

WASHINGTON.

Secretary Boutwell Opposing the Income Tax Repeal.

BONDS FOR THE NEW NATIONAL LOAN.

Attempt to Galvanize the Chopping Swindle.

The New York and Washington Air Line Railway.

Germany Wants no American Possessions.

The New National Loan—The Bonds in Course of Preparation.

Henry D. Cooke, one of the firm of Jay Cooke & Co., had a long interview with Secretary Boutwell to-day as to the best manner of obtaining subscriptions to the new national loan, but nothing definite was determined upon by the Secretary. He has, however, resolved that the interest shall be payable quarterly, and the Superintendent of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing has been notified to prepare the plates for the new bonds accordingly. In design they will differ much from the present issue. Six registered and four coupon bonds of each series will be issued, all conforming to a general plan but differing in detail. The engravers have been preparing designs since last July, and quite a number have been completed, from which Secretary Boutwell will select and determine on what particular denomination they shall be used. The vignettes of Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, the elder and younger Adams, Benton, Berrington, Farragut, Rawlins, Governor Andrew and others are already executed. The ornamental work upon the faces of the bonds is an ingenious combination of science and geometry, and will be different upon each denomination and series. The distinctive paper used by the government in printing legal tenders and fractional currency will also be used for the new bonds, millions of sheets of which are already stored in the vaults of the Treasury Department. The Secretary will probably select for the principal vignette a finely engraved vignette of the Capitol instead of the Treasury Department. It is the impression that the subscription books will be distributed among the Assistant United States Treasurers, United States Depositories, national banks generally and banking houses of well established reputation. Secretary Boutwell is sanguine that the new bonds will be readily taken. The first of the issue will be ready about March 1.

Opposition to the New York and Washington Air Line.

The democratic members of the House seem determined to prevent any action at this session upon the Washington and New York Air Line Railroad bill. The bill has not been properly managed, and those who have it in charge now lack either earnestness or a proper knowledge of Parliamentary tactics to get it before the House. The democrats understand this, and they have nothing to do but to worry over the morning hour each Monday by dilatory motions so as to prevent the bill from coming up in its regular order of business. James Brooks was the leader of the filibustering element to-day. For one hour after the reading of the journal he went through with nearly all the motions known to filibusters. Every bill and joint resolution offered for reference was rejected, and he then, in full, then the years and days were called on; then a motion was offered to refer the bill to the committee on Commerce and Navigation, and the same was demanded on that. All were intended to consume the time of the House, which should have been devoted to the transaction of the much delayed business of national importance. The Air Line bill meets with opposition from three sources—first, the democrats, who regard it as an infringement of State rights; second, the Massachusetts members, where the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad is mostly owned, and third, the Pennsylvania members, who are apprehensive that the road will be run through the Fairmount Park, near Philadelphia. This opposition crystallizes around the several railroad companies between this city and New York, every one of which has its special agents and attorneys upon the floor of the House. The members of the General Logan would take hold of the bill he might manage to push it through, for the Western and Southern members are strongly in favor of it. Under its present management it is not likely to come to anything.

The Income Tax Repeal Bill.

The Ways and Means Committee had a session to-day for the discussion of the repeal of the income tax. Dennis McCarthy, of New York, who has been absent for some days, made his appearance, so that there was a full committee. It was determined to take a vote in committee to-morrow upon a proposition to report a bill providing for the repeal of the tax on incomes. It is believed that the committee will be able to report such a measure.

Secretary Boutwell's Opposition to the Repeal of the Income Tax.

Secretary Boutwell has addressed a letter to the Hon. Samuel Hooper, Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, dated the 31st inst., in reply to his communication enclosing a resolution of the committee requesting the Secretary's views in writing upon several topics suggested by the proposition to repeal the income tax. He says:— It is impossible to state with precision the cost of collecting the tax, but he is satisfied it will not exceed half a million dollars, and that the net result will be not less than \$12,000,000 per annum for the two years covered by the existing laws. The estimates for the first year are based upon the data made upon the basis of the average prosperity of the laboring and business classes of the country. According to the estimate there will be a surplus of \$10,778,483 applicable to the payment of the principal of the public debt, in the second year the surplus will be \$12,000,000. It is also stated that if the proposed reduction should be reduced below the estimates the surplus applicable to the payment of the public debt would be increased. On the other hand, the appropriations should exceed the estimates the surplus will fall below the estimates. Assuming what is probable, that the country to be taxed with the estimated surplus is greater than prudence dictates. In the view taken by him of the question he is not prepared to advise the expediency of advising the continuance of the present system of taxation until the meeting of Congress in December next. We are now, he says, rapidly relieving the country of the burden of the recent changes than were when those changes were made. The reduction of taxes at the next session of Congress was estimated to be in the twenty per cent of the total revenues of the country, or more than \$80,000,000. It is wise to make a further reduction until the result of the law is known. After giving further reasons against the repeal of the income tax the Secretary says in one year more the effect of the reduction in force will be fully understood and legislation can then proceed upon the basis of experience. It is not an unreasonable expectation that Congress will be able to declare the income tax no longer needed, and also simultaneously to make corresponding concessions to other classes of taxpayers. It is his earnest desire that the result may be obtained; but while the future is uncertain he is not prepared to advise the expediency of relieving at once and completely those who are liable to pay an income tax, and by the same act transferring the chief burden of payment for the principal and interest of the public debt, and the present and current expenses of the government to the producing, consuming and business interests of the country. Entertaining the opinion that it is not expedient to reduce taxation at the present time to the extent of \$20,000,000, or in any other considerable sum, I am not prepared to advise the expediency of relieving at once and completely those who are liable to pay an income tax, and by the same act transferring the chief burden of payment for the principal and interest of the public debt, and the present and current expenses of the government to the producing, consuming and business interests of the country. Entertaining the opinion that it is not expedient to reduce taxation at the present time to the extent of \$20,000,000, or in any other considerable sum, I am not prepared to advise the expediency of relieving at once and completely those who are liable to pay an income tax, and by the same act transferring the chief burden of payment for the principal and interest of the public debt, and the present and current expenses of the government to the producing, consuming and business interests of the country.

THE STATE CAPITOL.

A change which has taken place in the financial system of the country during the last ten years renders the preservation of the public credit a duty of the highest importance. Every financial undertaking rests finally upon the public credit. The Southern Pacific Railroad Bill. The House to-day, by a vote of 129 to 61, suspended the rules and took from the Speaker's table the Transcontinental or Southern Pacific Railroad bill, for the purpose of referring it to the Pacific Railroad Committee for amendment. There is an understanding that the committee shall have ten days to report the bill back at any time after the 15th of this month. The action of the House to-day indicates that the bill for this great thoroughfare will pass before the close of the session by a large majority. It will probably be sent back to the Senate for concurrence in such amendments as the House may adopt. This, however, will not delay it, as the amendments will, of course, be acceptable to the advocates of the bill and those interested in it. The Southern Pacific is probably the only railroad measure which will pass Congress at this session. In the vote to-day it numbered among its friends members from all sections of the country and of all political parties. The Chopping Swindle—Further Exposures. There is considerable comment at the Capitol about the failure of the Senate Post Office Committee to report upon the House resolution suspending the Chopping Swindle. The case appeared so clear a fraud when explained by Mr. Dawes, of the House, that there was not a single vote against the resolution which he offered. Senator Pomeroy, of Kansas, is the special champion of Chopping in the Senate Post Office Committee. He wants a saving clause attached to the resolution which will allow Chopping to go to the Court of Claims with his case. If this amendment is reported the Senate will have to go back to the House for concurrence in the Senate amendment. In that event Mr. Dawes promises to make some interesting revelations which he withheld on the former occasion through regard for the feelings of the prominent officials whose names have been unflinchingly associated with this business.

The Woman Suffrage Debaté—Ben Butler Goes Back on His Friends.

An attempt was made in the House to-day to pass a resolution giving the use of the hall of the House on Wednesday evening next to Mrs. Victoria C. Woodhull and her collaborators in the women's suffrage movement. Mr. Julian, who offered the resolution, moved to suspend the rules for the purpose of passing it. Ben Butler, who has been set down as an earnest advocate of woman's suffrage, went squarely back on Mrs. Woodhull to-day, and voted against her. Mrs. Woodhull to-day, and voted against her. Butler called for the reading of the rule of the House which prevents the hall being used for other than legislative purposes. He sugar-coated the pill which he made his quondam friends of the suffrage movement swallow with the statement that he was an advocate of woman's suffrage, and they all knew it, but he was opposed to giving the hall for the purpose indicated. Of course the subject created some amusement, as it always does among members, and Butler's confession called forth roars of laughter from all parts of the House. General Garfield wanted to know whether the House could not meet on Wednesday evening as a Committee of the Whole. The House seemed to give something funny in this, and a general titter ran among the members. In fact, anything connected with this subject, to arouse the indignation of the House. Finally the yeas and nays were ordered, when the motion to give Mrs. Woodhull the use of the hall only received forty-one yeas. Mrs. Woodhull proposes to deliver a speech at an early day in some public hall here, when she will take occasion to pay her respects to those members of the House who voted against her to-day, and who are opposed to woman's suffrage. She contents that she has such names as Ben Butler, Judge Woodward, Charles Sumner and Judge Lawrence on her side. She proposes to keep the fight up, and in the long run hopes to get even with Benjamin.

The Elders at West Point.

The sub-committee of the House Military Committee, which recently visited West Point to examine into the condition of affairs and the causes of recent troubles among the cadets, to-day made a report to the Military Committee, which was denoted at some length. The majority of the sub-committee recommended the dismissal of the entire first class, except four, and the censure of the officers; and the minority of the sub-committee recommended that the usual privileges extended to the class, such as graduation furlough, be denied them. The report of the full committee is now in course of preparation.

The Burning of the Cadet Barracks at West Point.

The Secretary of War will ask Congress to appropriate \$50,000 to repair the damage done by the fire to the barracks at West Point on Saturday. The Superintendent of the Academy reports that it was burned through the exertions of the cadets that the building was saved. The fireings were frozen, and water had to be carried in buckets. Aid for the French and German Sufferers. The House to-day concurred in the Senate bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to send a vessel of war to the port of New York for the purpose of carrying provisions to the starving French and Germans. General Banks offered an amendment directing the Secretary of the Navy to place a vessel of war at the port of Boston and one at the port of Philadelphia for the same purpose. There will be a generous rivalry between the benevolent citizens of these three large cities as to which one will have their ship freight under sail first. It is expected, of course, that New York will be ahead.

Germany Wants No Possessions in America.

Much has been said in the press and Congressional debates as to the purpose of North Germany acquiring territory in America for naval purposes. These publications have come to the knowledge of Count Bismarck, he has recently taken occasion to repeat in an emphatic manner his declaration of July, 1867, that North Germany does not intend to acquire any territory on this Continent or possession of any of the adjacent islands. This course on her part is to avoid any interference with the Monroe doctrine or any measure of acquisition which our government may choose to adopt.

Internal Revenue Decision.

On a re-examination of the reports of surveys of distilleries made under what is commonly known as the forty-eight hour fermenting period it has been determined to hold such surveys as were made prior to the 1st day of March, 1870, as taking effect on and after that date. All assessments made prior to that date will therefore be adjusted accordingly upon application to the Internal Revenue Bureau for abatement or refunding, as the case may be.

The Cotton Tax Cases.

It has been incorrectly stated in many papers that the cotton tax case, to be argued to-morrow in the United States Supreme Court, involves \$50,000,000, when in truth it involves only \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000. The decision, however, will affect other kindred cases to large amounts, the one pending being a tax case.

The Following Nominations Were Sent to the Senate to-day:

George C. Stevens, to be Collector of Customs at Milwaukee; Wm. Isaac B. Duval, to be Assessor of Internal Revenue of the First District of West Virginia; William F. Wriggale, to be Collector of Customs at Bangor, Me. Nominations Confirmed. The Senate in executive session to-day confirmed the following nominations:—Alexander Rives, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia; Robert W. Hughes, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Virginia; A. S. Gray, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Virginia; J. R. Young, to be Postmaster at Camden, Ga.; A. Seymour, to be Postmaster at Plie Bluff, Ark.

Sale of the Bergen Heights Arsenal.

The President has approved the bill directing the Secretary of War to sell Bergen Heights Arsenal. Personal. Ex-Governor E. B. Morgan and lady, who have been the guests of the President for some days past, vacated the Executive Mansion this afternoon to make room for ex-Secretary Borgia and lady, who arrived here to-night. Governor Morgan has taken up his quarters at the Arlington. Senator Cameron is lame from a fall on the ice about a week since, but his general health is good. He is at his committee room to-day on crutches, but has not appeared in the Senate.

Slim Attendance of New Yorkers.

The Backwoodsmen Having it All Their Own Way.

NEW RAILROAD BOND BILL.

Lively Discussion Over a Westchester Savings Bank Scheme.

Who is to Have the Right to Physic the People.

They do say that many of our New York members are much noted for their plety, which they make a display of only on the first day of the week when far away from Albany. Somehow it has always the effect of making not a few of them rather backward in coming forward on Mondays, when they are expected to be in their seats looking after the interests of their constituents as well as their own. This effect was visible in

AN ARMY OF EMPTY SEATS.

In the lower House this morning, it is very seldom that the New Yorkers ever make a mistake or lose a moment of time when their own interests are in jeopardy; so it must be taken for granted that there is at least one day in the week when they can loaf at home without fear of losing a solitary morsel of the usual expectations from the third House. It is a pity that going to church on Sundays should produce such dire effects on Mondays, even upon men who make laws to regulate the way the Sabbath day should be kept holy. Thanks to the absence of the pious ones, the rural folk had things pretty much their own way in the two houses, not indeed that they managed to run any of their

BACKWOODS JOBS.

through successfully, but that several of their little local notions were made to sail smoothly through the Committee of the Whole. Probably the most important bill that was passed was Kilham's, in relation to railroad bonds. It will doubtless meet with considerable favor outside the profitable circles frequented by a peculiar class of bond robbers, who, when they make a haul, know so well how to pocket only those bonds which are negotiable and which cannot be turned into cities for their redemption. The first section of the bill contains the meat in the copypast, and for that reason I give it full. It is as follows:—

Section 1. It shall be lawful for any person or persons owning and holding any real estate, or any interest therein, which is not by law provided heretofore, or which shall hereafter be lawfully provided, in this State, and which is not payable to bearer, to transfer the same and the interest thereon to any other person or persons, by the owner and holder endorsing upon the same and attaching thereto a certificate of the nature and effect of such endorsement, and thereupon the principal sum of money secured by such mortgage shall be paid to such owner or his legal representatives or assigns. The bill also provides that the bonds may be transferred by an endorsement in blank, giving name and residence of the transferee, and that the payment payable to bearer or to the order of the purchaser (naming), subscribed by the assignor, who must give his name and residence, and that it is not to be taken together upon the holders of the bonds whether they desire to make them negotiable or not. The apparently insignificant act to incorporate a small savings bank in Westchester county created quite a breeze in the Assembly and rather startled the rank and file members who do not show his hand one way or the other when the real test in the case came up. Why they did not is a question the members of which may be left to the parties most interested.

WATCHDOG ALYDRO.

He saved the first bark. The bill limited the amount of an individual debt to \$1000, and the Creditors' bill representative wanted it fixed at \$5000. The bill, he said, is supposed to be the special deposit of the poor man's rights, and it is not for the honor of the State to have a law which gives seven per cent interest until they can find a better opportunity to invest their money. Denny this was the next to plunge headlong into the fight.

"THE POOR MAN'S RIGHTS"

was his battle cry, and with vigor down he charged upon the bill. He said that the bill was a radical step in such an impetuous way that even Garrison, of radical view in the West. Lawrence, had to yield his battle axe to the side of the bill. The bill, he said, is supposed to be the special deposit of the poor man's rights, and it is not for the honor of the State to have a law which gives seven per cent interest until they can find a better opportunity to invest their money. Denny this was the next to plunge headlong into the fight.

THE METROPOLIS ALSO VERY NERVOUS.

Had a large number of the members of the House, and especially those who are particularly well known in the metropolis, were very nervous. The question came meely rolled up in Nicholas P. Barry's bill, which requires all persons dealing in and dispensing drugs, to be licensed by the College of Pharmacy before giving professionally to handle the same. The bill, he said, is supposed to be the special deposit of the poor man's rights, and it is not for the honor of the State to have a law which gives seven per cent interest until they can find a better opportunity to invest their money. Denny this was the next to plunge headlong into the fight.

THE COTTON TRADE.

Large Shipments of the Staple from America to England—Cargoes Arrived in Two Days. The Senate met at half-past seven o'clock P. M. A COURT HOUSE IN THE FIFTH DISTRICT. Mr. CREAMER introduced a bill to provide for a court house in the Fifth district in the city of New York, which shall be located in the street between the City Hall and the Court House, and shall be bounded by the City Hall on the west, the Court House on the east, the City Hall on the north, and the Court House on the south. The bill was read twice and ordered to a third reading. The bill for the City of New York, which shall be located in the street between the City Hall and the Court House, and shall be bounded by the City Hall on the west, the Court House on the east, the City Hall on the north, and the Court House on the south. The bill was read twice and ordered to a third reading.

THE FREE SONS OF ISRAEL.

Defiance in the Order of the Free Sons of Israel—Secession of the Philadelphia Lodges. PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 6, 1871. Some members of the influential Order of Independent Free Sons of Israel, of this city, have for some time endeavored to improve the principles of the organization by the adoption of an amended constitution, the benefit of the widows of deceased members. This has been opposed by the New York lodges of the order, and the dispute has culminated in ten lodges of Philadelphia breaking off from the New York lodges, and forming a new order, the Free Sons of Israel. They are joined by lodges in St. Louis and Pittsburgh. They style it the "Improved Order of the Sons of Israel," and have elected a Grand Master. The secession was celebrated by a banquet last evening.

AMERICA AND SPAIN.

Herald Special Report from Madrid.

United States Minister Sickles at Audience of King Amadeus.

Diplomatic Relations Officially Continued Between the Countries.

FRIENDLY ADDRESSES ON BOTH SIDES.

The Monarch Compliments the American Nation.

TELEGRAM TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

LONDON, Feb. 6, 1871. The special correspondent of the HERALD in Madrid telegraphs a report of the occurrence of a very interesting incident in the history of the diplomatic relations between the United States of America and the Spanish Crown, as revived under King Amadeus. I transmit the letter by cable to despatch to New York. The HERALD special writer dates in Madrid on the 3d inst., and says:—Major General Daniel E. Sickles, Ambassador of the United States of America in the Spanish capital, had audience of his Majesty Amadeus, King of the Spaniards, at the palace to-day, when he formally and officially renewed and continued the diplomatic relations which exist between the American government and the Spanish Crown, by presenting his Ministerial credentials to the King. Minister Sickles was received with Court honors, and having arrived in the royal presence, delivered a brief and appropriate address, in which he congratulated King Amadeus in the name of the American republic on his accession to the throne of Spain, and expressed the hope that the most friendly relations would be maintained between the people and governments of the two countries. King Amadeus' reply was couched in very agreeable language, and its terms were highly complimentary to the American people.

PERSONAL INTELLIGENCE.

Major General George G. Meade arrived at the St. Nicholas yesterday. General James McQuibb, of Utah, is at the St. James. John G. Saxo, the humorous poet and inveterate punster, who lectured last evening on "Love" at the Chelsea Presbyterian church, has apartments at the Astor House. Ex-Governor William Beech Lawrence, of Rhode Island, is at the Brevoort House. Commodore Scott, U. S. N., is staying at the Grand Central Hotel. Edwin Forrest is remaining at the Metropolitan Hotel. Lieutenant Commander Elias W. Terry, U. S. N., and Professor Benjamin Pierce, of the United States Coast Survey, were in the City to-day. Judge L. O. Sullivan, of St. Domingo, and Judge Abbott, of Boston, are stopping at the Brevoort House. Colonel F. B. Loomis, of New London, is staying at the St. Nicholas Hotel. Colonel R. B. Bridges, of North Carolina, is domiciled at the Grand Central Hotel. Judge Henry Sherman, of Washington; J. G. Twitwell, of Massachusetts, and I. Gay, of Flatburgh, N. Y., and L. W. Chickering, United States Army, arrived at the Astor House yesterday. The names of H. G. Parke, editor of the Boston Evening Globe; Colonel Bishop, of Connecticut; Richard Coote, of England, and M. M. Hill, of Milwaukee, are registered at the Fifth Avenue Hotel as having arrived there yesterday.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

Decisions—Virginia Revolutionary Loan Certificates—New Just Claims Against the Government—The Authority of States to Tax Foreign Insurance Companies Affirmed. WASHINGTON, Feb. 6, 1871. The following decisions were rendered to-day in the United States Supreme Court:— No. 2. Ward, Executor, vs. The United States—Appeal from the Court of Claims.—This was a proceeding to recover from the United States the amount of the United States of \$500 each, with interest from the date of their issue, 1776. The petition was dismissed by the Court. The certificates had not been duly countersigned by a commissioner for the State of Georgia, by which State they were issued, and, therefore, they were not valid. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 3. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 4. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 5. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 6. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 7. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 8. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 9. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 10. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 11. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 12. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 13. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 14. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 15. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 16. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 17. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 18. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 19. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 20. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 21. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 22. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 23. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 24. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 25. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 26. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 27. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 28. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 29. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 30. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 31. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 32. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 33. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 34. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 35. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 36. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 37. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 38. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 39. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 40. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 41. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 42. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 43. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 44. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 45. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 46. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 47. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 48. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 49. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 50. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 51. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 52. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 53. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 54. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 55. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 56. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 57. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 58. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 59. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 60. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 61. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 62. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 63. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 64. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 65. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 66. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed, and the petition was dismissed. No. 67. The State of Georgia vs. The Citizens of the State of Georgia.—This was an appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, by which the petition was granted, and the interest was allowed, and the petition was granted. The interest was not allowed,