CONGRESS.

Senate Debate on the Removal of Disabilities.

Mr. Conkling's New Steamship Project.

THE OHIO NATIONAL ASYLUM CASE.

The Brooks and Hastings Quarrel Again Before the House.

A HOT SHOT FROM HASTINGS.

GEORGIA MEMBERS QUALIFIED.

The Ocean Telegraph Bill Passed in the House.

SENATE.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 16, 1871.

THE LINCOLN STATUE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the supervising architect of the Capitol extension, asking that a place be assigned for the statue of the late President Lincoln, executed by Miss Vinnie Ream. Referred to the Committee on Public Buildings.

ANOTHER STEAMSHIP PROPOSITION.

Mr. CONKLING introduced a bill to aid in the construction of twenty or more first class iron steamships, together with ship yards, machine shops, rolling mills, wharves, docks, &c., and to secure to the government the use of the same for postal, naval and other purposes. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce. The bill proposes to incorporate W. H. Webb, Clarence H. Clark, John A. Griswold, John Roach, Paul N. Spofford, Henry Steers and others under the name of the American Mail and Ocean Transportation Company, for the purpose above indicated, and provides that the government of the United States shall pay the interest on the first mortgage bonds of the company to the amount of $20,000,000 in gold for thirty years, not becoming responsible, however, for the payment of the principal. In return the company's steamships are to carry the United States mails and government agents free of charge.

SURVEY OF PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS.

On motion of Mr. WILLIAMS, (rep.) of Oregon, the Senate considered and passed the Senate bill to expedite the survey of private land claims.

Mr. WILLIAMS, in response to inquiries by Mr. Harlan, explained that the bill was the result of considerable legal research, and it would expedite the settlement of boundaries of old Mexican land tracts. Upon the importance of the measure to sections of the United States in which land claims existed, he said owners of thousands of acres of land in California and the Territories were unable to obtain patents, because there was no way of determining the boundaries of their tracts. The bill would, to a great extent, take those questions from the jurisdiction of the Land Department and give them to the courts of the country, where the titles have been confirmed, the parties thereby being enabled to bring their witnesses and have the questions adjudicated more satisfactorily.

REMOVAL OF POLITICAL DISABILITIES.

On motion of Mr. LEWIS, (rep.) of Va., the Senate resumed consideration of the House bill to relieve political disabilities of some fifty citizens of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT stated the question to be upon Mr. Trumbull's amendment to extend general relief from all such disabilities, excepting only former Congressmen and military and naval officers of the United States who joined the rebellion, and members of the secession State conventions.

Mr. HARLAN, (rep.) of Iowa, moved to include among the exceptions judges of the United States courts who joined the rebellion.

Messrs. LEWIS and WARNER, (rep.) of Ala., appealed to Mr. Trumbull to withdraw his amendment, which the latter declined to do, remarking that he thought the time had come for Congress to act on the general subject.

Mr. ABBOTT hoped the Senator (Mr. Trumbull) would not precipitate the question of general amnesty on the Senate at this time. There was nothing in the attitude of the South to justify the government in taking such a long step. He was opposed to the amnesty movement for public reasons, mainly because a large portion of the people of the Southern States were now as bitterly hostile to the government as ever before.

Mr TRUMBULL stated, in support of his amendment, that leaving out the authors of the secession ordinances he did not suppose the whole number of persons included in the exceptions would amount to more than two or three hundred.

Mr STEWART, (rep.) of Nev., spoke of the partial and unsatisfactory character of the legislation, intended to meet individual cases, and the necessity of legislation by classes.

The morning hour expiring, Mr. LEWIS reiterated his appeal to Mr. Trumbull for a withdrawal of the amendment, as its adoption would operate as a virtual defeat by compelling them to return the bill to the House. It was a measure of great importance to the people of his State.

Mr. TRUMBULL replied by inquiring whether, if the amendment prevailed, it would not embrace every person named in the bill. It was certainly unpleasant for him to refuse the personal appeals of the Senators; but he persisted in his refusal as the most effective means of ending the practice of piecemeal legislation in removing disabilities. A general bill could never be had while special bills were allowed to go through. Referring to a suggestion by Mr. Stewart Mr. Trumbull intimated his willingness to withdraw his proposition if the Senate would agree not to pass any more special bills on the subject until definite action was taken upon a general bill.

Several Senators objected.

THE OHIO NATIONAL ASYLUM.

Mr. SHERMAN, (rep.) of Ohio, then demanded the regular order, which was the bill ceding certain jurisdiction to the State of Ohio. This bill was then taken up and debated by Messrs. Sherman and Thurman, the Senators of Ohio, for several hours.

The bill gives the State of Ohio jurisdiction and title over the property purchased by the United States for national asylums for disabled soldiers.

Mr. SHERMAN explained that the bill was made necessary by the recent decision of the Supreme Court of Ohio, under which some three or four hundred soldiers in the asylum near Dayton, under the laws of the State and otherwise eligible to vote, were disfranchised as non-residents because within the one mile square ceded by Ohio to the general government preparatory to establishing the institution. He went on to show that the acceptance of this land by the general government was upon a condition that no resident upon it otherwise eligible should by that change of jurisdiction be deprived of his right to vote. He commented upon the judicial decision referred to as a shock to the feelings of every citizen of the State, and said there was a strong public sentiment in Ohio that the right to vote should be restored to those soldiers.

Mr. THURMAN defended the decision referred to as having been rendered uninfluenced by demagogism, by an independent and incorruptible judiciary. Regarding the inevitable effect of the passing of the bill as the destruction of the charity known as the Dayton Soldiers' Home, he proceeded to show the justice and propriety of the decision, which had been made by five republican judges against the wishes of their party in the State.

Mr. SHERMAN remarked he would prefer the abandonment of the asylum to disfranchisement of the country's defenders.

Mr. THURMAN did not propose to be carried away by unmeaning glorifications of the soldier. While he earnestly appreciated the soldiers of the late war, he thought that where they owed no allegiance to and partook of none of the responsibilities of a State it was no great hardship to deny them participation in its government for the time being. He had been one of the first to secure the ballot to the Ohio soldiers in the field in 1862, but that was not pertinent. The bill was unconstitutional in ceding to the State of Ohio the jurisdiction over this asylum.

A report of the Board of Managers, signed by General Butler, as chairman, was read at the request of Mr. Thurman, showing how some of the inmates procured their discharge as the time approached for the payment of their pensions, and that after drawing their pensions they ran into excesses, becoming debauched and diseased and finally street vagrants. Some of them plied the hand organ in the temporary employ of foreigners, the latter appropriating the lion's share of the proceeds received by these soldiers as charity. Notwithstanding the migratory habits of these men, as shown by the report, it was now attempted to treat them as permanent residents of the State, and to permit the whole of them to vote, whether sixteen hundred or sixteen thousand, because the managers could bring as many soldiers as they pleased to the asylum. In this way a general State election might be decided by those votes. Senators ought not to do violence to their own consciences by voting for a bill merely to secure party votes.

Mr. SHERMAN, after expressing regret that his colleague had wasted an amount of eloquence upon a very simple subject, argued that the Supreme Court of Ohio had erred in assuming, as a matter of fact, that exclusive jurisdiction over the land covered by the asylum grounds was ceded to the United States. He held that the land was the property, not of the United States, but of the soldiers, being held in trust for them by the Board of Managers.

Mr. THURMAN again spoke at length on the subject in support of his position, claiming that the interest of the soldiers in the charity was subject to the discretion of the managers and did not at all include the land.

Mr. WILLIAMS remarked that it would take a Philadelphia lawyer to tell what the bill meant.

Mr. CARPENTER, rep. of Wis., stated he was opposed to the bill. He regarded the corporation as subject to Congress and as managing the asylum for the United States. He regarded the decision of the Supreme Court as sound and the condition attached by the Legislature, in its cession of the land, as void.

Without disposing of the bill the Senate at four o'clock, after an executive session, adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 16, 1871.

BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

By Mr. BUFFINTON, (rep.) of Mass.—To enable the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad Company to mortgage its road; and to confer certain jurisdiction on the United States courts for the District of Missouri.

By Mr. STARKWEATHER, (rep.) of Conn.—Authorizing the appointment of commissioners by the President to ascertain the damage done by the Alabama and other rebel cruisers.

By Mr. PROSSER, (rep.) of Tenn.—Prescribing the mode of holding elections for President, Vice President and Members of Congress.

By Mr. CULLOM, (rep.) of Ill.—Amendatory of the act relating to the courts of Utah Territory.

By Mr. HOAG, (rep.) of Ill.—To amend the first section of the act of the 20th of July, 1868, imposing taxes on distilled spirits and tobacco.

By Mr. SARGENT, (rep.) of Cal.—Making a compensation of $10,000 to Joseph S. Wilson, Commissioner of the Land Office, for collecting the scientific museum at the Land Office.

By Mr. SPINK, (rep.) of Dakota—To remove obstructions in the Red river of the North. Also for the erection of a custom house and post office and United States Court rooms at Pembina.

NORTH CAROLINA CONTESTED ELECTION CASE.

Mr. McCRARY, (rep.) of Iowa, from the Committee on Elections, made a report in the contested election case from the Sixth district of North Carolina, that Shober, the sitting member, is entitled to the seat, and that the contestant, Nathaniel Boyden, should receive $1,000 for expenses.

THE NEW YORK CUSTOM HOUSE.

Mr. COX offered a resolution in relation to the New York Custom House. Referred to the Committee of Ways and Means. The resolution is as follows:—

Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury, under date of July 11, 1870, communicated to this House information in response to a resolution of June 27, 1870, relative to New York Custom House matters; and whereas in said communication the Secretary communicated two letters, dated 1st and 8th ult., requesting the restoration of the general order business to the bonded warehouses at Jersey City and Hoboken; and whereas this request has not been complied with, greatly to the injury of commerce, notwithstanding the appeal made to the Collector by Phelps, Dodge & Co., and many other merchants (naming them); and whereas the Secretary has repeated his request and the old system continues in defiance of his reiterated requests; therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary be requested to transmit all the correspondence since July 11, 1870, with his views as to the necessity of additional legislation to compel collectors to comply with his orders.

TOBACCO TAXES.

Mr. COX, (dem) of N. Y., presented a petition of Joseph Raphael and others, of New York city, to relieve the tobacco interest from the repetitions of the tax on sales, &c.

NEW YORK AND WASHINGTON AIR LINE RAILWAY.

The question of the Air Line Railroad bill between New York and Washington came up from last Monday, the question being would the House grant leave for its introduction. The question was decided in the affirmative—yeas 114, nays 78.

All the democrats voted in the negative, together with the following named republicans:—Messrs. Benjamin, Buffington, Butler of Mass., Dawes, Hale, Hill, Hooper, Kelley of Pa., Ketchum, Laflin, Moore of Ohio, Myers, Negley, O'Neill, Packer of Pa., Poland, Smith of Vt., Stevens, Twitchell, Van Wyck and Washburn of Mass.

Mr. ELDRIDGE, (dem.) of Wis., moved to reconsider the last vote.

Mr. KELSEY, (rep.) of N. Y., moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table. Agreed to—yeas 114, nays 78. So the bill was introduced, and the morning hour having expired the bill went over till Monday next.

GEORGIA MEMBERS SWORN IN.

The credentials of W. P. Price, P. M. B. Young, J. F. Long and Marion Bethune, Representatives elect from the State of Georgia, were presented, and, no objection being made, these gentlemen were sworn in.

THE HASTINGS-BROOKS CASE.

The following petition was presented to the House of Representatives to-day:—

Mr. LAFLIN sent up to the Clerk's desk and had read the following memorial from Hugh J. Hastings:—

TO THE HONORABLE THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:—

The petition of Hugh J. Hastings respectfully represents:—Your petitioner is now, and for three years past has been, the editor of a public journal published in the city of New York, and known as the *Commercial Advertiser*, and said journal has been identified with and known as an organ of the republican party; that during the same period there has been published in the said city another journal, known as the New York *Evening Express*, and which said journal has been identified with and known as an organ of the democratic party. The said last named journal is owned and edited by James Brooks and Erastus Brooks, under the firm name of "J. & E. Brooks," and the said James Brooks is a member of your honorable body. The said James Brooks was, in the fall of 1870, a candidate for re-election as a member of Congress from the city of New York. In the course of the canvass for such election the journal edited by your petitioner advocated the election of the nominee of the republican party, George Wilkes, editor of the *Spirit of the Times*, but in doing so did not overstep the grounds of proper political discussion and criticism. Nothing was stated during the course of said political discussion except what your petitioner believed to be as well the truth as a proper subject for editorial notice. On the evening preceding the day of election in the city of New York the said James Brooks published in the *Evening Express* a paper purporting to be an affidavit signed by your petitioner, and prefixed the same with an editorial article in the following words:—

"A few necessary words—the short metre method is the best way of dealing with some people, and will answer in the case of Mr. Hugh J. Hastings, editor of the New York *Commercial Advertiser*. That paper this afternoon contains a blackguard attack on Mr. James Brooks, one of the editors of the *Express*, which is best described by Hastings himself—thus, Hugh Hastings, as described by himself," to which was appended the said alleged affidavit, and such alleged affidavit was followed by these words, "this will be republished whenever it is necessary."

Your petitioner further states that he never made, signed, or verified in any manner or form the alleged affidavit so published by the said James Brooks, and never knew or heard that the same purported to be so made, signed and verified until he saw the same published in a public journal as an affidavit; and on so seeing the same your petitioner immediately caused to be published a denial that he had ever made, signed or verified said alleged affidavit or any affidavit of any kind relating to the subject matter to which said alleged affidavit purports to relate. Said original publication took place some twenty-eight years ago, in a newspaper published in the city of Albany, where your petitioner then resided, and was then known to be purely illusory, and a fiction published for the purposes of annoyance; and after such publication, it passed into oblivion until reproduced at intervals, and finally by the said James Brooks. The fact of the origin of the said alleged affidavit, and of its fictitious character, was, as your petitioner believes, well known to the said James Brooks prior to his publication thereof in the *Evening Express* of the 7th of November, 1870. Your petitioner, upon such publication by the said James Brooks, and believing him to be cognizant of the origin of such alleged affidavit, answered the editorial of the said James Brooks hereinbefore referred to, in what your petitioner believed to be a becoming and proper manner. Subsequently, and on the 30th of November, 1870, the said James Brooks published in the *Evening Express* of that date another article in the words following:—

"Mr. Hugh Hastings, of the *Commercial Advertiser*, seems anxious to have a personal, not a political, controversy with Mr. James Brooks. The *Express* next time will not only republish that *Switch* document, but placard it in handbills all over the upper part of the city."

Your petitioner, believing that it was his right to vindicate himself from the charges thus repeatedly, wickedly and maliciously published against him by the said James Brooks, quoted in his paper of the 1st of December, 1870, the said last named article from the *Evening Express*, and thereto appended such remarks with reference to the personal character and conduct of the said James Brooks as were justified in your petitioner's belief by his public reputation, and in the course of such remarks stated, with reference to said James Brooks, as follows:—"We have said that he has availed himself of his position, as a member of Congress, to put money in his pocket; we repeat it. This is actionable. We invite Mr. Brooks to give us a chance to prove it.' The said James Brooks, in his paper of the next day, namely, December 2, 1870, accepted the invitation in an article in the following words:—Mr. Hugh Hastings, in the *Commercial*, admits that the *Express* cannot reach him by republishing his affidavit or his (to quote his own description of himself) 'self-disgrace and public humiliation!' in which he is doubtless right; but he has uttered a specific libel against Mr. James Brooks, which is actionable, and which he shall have an opportunity to establish in a court of law, and, as once before in a case of libel, now again to confess to 'self-disgrace and public humiliation.'" This, as your petitioner believes, terminated for the time being the journalistic controversy. Your petitioner had been grievously injured by Mr. James Brooks by the publication of the said alleged affidavit, which he well knew was fictitious, and with a feeling of just indignation your petitioner made certain charges which the public voice asserted were true, and which your petitioner reasserted his willingness to maintain in a court of justice, whose process would enable him to produce those, claiming to be cognizant of the facts alleged. His invitation, as already appears by the quotation from Mr. James Brooks' journal, was accepted, and thereafter your petitioner quietly waited for the "opportunity" to establish in a court of law the charges which Mr. James Brooks then offered to afford. Your petitioner was, therefore, surprised to find in the public journals of the 11th inst. that Mr. James Brooks had withdrawn his invitation to your petitioner to meet him in a court of justice, and, under the privilege of membership in your honorable body, had taken occasion, in the absence of your petitioner, to republish to the country the said fictitious affidavit; to read the charges made against him by your petitioner, and in the place of the court of justice which he had publicly asserted to be his chosen tribunal, to ask for a special committee "to investigate and report at any time upon such charges," and that, in pursuance of such request, a committee of investigation had been appointed. Under the authority so conferred, as your petitioner believes, a telegram was sent to him on the 12th inst. in the words following:—"You are required to appear before the select committee of the House of Representatives, on Tuesday next, 17th inst., at ten A. M., and to bring with you all documents or papers touching your charges against Hon. James Brooks, made in *Commercial Advertiser*, December 1, 1870. Will you come? Answer. N. G. Ordway, Sergeant-at-Arms, House of Representatives." To which your petitioner answered in substance that he would attend on the designated day.

Your petitioner further represents that, as he is advised and believes, the controversy existing between himself and the said James Brooks is a purely political, editorial and personal one, and as such is not properly the subject of discussion, investigation or adjudication by your honorable body, but properly belongs to a judicial forum, in which your petitioner has been at all times, and is now, ready and willing to meet the same; that the charges made by your petitioner do not in any way affect the dignity of your honorable body, and, therefore, as your petitioner is advised and believes, are not properly the subject of investigation by a legislative body. Such charges were made in a heated canvass, by and against editors of public journals representing opposing political interests, and as such, so far as the same were made by your petitioner, are, if untrue, subject to be examined and decided upon by a judicial tribunal in which your petitioner is at all times willing and ready to appear. So far as the charge made against your petitioner by the said James Brooks is concerned, by the publication of said fictitious affidavit, your petitioner has already commenced a suit in the city of New York against the said James Brooks and Erastus Brooks for libel, in which the said James Brooks will have an opportunity to prove, if he can, the signature and verification of your petitioner to said alleged affidavit. It would seem but proper that the complaints of Mr. James Brooks, to which the attention of your honorable body has been called, should be remitted to the same tribunal which your petitioner has already selected, and to which Mr. James Brooks, in his editorial of December 2, 1870, stated that he invited your petitioner.

Your petitioner further states that, as he is advised and believes, the committee appointed by your honorable body, at the request of the said James Brooks, is not clothed with judicial powers, and that it will not afford to your petitioner an opportunity to be represented by counsel, nor entitle him to the ordinary processes of a court of justice, to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books and papers, nor will he be entitled to attend in person and by counsel, and to cross examine such witnesses as the said James Brooks may produce; but, on the contrary, as your petitioner is advised, the investigation by the said committee is to be entirely *ex parte*, in which your petitioner is to be forced into the attitude of a public prosecutor, and is not to be supplied with any of the means afforded by the law to those who occupy such position.

Your petitioner therefore prays:—That your honorable body will be pleased to hold and determine that the matters in controversy between your petitioner and the said James Brooks are of a personal and political nature, common to the profession of a journalist, and, as such, are not properly to be investigated by a legislative body, but are cognizable only to an impartial court of law.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

HUGH J. HASTINGS.

Mr. LAFLIN now moved the reference of the memorial to the select committee appointed on the subject, with instructions to make a preliminary report on the propriety of further continuing the investigation.

Mr. BROOKS, (dem.) of N. Y., in reference to political allusions in the memorial, declared that the democratic party had no greater, wilier advocate than Mr. Hastings. He had been employed for years in Albany and New York to deprave, damage and destroy his own party—the republican party. Almost every New York republican member knew Mr. Hastings to be a spy for the betrayal of the secrets of the republican party to the democratic party, and that he was paid for being such spy. In proof of that he had before him the *Commercial Advertiser* of the 12th of January, containing six columns of an advertisement of the New York city corporation. That paper received those advertisements, from the profits of which it received twenty-five or thirty thirty thousand dollars a year. This was his (Mr. Brooks') response to the sympathetic appeal of Mr. Hastings to the republican side of the House. The affidavit which he had introduced to the House was an old acquaintance in New York. When he was a member of the New York Legislature, and previously when he was a correspondent at Albany, the existence of that paper was as well known as the existence of the sun in the skies, and never was denied. It had been reprinted from time to time in the *Independent* of New York uncontradicted; it had re-appeared in handbills, when Mr. Fenton was elected to the Senate, and was not then denied. But now that Mr. Stone, the person libelled, was dead, and that his counsel, Mr. Fisher, was also dead, there was a denial of the affidavit. But that denial itself was only a technical denial. Mr. Hastings did not deny, and could not deny, that he had published the document in his own newspaper, and by that publication alone obtained exemption from the damages to which otherwise he would have been subjected. He (Mr. Brooks) appealed to the House to proceed with the investigation and to vindicate his character.

Mr. LAFLIN said that, while he appreciated the value of private character, he could not forget the extraordinary circumstances under which the subject had been introduced in the House. Last Tuesday the gentleman from New York (Mr. Brooks) had, on a question of privilege, and without notice, introduced to the House an affidavit which the gentleman knew had been publicly denied by the signer to it. That gentleman's desire to tarnish the reputation of the memorialist was so marked that he stood here to-day an organ of the democratic party, publicly confessing that that party had been in the habit of bribing republicans, and as proof of that referring to a corporation advertisement in the *Commercial Advertiser*. If he (Mr. Laflin) were correctly informed, that same advertisement appeared in the New York *Tribune* and *Evening Post*. And would any one pretend that Horace Greeley and William C. Bryant were by that pitiful advertisement bribed to betray the republican party? If not, why make such a charge against Mr. Hastings? He (Mr. Laflin) had had some acquaintance with New York politics for the last twenty years, and knew Mr. Hastings' political record during that time, and this was the first time he had heard that Mr. Hastings was anything but a whig and republican. In 1854 Mr. Hastings was elected clerk of the whig Senate of New York against the opposition of Mr. Erastus Brooks, who then brought up the same affidavit; but Mr. Brooks was subsequently satisfied that he had done an injustice to Mr. Hastings, and made ample apologies therefor.

Mr. FARNSWORTH, (rep.) of Ill., moved to lay the motion on the table.

Mr. DAWES, (rep.) of Mass.—What objection is there to having a preliminary report made on the subject?

Mr. RANDALL, (dem.) of Pa., called for a division on the question.

The vote was taken as to whether instructions should be given to the committee to make a preliminary report, and it was decided in the negative.

The memorial was then referred without instructions to the select committee.

OCEAN TELEGRAPH CABLES.

Mr. BANKS moved to suspend the rules and pass a concurrent resolution rescinding the resolution passed last Monday which referred to a special committee the subject of ocean telegraph cable legislation. He represented that the resolution was passed hurriedly and without being understood by the House, which had already referred the subject to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He went on to say that the subject involved appropriations to the amount of twenty or twenty-five millions of dollars. One enterprise alone called for a subsidy of ten millions, and there were four or five others which would follow in the same wake. The subject had been considered for five months by the Commission on Foreign Affairs and that commission was ready to report.

Mr. STARKWEATHER, who offered the resolution last Monday, opposed its being rescinded, and advocated the propriety of having the subject referred to a joint select commission, as no less than thirteen bills on the subject had been referred in the Senate and the House to the various district committees. He alluded to the fact that the Chairman of the Senate Commission on Foreign Affairs had stated in the Senate that the commission would not report at this session, thus leaving the whole business of ocean telegraphing in the hands of a monopoly that charges triple rates.

The question was further discussed by Messrs. Butler of Mass., Garfield and Dawes against the resolution offered by Mr. Banks, and by Messrs. Judd, Wood and Myers in support of it.

Mr. WOOD said there was something suspicious in the mode and manner by which it was sought to accomplish, indirectly and unfairly, what could not be accomplished by the action of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That committee had reported a general bill, but was opposed to granting subsidies. That fact was at the bottom of these proceedings. He was informed that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Butler) was really the author of the resolution offered on Monday last by Mr. Starkweather.

Mr. STARKWEATHER contradicted that statement, and said he had never consulted Mr. Butler about it.

Mr. BUTLER also contradicted the statement.

The motion of Mr. BANKS to suspend the rules and rescind the resolution of last Monday was rejected—yeas 103, nays 82, not two-thirds voting in the affirmative.

Mr. BANKS thereupon asked leave to report now from the Committee on Foreign Affairs a bill on the subject of ocean telegraphs.

Mr. ARNELL objected.

Mr. BANKS moved to suspend the rules, in order that such a bill might be reported now. The rules were suspended without division.

Mr. BANKS said he would not ask the House to consider the bill now.

Mr. STARKWEATHER—We want it considered now. If the gentleman has a bill let him report it.

Mr. WOOD thereupon, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported the bill relating to telegraphic communication between the United States and foreign countries, and moved the previous question on its passage. The previous question was seconded and the bill was passed without discussion or division. The following is the text:—

That all communication established or that may be established between the United States and any foreign country by means of telegraphic or magnetic lines or cables laid in any part thereof in and over the waters, reefs, island shores and lands within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be subject to the following conditions, stipulations and reservations; to wit:—

First—The government of the United States shall be entitled to exercise and enjoy the same or similar privileges with regard to the control and use of any such line or cable that may by law, agreement or otherwise be exercised and enjoyed by any foreign government whatever.

Second—Citizens of the United States shall enjoy the same privileges as to the payment of rates for the transmission of messages as are enjoyed by the citizens of the most favored nations.

Third—The transmission of despatches shall be made in the following order:—First, the despatches of State under such regulations as may be agreed upon by the governments interested; second, despatches on telegraphic service; third, private despatches.

Fourth—The lines of any such cables shall be kept open to the public for the daily transmission of market and commercial reports and intelligence, and messages, despatches and communications shall be forwarded in the order in which they are received, except as hereinbefore provided.

Fifth—Before extending or establishing such line or cable in or over any waters, reefs, islands, shores and lands, within the jurisdiction of the United States, a written acceptance of the terms and conditions imposed by this act shall be filed in the office of the Secretary of State by the company, corporation or party proposing to establish telegraphic communication.

SEC. 2. And be it further enacted that, subject to the foregoing conditions, stipulations and restrictions, and subject to such grants as have heretofore been made by Congress to lay and maintain telegraphic cables from the shores of the United States, the consent of Congress is hereby given to the laying and maintaining of telegraphic or magnetic lines or cables between the United States and foreign countries in and over the waters, reefs, islands, shores and lands within the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 3. And be it further enacted that any person connected with any company engaged in the transmission of news to foreign countries who shall, contrary to his duty, disclose or in any way make known or intercept the contents of any messages or any part thereof, and any person who shall injure or destroy any cable or other property of the company, or interfere with the working, repair or use of any cable or line connected with such cables shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine not exceeding $5,000 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years, and the party injured thereby shall have a right of action for damages. It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to prosecute all persons offending against any of the provisions of this act in any District Court of the United States.

The House then, at half-past four, adjourned.

RIGHT OF RIPARIAN OWNERS.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 16, 1871.

The Supreme Court of the United States to-day rendered the following decision:—

Case No. 51. *Yates vs. The City of Milwaukee—An Appeal from the Circuit Court for the District of Wisconsin.*—The bill in this case was filed to restrain the city of Milwaukee from removing a wharf built upon a block adjacent to the Milwaukee river, which the complainant claimed as his private property, but which was deemed by the city an obstruction to navigation. The decision below was for the city; but this Court reverses the decree and remands the case, holding that the owner of a lot on a navigable river has a right to build a wharf or pier out to waters navigable in fact. The order is that the Court below issue an injunction against the city and its contractor, as prayed for, provided that the city shall be at liberty, for the purpose of improving the river, to take the wharf, making just compensation therefor.

THE NATHAN MURDER.

A Speculative Chicago Detective Tries a Neat Little Game, but Don't Quite Succeed—Discouraging Antecedent History and Encouraging Future Prospects of the Arrest of the Real Murderer.

The six months, which it is now very nearly, since the Nathan murder have not diminished the public interest as to the discovery of the murderer. All the peculiar circumstances hedging about the case have served to stimulate this interest. It is certain that no murder has ever been committed in this city upon which so much detective skill and energy have been spent to discover the perpetrator of the crime, and in no case with such assured unsatisfactory results. But it is unnecessary to dwell upon this point or the clues that have been vainly sought out and as vainly followed up to lift the veil of secrecy casting its overshadowing and impenetrable pall over this dreadful homicide. Unheeding the various false arrests and unreliable rumors and stories that have been set afloat in reference to it, we come down to

—The last scene
Of this strange, eventful history;

or, in more plainly prosaic words, to the narrative about the Chicago detective, Mr. W. P. Felcker and his wonderful alleged discoveries in connection with this mysterious murder. This

CHICAGO DETECTIVE'S STORY

is quickly told. He claimed to be able to produce the watch and chain of the murdered man, to be able to indicate the assassin, to be able to lay his hands upon him. He did not do this, and perhaps the $47,000 reward promised for his capture would not have become his if he had. Mr. Felcker has now shaken the metropolitan dust from his pedal coverings and has gone back to Chicago. He doubtless thought he would let no New York detectives get the best of him. People of Chicago know a thing or two, and he shared in this general knowledge of the people of the Garden City. Anybody can see that this is

A PRETTY NARRATIVE

and greatly redounding to the credit of the Chicago detective. To bring the dastardly author of this terrible murder within the clutches of the law has with him no consideration. To serve the ends of justice might not with him be a brother's right. But there is nothing like sifting a story thoroughly. With this view a HERALD reporter called yesterday on Judge Cardozo and the

SIFTING PROCESS

was easily and speedily accomplished.

"I will tell you all about it," said the Judge in his usual prompt and pleasant way, as soon as the object of the visit was made known.

"I was at Long Branch with my family, when the murder was committed. As soon as the sad news reached me I came to New York. Judge Dowling I had known long and intimately. I also knew Superintendent Jourdan and Detective Kelso. The matter of discovering the murderer was at once placed in their hands. No man has been more zealous, from that time to this, in trying to discover the murderer than Judge Dowling. Superintendent Jourdan gave his soul and energies to the work almost to the day of his death. Detective Kelso, as he was then, was unwavering and unflagging in his efforts while chief of the detective force, and his energies to this end have not relaxed since becoming Superintendent. The Mayor, also, has been most assiduous in laboring to the same end."

"Well, what about Feckler's discoveries?" we asked, interrupting this preliminary narrative, which was going into detail, but which it is unnecessary to reiterate here, the facts are so generally known.

"He is

A FRAUD,

as I am now thoroughly convinced. He came to my house and showed two blood-bespattered pieces of cotton which, he said, was cut from the shirt of the murderer."

"Did he show the studs Mr. Nathan wore, or a locket taken from the vest?"

"Neither. He claimed, however, to know where the watch and chain are, but I am satisfied now he knows nothing about them. I told him if he would produce them he should have the reward offered for them."

"Did he come alone?"

"Judge Dowling and Mr. Kelso came with him. He had talked to them about knowing so much about the murder and who was the murderer that they thought they had better bring him to me."

"Did they have much confidence in him?"

"Very little; but in the possibility of his knowing something we thought it best not to leave a stone unturned."

"What was said about the reward?"

"That was the burden of Feckler's talk. I could scarcely get him to talk of anything else. He said he

WANTED ALL THE REWARD

if he got the murderer. He did not want the New York detectives to come in and claim a share."

"What did Mr. Kelso say to this?"

"He told Feckler he should have it all if he got the murderer; and more than this, that he would assist him personally and all the detectives if necessary, and they wouldn't any of them claim a cent. 'We are working for the ends of justice, not for money,' said Mr. Kelso. 'I am working for money,' said Feckler. 'I will give $1,000 from my own pocket if you discover the murderer,' said Judge Dowling, and added, 'I would have given $5,000 if he had been discovered in Jourdan's lifetime.' Mr. Kelso and Judge Dowling meant every word they said."

"What did Feckler say to all this?"

"He wanted

$1,500 TO PAY EXPENSES

he had already incurred and would incur. I gave him a check for $500 and sent one of $1,000 two days after. This was to try him. Judge Dowling said if he did not fulfil his promises he would make this country too hot for him. This scared him, and he afterwards paid the $500 back, which, with the $1,000, were sent to me by Superintendent Kelso."

"And is this the last you expect to hear of Feckler?"

"The last in connection with the Nathan murder."

The Judge went into further and interesting details, but mainly touching facts already known to the public. In the above interview we have only embodied the main facts touching Feckler's *rôle* as a detective. Meantime it is said that this Feckler has a somewhat interesting

ANTECEDENT HISTORY

in connection with operations of this kind. After serving an apprenticeship under William B. Wood in the old Capitol Prison, it is alleged that he was arrested at Chicago for beating a woman out of $1,800, under pretence of effecting a release of her husband from State Prison, and that he pretended to the parents of the Joyce children, murdered in Roxbury, Mass., that he knew the murderer and could effect his arrest, and upon this pretence obtained quite a sum of money from them. Following on the end of this comes

LIGHT FROM ANOTHER QUARTER.

Colonel Whitley says that the murderer of Mr. Nathan is positively known, and that his arrest within a very short time is almost certain. This person is now said to be under the strictest surveillance, the proofs of his guilt are being gathered together, and as soon as they are complete that he will be arrested, his escape being hardly within the bounds of possibility.

THE ROGERS TRAGEDY.

The Mystery Still Unveiled—Another Statement by the Pretended Rogers Murderer—Pinton Confined in the Tombs at the Time of the Murder.

AUBURN, Jan. 16, 1871.

The so-called confession of the convict, Francis E. Pinton, now in the prison at this place, of the murder of Mr. Rogers, in New York, on the 31st of December, 1868, causes considerable excitement, the more so as he now endeavors to ridicule his first statement and to show that in the whole business he was, to use his own language, "only funning." I called at the prison this morning, and through the courtesy of Mr. Allen Ross, the agent, obtained an interview with the keeper, Hoffman, and the convicts, Harris and Pinton. Their statements were interesting, though somewhat colored and conflicting. It must be said, in explanation, that Hoffman, the keeper, is exceedingly anxious to secure the large reward offered by Mayor Hall; that the convict acknowledges he has a motive in giving evidence against his brother ruffian, and that the latter may possibly have had a motive in throwing dust in the eyes of the authorities. That this latter is the more correct supposition is now a fixed fact. After writing out my interviews with the parties named I received a telegram stating that Pinton, alias Williams, was in the Tombs on the day of the murder of Mr. Rodgers, as he positively stated to me to-day that he was so confined on the occasion of the tragedy, and that the effort to convict him of the crime was all nonsense. His statements must now be considered true. Clearly he was not the murderer, and his confession must be classed with those of the desperate seekers after notoriety who acknowledged themselves the assassins of Mr. Nathan.

SHOCKING CASE OF BARBARITY.—An old negro man, probably upwards of ninety, formerly a slave of Mr. Gamble, of Rutherford county, Tennessee, was taken from his home one night last week by parties in disguise. He was taken away about nine o'clock at night, and was found early next morning hanging to the limb of a tree. The object of the murderers could not be ascertained. No one knew of any enemies of the old man except some negroes who had been making some reckless but, perhaps, unmeaning threats. The first supposition was that he had been murdered for his money; but in his pockets they found some twenty or thirty dollars which had not been disturbed. The rope with which he was hung had been inserted in his mouth and passed thence around the back of his head and securely tied. When found his feet were resting upon the ground.

THE METHODIST MUDDLE.

The Book Concern Scandal—The Squabbles of the Faithful—The Lanahan Persecution—An Attempt to Shelve the Examination.

The Methodist Book Committee met yesterday at half-past nine A. M. After the religious preliminaries Rev. Dr. Curry was recalled and examined direct in regard to matters to which he had testified substantially on Saturday. He was then cross-examined by Judge Reynolds in regard to the conversation which took place in the office of Harper Brothers, heretofore referred to. He was surprised to hear the subject of the concern's management talked of by Dr. Lanahan before a third person as it then was. This was before the appearance of the *Times* article, and he considered the matter then as confidential. He did not advise or suggest, but rather consented that Mr. Harper should be consulted in the matter. He did suggest that he was a good adviser in matters of publishing.

Question—Did you say that Dr. Carleton was a man

WHO KILLED BY SILENCE?

Answer—I did say that or its equivalent, and I verily believe it; I don't think I said that Dr. Carleton could not be moved in this thing.

Q. Did you say that Dr. Carleton excelled in one attribute of human nature, and that the lowest—cunning? A. I don't think I did.

Q. Did Mr. Harper say so? A. I did not say he did; the conversation was a very free one, and the character and conduct of the agent was discussed, not to censure, but rather in regard to different casts of mind that were needed for different kinds of work; the assistant agent and myself were somewhat constrained in this regard, but Mr. Harper was not so constrained and spoke freely; I don't think Dr. Lanahan made use of this language toward Dr. Carleton, and I am very certain I did not; two or three days after the publication of the *Times* article Dr. Lanahan and myself ceased to converse so freely or frequently, as we stood on opposite sides of the case; Dr. Lanahan offered to sign a card exculpating the agents, past and present, from all connection or knowledge of frauds, provided that the admission of frauds in the concern was allowed to go forth with it; to this the witness strongly objected; he could not remember any specific amounts of losses mentioned by Dr. Lanahan, but he knew that sums were mentioned; the Doctor acknowledged his disagreement with Dr. Lanahan, but denied that he had taken any active part against him in this case until the present time.

A short editorial article from the *Christian Advocate* of March 3, 1870, was read, in which the word "infamous" is applied to Dr. Lanahan's course. Dr. Curry was questioned in regard to its authorship. He was responsible for it, though his assistant, Dr. Dupuy, wrote it. Dr. Curry admitted that when the committee met here last February he made suggestions to individual members, but took no part in the debates or actions of the committee. He refused to endorse the action of the committee in one particular where Mr. Pike, three days before the adjournment,

ANNOUNCED WHAT HIS VERDICT

would be.

Mr. Pike subsequently rose to a question of privilege, and stated that the witness had misrepresented him altogether, and he appealed to the records in proof of his position.

Extracts were read from a "supplement" to the *Christian Advocate* which exhibited the condition of the Book Concern, and stated certain facts which tended to disprove some, but to confirm others of Dr. Lanahan's charges of fraud and mismanagement, and in answer to questions Dr. Curry acknowledged himself the author of that paper, and stated that he obtained his information from various sources, but he refused to name parties. As Judge Reynolds continued to read further extracts Mr. Fancher objected, unless the paper itself was first placed in evidence. Judge Reynolds was not prepared for this, and after a discussion the cross-examination on this point ceased for the time being.

Mr. Buckley called attention to the presence of Dr. Dupuy in the room, contrary to the rule which excludes more than one witness from being present for either side at the same time. Inasmuch as the resolution admitting reporters had passed the committee subsequent to this the rule was nullified, and on motion of Dr. Bannister it was rescinded.

General Moore moved, at half-past eleven A. M., to adjourn until half-past nine A. M. to-day, and, as his motion looked to a final adjournment, he stated his reasons for making it. When the committee investigated those charges before it found them unsustained, and he then favored an adjournment of all further investigation until the meeting of the General Conference of 1872, unless any new matter should come up before that time; and being now convinced that there is nothing new before the committee he believed it would be one of the happiest things for the Church if this thing could stop here, and his motion would enable the committee and the counsel on both sides to consult upon this matter.

The motion was voted down.

General Moore again renewed his motion for the purpose of eliminating from the charges everything that did not relate directly to the official conduct of the accused.

The motion was laid on the table.

The rules allow any three members of the committee to call an executive session, and, upon the call of Messrs. Moore, Rawlins and Blades, it was voted that after the recess (one P. M.) the committee meet in executive session.

Dr. Kennedy gave notice that he should move for a dissolution of the executive session.

The bishops were invited to be present at it, and the business before them was understood to be to prune the charges down to such points as the bishops can concur with the committee on. During the session it was agreed that at its close the committee should adjourn for the day, so that the reporters and counsel were relieved from remaining outside unless they desired to stay. The committee will meet this morning at half-past nine o'clock.

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE.

How a Policeman Obtained a Diamond Pin.

NEW YORK, Jan. 15, 1871.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

Seeing an article in your paper the other evening under the heading of the "Demoralization of the Police Department," I thought it my duty to send these facts to you so you could show the public the way the police beat the liquor dealers. I have been in the liquor business fifteen years, and always kept a decent place. Two weeks ago a detective came into my place and asked me to put my name down on a paper he had for twenty-five dollars, to help to buy a diamond pin to be presented to Captain ——. I told him I was under no obligations to Captain —— or anybody else. He said it would be better for me to give it, as they all were putting their names down for the same amount. I said the last time he came in, that the Superintendent had issued an order against the police taking anything. He only laughed and said that would be all right. So, for fear of being watched night and Sunday, I gave him twenty-five dollars. Now, sir, what do you think of this? He got the pin and now wears it—a disgrace to the Police Department.

This is Not "What's the Matter."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

W. A. P. may have found the "modern system of spelling" in one of the schools, but if he had visited many others under the control of the Board of Education he would have found, first, the child pronouncing his word; second, spelling it, pausing slightly to show the division of syllables—this latter being considered better than to pronounce each syllable after spelling. This plan is followed in many, if not all, of our public schools. Many a time have I heard the superintendent correct a child for omitting to pronounce his word previous to spelling it. I think the spelling in our public schools will compare with that in private schools and leave a balance favorable to the former.

B. W.

About the Over-Crowded Cars.

NEW YORK, Jan. 14, 1871.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

Being a constant reader of your paper, and reading in it an article which is agitating the minds of our principal citizens, I would like to have my say on this important subject—I refer to the packing of the cars. Being one of the riders on our city railroads—that is, when I can get on a car—I would protest against being smothered alive and catching my death of cold on a rainy night, when the cars are packed to their utmost. I have counted on a rainy night as many as forty-five passengers on a Sixth avenue car, and, let me tell you, it was pretty full; but had there been more passengers to get on, the conductor would manage to get them in. Now, there are a great many persons who will not get in a packed car. If the railroad companies would put on more cars they would have no need of grumbling at the five cent passage, for I am sure they would make money, as our country boys say, hand over fist. Hoping that you will, with your valuable paper, help this object along, I remain yours truly,

C. W. ACKERMAN.

A Suggestion for the Third Avenue Railroad Company.

NEW YORK, Jan. 14, 1871.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

Why does not the Third Avenue Railroad Company lay an extra track, and from seven to eleven A. M. run an additional number of cars on this extra track going down town, and let the cars return on the same track used for cars going up town, and from three to eight P. M. use this extra track for the additional cars to run on going up town, letting them come down on the same track used for cars coming down town, and when arriving at City Hall can be switched on an extra track?

A SUGGESTION.

CUBA.

Arrival of the Wife of Carlos Manuel Cespedes, President of the Cuban Republic.

Her Statement in Regard to Her Capture—Her Companion Not the Son-in-Law of Juarez, as Reported—Her Treatment in Havana—Courtesy of Valmaseda.

By the steamship City of Merida, of the Mexican mail line, arrived here yesterday from Havana, Donna Anita Loyenaz, wife of Carlos Manuel Cespedes, President of the Cuban republic, and sister of the well known General Queseda. This lady is much the junior of her renowned husband, to whom she was married two years ago and about the time of the breaking out of the insurrection. She is a fine example of the pure Cuban in form and feature, with olive complexion, brilliant black eyes, and easy and courteous in demeanor. According to her statement she was captured by a detachment of Spaniards on the 30th of December, near the small village of Guanaja, on the north coast, opposite Cayo Romano. She had been for more than two months in that vicinity, waiting an opportunity to embark for Nassau, her husband wishing to separate her from further exposure and suffering in the arduous struggle which he is leading. At the time of her capture there were with her but two persons, a French attendant and Señor Don Juan Clemente Zenea, erroneously reported as the brother-in-law of Juarez, President of Mexico. The Spaniards reported fifteen men captured with her, but this was the number of Chinamen and other inoffensive people which the column had taken and killed during the day, and who were in no way whatever associated with her. Señor Zenea was a Cuban poet of no mean pretensions, and well known throughout the island. He formerly resided in Havana, where he married. At the beginning of the insurrection he was in Mexico, but went to Cuba about a year since, where he remained up to the time of his capure. He was hurriedly tried, condemned and executed, dying, like all of his compatriots, with marvellous resignation and coolness.

Señora Cespedes was at once sent to Havana, and, as the phrase is, "was placed at the disposition of the First Authority." There, fortunately for her, she found an old friend in the present Captain General Valmaseda, who, when Governor of Puerto Principe, was a frequent visitor at her father's residence. He received her, as she states, with the most marked kindness and courtesy. For the better preservation of her retiracy, and to shield her from all annoyances, he directed that rooms should be prepared for her in the Beneficiencia, or French Hospital, a very old institution of Havana, under the patronage of the leading ladies there, with orders that she should be in no way disturbed nor compelled to see any, save those she desired. She states that while there some of the volunteers, for the gratification of their curiosity, called and asked to see her, promising to treat her with entire courtesy, but she refused to admit them, and they were compelled to depart unsatisfied. A few of her personal friends called upon her, being allowed to come and go as they chose. Having expressed her desire to proceed to New York, just prior to the departure of the City of Merida, she quietly went on board, escorted by an American who had been requested by his Excellency the Captain General to do so. She crossed the wharf, when great numbers of Spaniards, members of the volunteer organization, were gathered, unrecognized and undisturbed, reaching the vessel without incident and soon after sailed away from the scene of that deadly struggle, of which, from the time of its inception, she has seen so much.

Señora Cespedes had not seen her husband for more than two months prior to her capture, but had heard of him at intervals. He was, when last heard from in the Camaguey, together with the Cuban House of Representatives, in excellent health and spirits, confident of success as ever. On the very day of her capture she had seen the chief, Cornelio Porro, with a small party, by whom she had forwarded a message to Cespedes. She evidently has no idea that the Cubans expect to give over the struggle. She states that the Spanish troops do very little harm to the insurgent cause proper, though much to the poor people, who go about the country unarmed, are captured and killed to a greater or less extent by the Spaniards and by them reported as so many insurgents shot.

Señora Cespedes will take up her residence in this city.

Confirmation of the Capture of the Entire Cargo of the Steamship Hornet—Seventeen of Her Passengers Killed in an Engagement with the Spanish Forces—Insurgents Worsted in Another Fight—Accident to the Jamaica Cable.

HAVANA, Jan. 16, 1871.

Later and authentic news confirms the previous report that the entire cargo of the Hornet landed on the island had been captured. One cannon and three flags were also captured in an engagement with those who composed the Hornet expedition, and seventeen of the men were killed. In the same engagement four Spaniards were killed and nine were wounded.

Colonel Chinchilla, who has established himself at Santo Serterendos, had an encounter with 200 insurgents, under the command of Ocevedo, at Sales, and twenty of the insurgents were killed.

An accident happened to the Porto Rico cable at a point about twenty miles off Morant Bay, Jamaica. The steamer Dacian is now engaged making the necessary repairs to the injured cable, and her prospects of completing them at an early day are considered bright in Kingston.

The Steamer Hornet.

The Cuban officials in this city state that the steamer Hornet landed her cargo on the Cuban coast on the 7th inst. Press despatches by telegraph state that on the 8th inst. she was on the coast of Cuba, but was sighted by the Spanish gunboat Yumuri, was fired at and chased to sea. Another despatch, dated Havana, 15th inst., announces that she had returned and landed her cargo on the 12th, but that the entire cargo was captured, and still another despatch, dated at Havana yesterday, confirms the capture of the cargo, and states that seventeen of her passengers were killed in an encounter with the Spanish force making the seizure. Time alone can solve the question which of the statements is correct.

THE ALASKA SEAL FISHERS.

It is known that the government has sold to a California company the monopoly of the seal fisheries on the Alaska coast, and that the skins procured by this company are becoming a considerable item in our fur trade. It seems, however, that the company's operations are prosecuted with the usual heartlessness of monopolies that are not responsible to any higher power. The San Francisco *Bulletin* learns from Mr. Buynitzky, United States Treasury agent at Alaska, that the company catches no seals itself, but buys those caught by the natives of the islands of St. George and St. Paul. These natives live in huts sunk in the ground and covered with sod. These rude dwellings are nearly always damp, and so unhealthful that the adult natives die of consumption about as fast as children are born. In religious belief they are Christians, and most of them can read and write. They have no fuel except blubber. The company buy all the seals they catch and sell them all the supplies they need, and have such complete authority over them that they are compelled to give whatever prices for goods and provisions the company see proper to ask. The seal catchers do a good business, but they can make nothing by it. They average $1,000 a year in the value of the seals they catch, but all this money, Mr. Buynitzky declares, is extorted from them, so that at the end of the year they have saved nothing. It would seem that these poor people are quite as well entitled to the protecting interposition of the government as some other pet classes who are constantly receiving it.

GENERAL NEWS ITEMS.

Pittsburg is considering plans for utilizing its famous gas well in lighting the city.

It is reported that the trustees of Harvard College intend to contest the will of the late Hon. A. K. P. Welch.

There is a woman in Oshkosh who has been married six times, twice to the same man; been divorced three times, twice from the same man, and is now a widow.

The town authorities of Uxbridge, Mass., have prohibited driving neat cattle through that town till February 1. There are about fifty diseased cattle in the town at present.

A young man at La Crosse, Wis., looked through the keyhole of a girl's bedroom, and ever since the doctors have been trying to get a knitting needle out of the place where his eye used to be.

A Chicago boy being asked if he had a mother, said he didn't know, as he hadn't been home since morning, and when he left his father and mother were quarrelling, with odds in favor of his father, who had the hatchet in his hand.

At last some attention is about to be paid to the grave of ex-President Harrison at North Bend. It is about time something was done in the premises. Petitions to the Legislature of Ohio are now being circulated to enact a law to accept the plot of ground and suitably improve it.

The State prisons in Maine, New Hampshire and Massachusetts more than pay expenses, and it is urged that it would be no more than just to credit the surplus to the prisoners, to be paid at the expiration of their sentences or to their dependent families, when they have such.