THE STATE CAPITAL.

The Irving Special Election Bill in the Assembly.

REPUBLICANS STANDING FIRM.

The Bill Lost by One Vote, but Reconsidered and the Motion Laid on the Table.

A LAST CHANCE HELD IN RESERVE.

The Stirring Discussion Over the Bill in the Assembly.

Republicans Charged with Bargaining for the Expulsion of Irving.

Mr. Prince Shows the Democrats a Way Out.

ALBANY, April 14, 1871.

THE EXCITEMENT

created by the bold and unexpected stand which the democrats took last night in the lower House was, if possible, greater than ever this morning. The fact that the republicans, at their caucus at nine o'clock, had resolved to vote in a body against the Special Election bill, but added fuel to the flame. Precisely at half-past nine o'clock the House was called to order. Notwithstanding that the republicans had been led to believe the night previous that the House had been adjourned to ten o'clock, they were all on hand, with but two exceptions, when the Speaker took his seat. Strange to say, the democrats, who were supposed to have been given the inside track by the little mistake of the night before, lacked several of their number to make up their sixty-four. Something had, therefore, to be done to give the laggards time to put in an appearance before

THE SPECIAL BILL

now would begin. Fields bethought himself of the heavily freighted journal of the proceedings of yesterday, and so a motion that it should be read was carried. The Clerk, faithfully obeying instructions, took his time about it and went over line after line of the dry details of bills passed and bills lost, as though he was spelling each word in his own mind as he went along and found it very hard work at that. Meanwhile the republicans sat quietly in their seats, while a few of the more active members on the other side of the House kept moving about from one side of the chamber to another, now darting into the lobbies and now into the vestibules, button-holing as they went every one they met coming from the direction of the Delavan House, with the hope of finding out just how far away the missing faithful really were. It was very near ten o'clock before

THE LAST DEMOCRAT

appeared upon the scene, and by that time, of course, the last line of the journal had been reached. It then became necessary for the democrats to unfold the plans which they had decided upon in caucus last night, and the ball was opened by Alec Frear presenting the privileged Election bill. By this time every available space of room on the floor into or upon which a body could be crushed or laid had been seized upon by persons who had succeeded in running the gauntlet of grim doorkeepers, who did their best to prevent the ingress of every person who was not entitled to the privileges of the floor. As for the galleries, they were so densely packed that, from the Speaker's desk it seemed as though the people were piled on top of one another in all sorts of positions. The confusion, besides, was very great. The subdued murmuring of voices upon all sides and the shuffling of many feet completely drowned the voice of Frear when he stood up to hand the bill to the page and explained what his question of privilege was. It became a necessity, therefore, to

CLEAR THE HOUSE

of all outsiders. After this was done a certain degree of order was maintained. The Speaker, as a matter of course, was quite equal to the occasion when the bill was presented, and at once made the usual announcement of the presentation of a bill. Then came the test for Hitchman's firmness and

THE FILLIBUSTERING MANŒUVRES

of the opposition. Alvord, quick as lightning, entered his solemn protest against the introduction of the bill as a privileged one. The Speaker's reply that his protest would be received with all the honors tickled the risibles of the galleries immensely, and a loud roar of laughter greeted the decision. Alvord sat down, looking anything but amiable. He then demanded the yeas and nays upon every motion, and every one resulted in defeat by a strict party vote. The biggest hubbub broke out over the ordering of the bill to a third reading. The republicans claimed that, according to the rules, a two-thirds vote was required, and they were quite taken aback when Weed, of Clinton, showed his hand and proved himself one of the warmest advocates of the bill. As soon as they saw that the result of the fight would, after all, depend solely upon their own efforts, they became more desperate than ever. The debate over

THE TWO-THIRDS RULE,

therefore, was a stirring one. Even Gleason, from black St. Lawrence, who always stands in the background when there is danger of a discomfiture to his party, attempted to take a hand in the rumpus by quoting the forty-second rule, but was sent to grass by the Speaker informing him in a dry sort of way that the Chair was conversant with the rule. Then Littlejohn, not liking the aspect of affairs, rose from his seat and in a very meek fashion expressed his hope that the yeas and nays would be allowed on the ordering of the third reading. The mild power subdues, even in a legislative wrangle, and so the Oswego rooster's crowing was listened to with favor. But he did not get out of the debate without getting his feathers badly ruffled. The Speaker cited an instance of Littlejohn's own ruling when Speaker, where he had decided a certain question which he considered a precedent for ordering the bill to a third reading, and the lame way in which he tried to get away from his past record afforded no small amusement. Hitchman, while his hand was in as to precedents, thought he might as well touch

ALVORD ON THE RAW

likewise, and when he recited the little incident where the Onondaga giant tried to wriggle out of a wrong that he had done a New Yorker in a decision he had made when Speaker, he brought down the house in such a roar of laughter that for several minutes the Assembly chamber became a perfect bedlam. The most important thing elicited by the debate was that a pledge had been made by certain republicans a week ago that one of their number should be designated

TO VOTE WITH THE DEMOCRATS

on all political questions provided Irving was got rid of after his difficulty with Weed. Goodrich acknowledged half the corn, but he said the promise was that if Irving would be expelled the much-needed sixty-fifth man would be forthcoming. To make his position tenable he appealed to the Speaker, with whom he had conversation upon the subject, but Hitchman asserted that the promise was that "if justice were done in the difficulty between Irving and Weed the republicans would lend a man for all emergencies." When all the members had voted upon the final passage of the bill Jacobs asked that some republican should move a reconsideration, but he was met with loud cries of "No, no, no." Unless a motion to reconsider and lay upon the table was made and carried the bill was

A "GONER,"

and that the republicans were well aware of; hence their unanimous refusal to accede to Jacobs' request. Having no other alternative, therefore, he changed his own vote from the affirmative to the negative, and so the result of the vote stood 63 yeas to 62 nays. The motion to reconsider and lay upon the table was then carried. Thus it will be seen that by Jacobs' manœuvre the bill can be called up again at any time. The tabling of the bill ended the fight, and the House then adjourned amid much excitement, the democratic members at once resolving themselves into a

SECRET CAUCUS.

This resulted in nothing whatever. A motion was made by a peacefully inclined member to appoint a conference committee, with power to settle a basis for future operations with the republicans, so that the business of the session could go on, but it was voted down by an almost unanimous vote, the cry being, "No compromise." The republican members of both houses held

A JOINT CAUCUS

later in the afternoon, and, after making themselves ridiculous by excluding all the members of the press "except those devoted to the republican party," passed a resolution pledging each and every one of them to vote against all motions for an adjournment, and declaring it to be their policy to go on with the usual legislation as if nothing of a serious character had occurred to mar the general harmony of the lower House. The following is the resolution:—

Whereas certain members of the democratic party have seen fit to charge the republican members with a purpose of blocking the wheels of legislation, therefore

Resolved, That the republican members of the Legislature, adhering firmly to the position they have already taken, will oppose any final adjournment till proper and necessary measures are passed.

At six o'clock the democrats held another caucus, but it was found that every man stood firm against anything like concession to the enemy, and so they broke up in the same frame of mind as they had been before. Thus matters stood when the House was called to order

TO-NIGHT.

The galleries were crowded and the lobbies were filled to repletion by an excited crowd. Everybody asked everybody else what was to be done. Rumors flew thick and fast that the democrats had taken water—in fact, retired from their stand of last night. The excitement was indescribably intense, and when the Speaker took the chair and called the House to order a silence of death fell upon the vast assemblage. In the chamber every member of the minority and majority was in his seat, and from the general uneasiness it was evident that neither side knew how the other intended to act. The suspense was of not long duration. Aleck Frear rose from his seat. Every eye was turned toward him. What was up? He simply said, "I move that this House do now

ADJOURN

until to-morrow morning at eleven o'clock. The motion was carried with cheers by the democrats, and thus ended the struggle of the day. So the deadlock is still as insurmountable as ever. The question now is which side will give way first. The republicans swear they will not; so do the democrats. The latter have the numerical majority in both houses to adjourn the Legislature *sine die* by joint resolution. In case of a compromise being ineffectual they have the game in their own hands. It is a dangerous one to play. Will they take advantage of this position to-morrow may tell.

THE DEBATE IN THE ASSEMBLY.

Able Filibustering Manœuvres of the Republicans.

The Senatorial Fifteenth (Saratoga) District Also Unrepresented—The Odium of Barring Full Representation Not Thrown on the Republicans—Mr. Prince Offers Mr. Fields a Suggestion—How the Democrats May Get Out of Their Difficulty.

ALBANY, April 14, 1871.

Immediately upon the opening of the House of Assembly this morning Mr. FREAR, of New York, rose and said:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I desire to present the following privileged bill at this time.

Mr. ALVORD—I protest in the name of the parliamentary law of this House and of this land against the introduction of this bill.

The SPEAKER—The Chair will accept the gentleman's protest.

The Clerk read the title of the bill offered by Mr. Frear, as follows:—"An act to provide for filling the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of James Irving in the Sixteenth Assembly district of the county of New York."

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—This being a precedent in the legislation of this State, I ask that the protest of the gentleman from Onondaga (Mr. Alvord) shall be entered on the journal.

The SPEAKER—The Chair has announced that the gentleman's protest would be entered.

Mr. FREAR moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole upon the bill.

Mr. ALVORD raised the point of order that it required a two-thirds vote to pass the motion.

The SPEAKER—The Chair will decide that this being a privileged bill the motion may be carried by the action of the majority.

Mr. ALVORD—I desire to say that I will not under the circumstances of the case appeal from the decision of the presiding officer of this House, but I desire also that my solemn protest against this invasion of the rules be entered on the journal, and upon the question now before the House of going into Committee of the Whole I call for the ayes and noes.

The ayes and noes were ordered, and before proceeding to the calling of the roll the Chair ordered the floor to be cleared of those not entitled to the privileges of the floor.

The roll was then called upon the motion to go into Committee of the Whole and was carried by 64 to 60. The House then went into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frear in the chair.

Mr. WEED asked that the bill be read through, which was done.

No amendments were offered to the bill.

Mr. WEED moved that the committee rise, report the bill to the House and recommend its passage.

Carried by a *viva voce* vote.

The committee rose and made their report and the Speaker announced that the question was now upon agreeing with the report of the committee and ordering the bill to a third reading.

Mr. GOODRICH called the ayes and noes thereon, and they were ordered.

The vote was then called upon ordering the bill to a third reading, and resulted in a vote of 64 in the affirmative to 62 in the negative. The bill was therefore ordered to a third reading.

Mr. FREAR moved that the bill now have its third reading.

Mr. ALVORD—On that question I call the ayes and noes, and desire that the Speaker will rule that it requires a two-thirds vote.

The SPEAKER—The Chair will not so rule.

Mr. ALVORD—Then, in addition to my solemn protest against this invasion of the parliamentary law of the land, I do most respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER—The Chair has not yet stated the question. When he has done so the appeal will be in order.

Mr. ALVORD—I desire the Speaker now to rule whether, upon the incoming of the vote, a majority of the House carries the bill to a third reading.

The SPEAKER—When the gentleman presents his appeal in the proper form and time the Chair will entertain it.

Mr. GLEASON—I call the attention of the Chair to the forty-second rule, and raise the point of order that the motion of the gentleman from New York requires a two-third vote.

The SPEAKER—The Chair is conversant with the rule. The question is now on the motion of the gentleman from New York that this bill be ordered to a third reading.

Mr. GLEASON—I call for a ruling on my point of order.

The SPEAKER—The Chair will decide that this is a privileged motion.

Mr. GLEASON—Then I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. FIELDS—I rise to a point of order. I submit that this appeal is not in order until after the result of this vote is announced. The result may be that the motion may get a two-third vote.

The SPEAKER—The Chair decides the point of order well taken.

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—I am perfectly aware, sir, that the majority upon this floor intend to pass this bill, and when it shall be passed I shall bow to the will of the majority; but I do hope that the Chair, with his perfect knowledge of the rules, will in all kindness permit us to record ourselves as we ought to be recorded upon the journal of the House, and if there is any proper time to take an appeal from the decision of the Chair this is the time. I think the Chair must know that this appeal must be taken now or not at all, and as one of the minority I simply claim the right to record my vote upon what is a violation of the rules of the House. I wish to do it without feeling and in all kindness and without further debate.

The SPEAKER—The Chair will state to the gentleman from Oswego and to the House that the Chair finds high precedent for this action of his in the action of the gentleman from Oswego, when he was Speaker of this House, on a party measure, as it was then called.

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—As the Chair has pointed to an error of mine in the past—(laughter)—he will permit me one moment to say this. In the first place let me say that, to accomplish what seemed at that time a great good to the State—(great laughter)—within some thirty minutes of the adjournment, under the joint rules of the Senate and the Assembly, I believed it my duty then to rule as I did rule. It was the only time during the five years that I occupied that chair that I made a ruling which I knew was in violation of the rules of the House. It was only justified, sir, by the prospect of an immediate adjournment. No such precedent can be quoted for this present ruling of the Chair. We are under no joint resolution to adjourn. There is nothing that requires this ruling, and yet the Speaker has the same right to rule now as I did then. (Laughter.) Now, sir, all I desire is that the Speaker will permit us to record our opinions on his ruling, and the only time when it can be done is just here. The Speaker gives his ruling on the ground that this bill is a privileged question. We take issue on that and declare that the bill is not a privileged question, and as a minority, and a large minority on this floor, we ask the right—I will not call it privilege—to record our votes here at this time upon this issue, and I trust that the Chair will, in all good nature and good feeling, accord to us that privilege.

Mr. ALVORD—I am clearly of the opinion, sir, that as I made my motion so is the parliamentary rule. The Chair has decided against my point of order—I think I did not say in terms that I rose to a point of order, yet it was in fact a point of order—that this motion requires a two-third vote to carry it. I understand the Chair to rule that it requires only a majority vote to carry the motion, because this is a privileged question. I cannot see, sir, at what time, under any possible contingency, this question can be settled so far as regards the opinion of the House, except at this juncture. It would not be proper after the incoming vote of the House to make the appeal. My friend from New York (Mr. Fields) suggests that there may be a two-third vote of the House upon this motion. Whether that should be the case or not, it is right and proper that the House should be informed what is necessary in order to bring this matter to a close. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I do not stand in the position of the gentleman from Oswego, nor in the position of the gentleman from——

Mr. FIELDS—I suggest that this House has no right to take an appeal from a mere opinion expressed by the Chair which he has not yet made a ruling.

Mr. HUSTED—I wish to ask the gentleman from Onondaga if he will be kind enough to state what his point of order is?

Mr. ALVORD—My point of order is this. I asked the Chair to say whether the motion to order the bill to a third reading did not require a two-third vote. The Chair has stated that when a proper time came to rule upon the point he should rule that the motion required only a majority vote, because this was a privileged question.

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—I will remind my friend that the position is a much stronger one than he states it. The gentleman from St. Lawrence appealed from the decision of the Speaker upon the point that this was a privileged question.

Mr. ALVORD—I understand that. I understand the Chair to say that this is a privileged question and that the motion to order the bill to a third reading does not require a two-third vote. Upon both of these points I take issue with the Chair, and claim that this is the only time to appeal from his decision. I was about to say, when I was interrupted by my genial friend from New York, who will always get in his joke upon every occasion, however solemn it may be, that when I had the honor to preside over this House in past time, whether as Speaker of a democratic or republican House, I never found it necessary to rule in any other way than my judgment upon the rules of the House required me to do, and I hold, sir, that in the long run——

The SPEAKER—Will the gentleman from Onondaga allow the Chair to suggest one instance? The last time that the gentleman was Speaker of this House a motion was made by a gentleman from New York—Hon. Joseph Lyons—which was decided by the Speaker as out of order. The following day a motion of the same character was made by a gentleman from the interior of the State, of the same political party as the gentleman from Onondaga, which was ruled not out of order. The gentleman from New York (Mr. Lyons) called the attention of the Speaker to the fact that he had ruled differently on a similar question the previous day, to which the Speaker replied:—"The Chair knows not what his ruling was yesterday, whether right or wrong; the Chair knows it is right now."

Mr. ALVORD—The Chair has somewhat amplified my answer upon that occasion, and has not fully stated the case. The case was this:—That there was a very distinct difference between the motion made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Lyons), and that made by the other gentleman on the following day. But, sir, in the vein of humor which runs through everything done by my friend from New York, the gentleman from Onondaga did answer that however the Chair had ruled on the previous day the Chair was eminently right to-day, and therefore ruled as he did. But I have a distinct recollection that there was a dissimilarity between the motions made upon the two different days.

The SPEAKER—I will simply state that the gentleman from Onondaga was my informant.

Mr. FIELDS—I have no doubt that the gentleman from Onondaga thinks he was right in both his rulings.

Mr. ALVORD—I am always in favor of bringing in for the jury, and I may say that I am always right. I do not desire, sir, to prolong this discussion, but I simply ask the majority of the House, through its Speaker, that we may put upon record our protest by way of appeal from the Speaker's decision upon the matter now at issue before the House, and that protest might as well come at this time as any other stage of the proceedings.

The SPEAKER—If the gentleman from Onondaga will state his point of order the chair will rule thereon.

Mr. ALVORD—My point of order is this:—That this is not a privileged question, and that therefore it requires a two-thirds vote of the members present to order the bill to a third reading.

Mr. HUSTED—I rise to a point of order. The gentleman from Onondaga and the gentleman from St. Lawrence have stated their points of order, that by rule thirty-nine the third reading of a bill must be on the day subsequent to the day on which it passed in Committee of the Whole, unless the House by a two-thirds vote direct otherwise.

The SPEAKER—The point of order of the gentleman from Westchester is not well taken, the bill having been already ordered to a third reading.

Mr. ALVORD—I would say to my friend from Westchester that if the Speaker is right in his proposition that if this is a privileged question he is right in his decision that the motion to order the bill to a third reading does not require a two-third vote, and that the only point between the Speaker of the House and myself is that this does not rise to the dignity of a privileged question, and, therefore—

The SPEAKER—The Chair will state the question, and then the gentleman from Onondaga can debate it if he desires. Upon the motion that this bill be ordered to a reading the gentleman from Onondaga raised the point of order that the motion required a two-third vote. The Chair rules that this is a privileged motion as made by the gentleman from New York, and does not require a two-third vote to carry it. The gentleman from Onondaga appeals from that decision, and the question is, Shall the decision of the Chair be sustained?

Mr. ALVORD—Upon that I call the ayes and noes.

They were ordered and the Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JACOBS asked to be excused from voting and said:—We are about, I think, to make a precedent in the legislative history of the State. The Speaker of the House, in obedience to a necessity which could not be avoided by the party of which he is a member and the main representative here, has been compelled, in justice to himself and in justice to his party and in justice to the interests of the State, to make a certain decision. The facts of the case are simple. Through an unfortunate occurrence upon the floor or within the bar of this house a member of the majority was lost to that majority, in consequence of which there is no political majority in this Assembly. This vacancy having occurred the members of the minority upon this floor, without regard to even common decency, without respect to themselves as individuals, forgetting that they were the representatives of the people in one sense, and not merely of a party, took advantage of that unfortunate occurrence and in secret caucus decided that legislation here shall be blocked. I say that in the political history of this State, with all its black pages and dark lines, there is nothing to equal this consummate outrage—a minority of the people, a minority of the 30,000 compelling the legal majority, in consequence of a circumstance over which that majority had no control, to sit down here and do nothing. Now, what is their object in this? Their object is that the important legislation of the session shall not be accomplished, so that they can say to the people of the State that the democracy have failed in their duty. Sir, there is no question of privilege so high as that which involves the right of the people to be represented on the floor of this House. The people of the Sixteenth Assembly district of the city of New York have as much right to be represented here as the people of the Ninth Assembly district of Kings, and when that representation means legislation, when it means that the business of the people shall be transacted, it becomes the highest question of privilege known to parliamentary law; and I say that the Speaker of the House is justified, I say that the future will justify him, as I believe the present will, in making a ruling, not against the gentleman from Onondaga, but in favor of the right of the people to be represented here. We know, sir, the object of the gentleman from Onondaga in compelling this action upon the part of his party; for I believe that there are republicans upon the floor of this House who have been compelled unwillingly to follow his leadership. I give him credit for his courage and persistency; I give him credit for the ability by which he has compelled the members of the party to wear the yoke put upon their shoulders. Even in his approaching old age he shows the spirit and the strength of a dictator, just as the leader of his party in Washington, Mr. Butler, has shown the spirit of a dictator. And even my distinguished friend from Oswego falls into line and is silent. And now, sir, I turn from my friend from Onondaga to my friend from Westchester—he, sir, who was the republican candidate for Speaker at the beginning of the session, and who laid low my distinguished colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Tompkins, in that candidacy, knowing, sir, that he feels that this action of his party is all wrong and that the minority of the House has made a fatal mistake. And yet the two fall under the leadership for which the gentleman from Onondaga has struggled and at last secured. Now, sir, I think that the gentleman from Onondaga, who has been Speaker of this House for many years, and the gentleman from Oswego, who has been Speaker longer than any other man on this floor—I think these two gentlemen will say with me, when they come to a mere question of privilege like this, that it is the right of the Speaker to make a new ruling. The rules laid down in the book do not cover a case so extraordinary; the rules laid down in this book do not cover a case which takes within its broad scope the question of popular representation. Therefore I hope the Speaker will be sustained in his decision, and that the good sense of the minority will rally around, not a party, but around the people of the State, who have the right to be represented on the floor of this House.

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—But for the remarks of the gentleman from Kings I should have contented myself with a quiet vote upon this question; but, sir, that gentleman has taken occasion to defend this ruling, and, in doing so, to denounce the party of which I am a member, and pronounce the action of the minority upon this floor as without precedent in the history of legislation in this State. Come back, sir, with me to the year 1851, and when the great question of the enlargement of the water avenues across this State, for the purpose of enriching the State and advancing our prosperity, was upheld before the Senate; fifteen democrats of that body not only refused to vote on it, but by a revolutionary step broke up the legislation of the State. Is that, sir, no precedent? That act, sir, was without justification. There was no excuse for it.

Mr. FIELDS—I would like to ask the gentleman from Oswego this question:—Did not the result of the election occurring upon the question of filling a vacancy at that time occasioned prove disastrous to the gentleman who resigned? Was not the leader of these fifteen, Mr. Mann, of the county of Oneida, defeated by a majority of 3,000? That sir, I believe is so.

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—My friend from New York is correct. The people sealed with their condemnation that withdrawal from the Senate. But, sir, the minority upon this floor do not propose to adopt a revolutionary step, and withdraw; but exercising that right which the democracy of this State, during the whole period of their organization have ever exercised, they have met in caucus, and the minority of that caucus have bowed to the will of the majority, and we have agreed only that we shall vote against certain bills that we believe to be injurious to the best interests of the people.

Mr. JACOBS—Did the minority agree in caucus against this bill?

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—I think I am quite competent to present my views without interrogatories of this character, though I am willing to answer them now. I repeat that this is not a revolutionary step at all. We have not decided to revolutionize this Legislature. We have simply decided that whenever the majority here bring forward a bill such as that for the repeal of the Registry law and other bills that we believe to be party questions, we shall not vote for these bills. Now, last evening, if my friend from New York had not indulged in a tirade of three-quarters of an hour, and had permitted legislation to go on in the usual course, we would simply have recorded our votes against these measures and voted for such bills as we thought ought to pass. There is nothing revolutionary in that. It was our privilege, our right, to agree not to vote for certain bills. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will refer to another fact that may have had its influence in guiding the minority on this floor in its action. We believe as a party that Mr. Twombly, of New York, was entitled to a seat upon this floor. We believe that if that seat had been awarded to him the majority in this House would have been with the republicans. We believe that you exercised the powers of a majority in deciding that question, and gave yourselves in that way the constitutional majority of sixty-five upon this floor. Now, sir, this has influenced the minority to meet in caucus to decide, if possible, to arrest legislation, which, in our opinion, will be damaging to the best interests of this State. We believe in protecting the purity of the ballot box. We believe that there is no higher question than this Registry act and the bill affecting the election laws of the State, and for my part, as a party man and as a citizen of the State, I am opposed to these same bills. These are briefly some of the reasons that have induced the minority upon this floor not to take a revolutionary step, but to meet in caucus and decide that they will not vote for certain bills. We are ready to go on with legislation. We will vote against these bills which we have named. If we can prevent their passage we feel that we have done our duty to the State. Now, coming to the bill before us, I do not believe that it is a privileged question. Why? Because this Legislature has fixed no time for an adjournment and this bill can be reached in the ordinary course. It is as sure to be reached in due time as that the sun will rise to-morrow morning.

Mr. FIELDS—I would ask if this resolution, which I will read, and to which is affixed the name of the gentleman from Oswego and of every member of his party in this Legislature, is an ordinary resolution, to be passed by a party in caucus? Mr. Fields read the last of the resolutions of the republican caucus, threatening to denounce as traitors, in the public press, all those who failed to comply with the decree of the caucus, and continued:—I, sir, have never before read a resolution of that kind passed by any caucus.

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—That has no bearing upon the question of this bill.

Mr. FIELDS—It has a bearing upon what you said, for you were defending the action of your party in caucus upon this matter as being of an ordinary and legitimate description, and I call your attention to this resolution and ask you if it is any ordinary resolution to be passed by a party caucus in relation to legislation coming before a legislative body?

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—It is only done by my writing and signature, putting upon paper what is the binding obligation of every man who agrees to abide by the decision of a caucus. It is only reducing to writing what without writing is binding, and my friend from New York is too good a party man not to know that every man that enters a party caucus, and agrees to be guided in his action by it, is bound by the highest considerations of honor to abide by its decisions until he bolts from his party and takes an independent attitude. To resume. This is not a privileged question. Why? Because this bill can be reached in due course of time in the ordinary course of legislation.

Mr. JACOBS—I should like to ask the gentleman from Oswego whether in the meantime the people of the Sixteenth Assembly district of New York have no right to be represented here? If we are to go on with legislation should not the people of that district have their voice and their vote here as well as those of any other part of the State?

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—Mr. Speaker, the party of which I am a member have determined that it was right to oppose this bill, because if it could be defeated we could prevent the outrageous attempts to interfere with and break down the barriers which stand around the purity of the ballot box. We believe that we are justified in resorting to every legitimate means in legislation to prevent the passage of these bills. Having said this much in reply to the gentleman from Kings, I will simply say, on the part of the minority on this floor, that we are ready now, in a kindly spirit, the spirit which has prevailed here during the entire session so far, to proceed with the ordinary legislation of the session. We advocate no revolutionary action. We are ready to go on with the discharge of our duties under our oaths of office, and to vote for such bills as commend themselves to our best judgment as conducive to the interests of the State and against those which we believe to be injurious to those interests.

Mr. FIELDS—I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he had not once in his life followed his best judgment in bolting from a caucus of the party to which he belonged and voting for a United States Senator other than the man that his party had agreed upon?

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—Never; but I have at times, sir—and, perhaps, they were the proudest moments of my life—stepped outside of party obligations when they violated my conscience; and if in the future I should feel called upon to do so again I shall, with like independence, assert and stand by my manhood. But that time is not now. If the majority upon this floor feels so sensitive about the right of a constituency to be represented here, I ask why it stands upon the question of the Senatorial district of Saratoga?

Mr. FIELDS—My friend is too well acquainted with the usage of parliamentary bodies not to know that that is a matter for the Senate to initiate. It is a vacancy in their body, not in ours. This is a vacancy in our body. When the Senate proceeds to fill the vacancy in their body I will give my heartiest support to them, and I believe every member of my party will do the same. But what we are called upon now to do is to fill the vacancy in our own body.

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—The answer to that is here:—The right of representation is a principle, and if a vacancy exists in the Senate it is the duty of the majority there to fill it, and I ask again of the democratic party where the responsibility rests for the non-representation of the Saratoga Senatorial district in this State.

Mr. FIELDS—I desire to inform the gentleman that if the minority here wished to fill the vacancy in that district they had the opportunity to do so when the bill was in Committee of the Whole by moving an amendment to the bill; but they saw fit to do no such thing.

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—The minority on this floor are not responsible for the vacancy in the Saratoga district. It was not their duty to move an amendment to the bill. It was the wish of the minority here to sit and vote quietly upon such measures of the majority as they presented and let them take the responsibility of their action, without a word, if the Saratoga Senatorial district goes this year without representation upon the floor of the Senate. I have felt it my duty to say this much in vindication of the party of which I am a member, and, sir, having said this much, I now record my vote in the negative.

Mr. JACOBS—Before the gentleman records his vote I would like to ask him a question or two. I am sorry I cannot ask them of the gentleman from Onondaga. The trouble with him is that he does his bad things so quietly that nobody knows anything about them. The gentleman from Oswego says that it was his duty to his party to obey party obligations. That, sir, is right. But let me ask him whether two years ago, after his party had made the regular nomination for his Senatorial district, he did not bolt his party, run independently, and carry the district? (Applause.)

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—I was not aware, sir, that my personal acts were to be brought into this debate. In the case of the Speaker I think his question was peculiarly pertinent. In this case it may be the same. That was one of the occasions, sir, to condemn party action—(laughter)—when it is necessary for manhood to assert itself, and, sir, the attempt was justified by the terrific majority in the district.

Mr. JACOBS—Another question. I think the gentleman from Oswego has been a member of this body for some eleven years, and has been in caucus of his party probably every year during that time. I will ask him if his manhood was ever before so insulted by the party of which he is a member as when they required him, no doubt in order to keep him to his word, to put his name to a paper containing certain resolutions of a caucus of his party, when his honor should have been a sufficient guarantee that he would adhere to? No democrat would sign a paper of that kind.

Mr. ALVORD—I would state that there were great doubts in regard to the Senator from my district and myself unless we were bound by writing. (Laughter.)

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—I have never yet in caucus, in the Legislature, in convention or in the private relations of life decided to do anything that I was ashamed to put in writing with my signature attached, and no shame will flush my brow for having put in writing that which we agreed to do by resolution in caucus.

Speaker HITCHMAN, when his name was called, said:—On all questions of this character in parliamentary bodies the Chair from courtesy refrains from voting. But I feel that this is a high question of privilege—the right of representation here on the part of the people of the Sixteenth Assembly district of the county of New York. I deny that it is the right of the minority to restrain or destroy the policy which was enunciated by the majority here, and which was sustained by a vote of thirty odd thousand last fall. I believe that the policy of the majority of the people of this State should be carried out to the letter. I believe that the action of the minority will prevent the carrying out of that policy, and inasmuch as my vote is necessary on this question I will cast it in the affirmative.

Mr. WEED asked to be excused from voting and said:—

MR. SPEAKER AND GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE—Many of the arguments upon this question, which is simply a question of parliamentary law, have been, to my mind, entirely foreign to it. I have regretted to see exhibitions of feeling between gentlemen of the House of different political parties. It does not seem to me, sir, that the Twombly case should be construed as having anything to do with the question before us. The question is simply and purely whether the ruling of the Chair in respect to this bill—that it is a question of privilege—is a correct ruling or not. I, in common with other members of this House, regret that the Twombly case was not more fully discussed at the time it was before the House; for I believe that any court of law examining that case, as it was presented to this Legislature by the reports of the majority and minority of the committee which investigated it, could have come to but one conclusion, and that the conclusion that this House came to; nor do I think that the question of the vacancy in the Senatorial district of Saratoga should in any way affect this question. That is a matter for the Senate to initiate, as stated by the gentleman from New York. If any gentleman of the republican party had arisen and asked that that vacancy should be filled I believe that it would have been the right of the Speaker to rule that as a privileged question. I wish now to speak for one or two minutes upon this question of the ruling of the Chair. There are rights which every member upon this floor has, which are considered privileged rights, and which are above the rule, which are not considered in the rule, which are not mentioned in the rule. These are the personal rights of the House. Now, the rights of the people to representation in the House are coequal with the rights of the representatives, and from time immemorial questions affecting such rights have been considered privileged questions. This question which is before the House now is a new question. This is the first time it has been presented to this legislative body that I know of; and this bill coming so before us as a privileged question, it seemed to me that it was duty of the Speaker to rule that it may be presented and passed through the regular forms without and above the ordinary rules, so that the Sixteenth Assembly district of New York city may have an opportunity to be represented upon this floor. But the democratic party in this House are not confined to this course. Every lawyer on this floor who has examined the question at all knows that under the letter of the law the Governor of the State of New York has the right to fill this vacancy to-day, and it is only because he does not believe that the spirit of the law gives him the same right that the letter does that he refrains from doing so. He voted in the affirmative.

The decision of the chair was sustained—yeas 64, nays 63—a strictly party vote.

The question being on the motion of Mr. Frear, to order the bill to a third reading at once.

Mr. ALVORD called for the ayes and noes, and it was carried by the same vote.

The bill was then placed upon its third reading.

The CLERK proceeded to call the roll on the passage of the bill. When the name of Mr. GOODRICH was called he said:—

Mr. Speaker, I ask to be excused from voting. There is one question that it seems to me has not been touched upon in the somewhat wide discussion that has been had here this morning. Under ordinary circumstances I should be swift to secure for the people of any district in the State the right of representation here. But one of the measures which, by this action, the republican party seek to defeat, is an act to repeal the Registry law passed last winter. That law was passed in pursuance of an agreement made by the democratic magnates, in the Senate and in the Assembly, with the republican leaders, by which the election law was given as a consideration for the passage of the New York charter. That agreement was avowed by Mr. Tweed in the Senate in this language:—"I was a party to the arrangement made here last year by which the Charter law and Election law were passed, and, while I insist that the bill now before us is fair and just in itself, I say further that if the situation had remained unchanged, if the federal government had not interfered with our elections, we would not have asked or proposed any change in our election law. But the change has been forced upon us by the action of the federal government. We must protect the rights of our citizens. We must give every man who has the right to vote an opportunity to register and to vote. This bill has been carefully drawn for that purpose."

It is clear, then, that this election law which the democratic party now seek to repeal was enacted in pursuance of a solemn compact made between the republicans and the democrats, that if the republicans would vote for the Charter bill the democrats would vote for the Election law. That law was designed, as the gentleman from Oswego (Mr. Littlejohn) says, to preserve intact the purity of elections in this State; but no sooner was the Senate convened, I believe on the very first day of the present session, than a bill was introduced by one of the Senators from New York to repeal that law, in violation of the solemn compact of last winter.

Mr. JACOBS—I wish to ask the gentleman from Kings a question. Can the action of the last Legislature, or the promises or pledges made in that Legislature, bind this one?

Mr. GOODRICH—I did not say that it bound this Legislature, but I say that the parties are bound by the action of their leaders. I presume that the gentleman who asks the question was cognizant of that agreement at the time.

Mr. JACOBS—I knew nothing of any such agreement or of any jobs of any kind.

Mr. ALVORD—I wish to ask the gentleman from Kings (Mr. Jacobs) whether the Senators who made that agreement do not still occupy their seats in the Senate?

Mr. FIELDS—Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the other gentleman from Kings (Mr. Goodrich) if he is in favor of parties when they make solemn pledges of that kind executing them faithfully?

Mr. GOODRICH—To the letter.

Mr. FIELDS—Then I ask the republican gentlemen in this House who agreed to vote for all measures that the majority should desire to pass on condition that a certain gentleman should be expelled from this House to fulfil that pledge.

A MEMBER—It was never made.

Several MEMBERS—Never, never.

Mr. CAMPBELL—Mr. Goodrich said that.

Mr. GOODRICH—One moment. I will state what Mr. Goodrich said. But first I will say that if the republican party made any such pledge, I, for one, will vote to designate a man to vote with the democrats and fulfil the pledge. I deny, however, that it was ever made. What I said on the subject was this; I believe I said it to the Speaker at the breakfast table, and I call upon him to remember it. Speaking of the lamentable occurrence in the House which has since made the vacancy in the representation of the Sixteenth district, I said that I believed that the republican party in this House felt so aggrieved by the outrage which had been committed that if the democratic party would expel Mr. Irving the republicans would be willing to designate a man to vote with them upon all party questions.

The SPEAKER—The gentleman from Kings stated that if the democrats in the House would do justice in the premises then such action would be taken by the republican party.

Mr. GOODRICH—I have stated what I believe I said.

Mr. LITTLEJOHN—And you stated it merely as your opinion.

Mr. GOODRICH—Yes, I stated it as my opinion of what would be the action of the republicans if the democratic party would take the action that I mentioned. But what was the fact as to their action? They did not expel the offending member. Common rumor asserts that there was no intention that Mr. Irving should even resign, that he came from New York on Monday without any such intention, and that the plan was afterwards arranged here. Why? Because seven members of the democratic party were so outraged by the action of Mr. Irving that they said that either he or they must leave this House. More than that, I say that if the democratic party upon this floor will certify to the people of the State that their action in that matter was taken solely at the request of the republican party, perhaps even now such a pledge can be carried out. Let me say one thing further. I have not spoken to a single member of this House upon what I am now about to say. I speak without authority and without consultation with the members of my party, but I presume that every republican member of this House would be willing to resign and go to the people upon the whole question. Now, a word as to the Fifteenth Senatorial district. The democratic party now express great sensitiveness about the non-representation of the Sixteenth Assembly district, and the gentleman from Oswego (Mr. Littlejohn) very properly asked them awhile ago, "Why, then, do you allow the Saratoga Senatorial district to go unrepresented?" The answer is made that it is because the Senate does not take the initiative in filling that vacancy. But is it not the privilege of any member of this House to introduce a bill for that purpose without waiting for the action of the Senate? Now, our democratic friends complain that we have made certain measures, caucus measures. But, what is the difference whether a single measure or half a dozen measures are caucus measures? They complain of our caucus action, and yet, last evening, on the very heel of the tirade of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Fields), immediately on the adjournment of the House, the Speaker called a secret caucus.

SEVERAL MEMBERS—No.

Mr. GOODRICH—Well, he called a caucus. I withdraw the word secret. But he called a caucus of the democratic members for a party purpose. I withdraw my request to be excused, and vote "No."

When the name of Mr. JACOBS was called he said:—Mr. Speaker, I ask to be excused from voting for the purpose of asking a question. I desire to know how many republican members of this House pledged themselves to the majority that in case the member from the Sixteenth district left the House, no matter in what way, they would not interfere with our ordinary party legislation. I ask the gentleman from Suffolk (Mr. Carman).

Mr. CARMAN—None!

Mr. JACOBS—I understood that a great many did. I withdraw my request to be excused, and vote "aye."

When the name of Mr. LITTLEJOHN was called he said:—

Mr. SPEAKER—I asked to be excused from voting. A very lamentable occurrence—one that every member of this House regretted—happened here a few evenings since. In the excitement of the moment members of the republican party here, knowing that by the removal of one democratic member of the House there would be no constitutional majority upon this floor, did undoubtedly say for themselves that if the member from the Sixteenth district should be removed they would be willing to vote with the democratic party upon party questions. But that was a momentary ebullition of feeling and ought not to be spoken of in this debate as a binding obligation upon the party. That, however, is not claimed; but I say further that it should not be held binding upon individuals. I vote "No."

When the name of Mr. MOSELEY was called he asked to be excused from voting and said:—Mr. SPEAKER—I had not intended to say anything upon it from its inception to the present time. I have avoided it for the reason that the man whom I have always recognized as the leader of the republican party of this House, though the people of the State did not know it until now, has not yet spoken. I refer to my colleague from Kings (Mr. Goodrich)—(laughter)—and I desire to say in the presence of this House that if there is any republican who is entitled to the credit of being a manly opponent, it is my distinguished colleague, and I am glad that the day has come when his leadership is recognized, and when he has succeeded in getting all the republicans here to put their names below his to a series of resolutions which he has published. (Laughter.) He is clearly the true leader of his party here. My colleague fought the Carey case. My colleague fought the Water bill. My colleague has fought the democrats from the start upon every question. He has never been silent, and now at last his virtue proves its own reward. I, therefore, desire, as a democratic representative from the county of Kings, proud of my distinguished colleague, to say here in the presence of the House that he, and not the gentleman from Onondaga (Mr. Alvord), is the leader of the republican party here. (Laughter.) Now, my colleague speaks of a bargain made last year, but he refutes his own argument by reading what a distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. Tweed) said on the subject in the Senate, that after we had passed a law to throw safeguards around the ballot box, the federal government interfered by a law substantially taking the elections of this State out of the hands of the State government. My colleague knows that, in pursuance of that law, the Navy Yard in his district was filled with about 6,000 men, who were armed at the expense of the federal government, and sent through the election districts of New York and Brooklyn, driving or deterring persons from the polls; and he knows, further, that if there had been a fair election even he himself might not have occupied a seat here.

Mr. GOODRICH—If my very complimentary friend will allow me, I wish to say that if he asserts that that was my knowledge or belief, or suspicion, he is mistaken.

Mr. MOSELEY—Then my colleague is too high-toned. (Laughter.) Now, I, too, say that if the federal government had not interfered with our elections we would have adhered to the arrangement made last year; but I insist that the action of that government absolved us from that agreement. But I let that pass, and proceed to another consideration, which I hope the people of this State will bear in mind, and which I trust that every democrat will bring to their recollection next fall. There are now pending before this House important measures of legislation seriously affecting the interests of the city of New York. The Sixteenth district, in that city, is not represented here. It is stated by the republican newspapers that the men who support those measures cannot be sustained by the people of that city. The legislation is necessary. Now, all that we ask is, that you will pass a bill giving the people of that Sixteenth district an opportunity to send a representative here. Do that and the democratic leaders of the city of New York will rest content with the verdict of the people. You say these gentlemen are conspirators, who do not represent the people of New York. You cannot, therefore, consistently object to letting this bill pass, so as to give the people of the Sixteenth district an opportunity to say whether they want this legislation or not. I withdraw my request to be excused and vote, "Aye."

When the name of Mr. PRINCE was called he asked to be excused from voting and said:—Mr. SPEAKER, I deem it no more than due to myself as a man to say that were there no other way in which the people of the Sixteenth district could secure representation upon this floor than by the passage of this bill, I would vote for this bill, without regard to what the other members of my party might do, without regard to what a caucus of that party might do, but on my own responsibility as one intending always to do what is right in my own judgment and before my conscience, regardless of any man. But I may examine the law, and I find that there is full and ample opportunity for the people of that district to be represented here without the passage of any special bill such as presented here this morning. This Legislature can go on as usual and pass the bills which a majority of its members are in favor of and adjourn within a day or two. The Governor can then call an extra session within twenty or thirty days after, and can in the meantime order a special election in that district.

Mr. FIELDS—Oh, that's too thin! (Laughter).

Mr. PRINCE—I did not understand the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fields.

Mr. FIELDS—I said that was too thin. (Renewed laughter).

Mr. PRINCE—I presume that gentleman is acquainted with the law. As I was saying, the Governor can call a special session of this Legislature, and can, in the meantime, call a special election in the Sixteenth district, and then I suppose that the democratic party here will have their constitutional majority of sixty-five votes, and can go on and pass whatever measures they choose to take the responsibility of passing.

Mr. FIELDS—I wish to ask the gentleman whether in his judgment as a lawyer the vacancy can be filled under the existing law without an adjournment of the Legislature *sine die*.

Mr. PRINCE—What I have said is that we can go on here in the usual course and pass such bills as the majority will support and then adjourn, and that then the Governor, who is in union with the majority of both houses, can call a special election in the Sixteenth district, so that that district can be represented at an extra session of the Legislature. That would give the democratic party a constitutional majority, and it could then pass its own party measures. All that we ask is that we of the minority be allowed to vote as we choose, and the majority shall pass its own party measures, if they are to pass at all, by its own party vote, and not ask us to vote for them. If the course I have suggested had been adopted everything would have gone on tranquilly, and the majority would have carried out the general law strictly, instead of asking, as they have asked, for a special law for this special case, although they did not think it necessary in the case of the Saratoga Senatorial district. Now, I wish to say a word in behalf of my friend from Suffolk, whose name was passed, and who, therefore, had no opportunity of speaking for himself. It is proper for me to say in behalf of him and of others that members of the republican party did say that if the representative from the Sixteenth district should be expelled they would see that some republican members would vote with the democratic party; but it is only fair to draw clearly the broad line of distinction that exists between the action that they spoke of and that which actually was taken here. Expulsion would have required probably the united action of the democrats as a party, while by the course that was taken the action of only one member was required—the individual who resigned. I believe, indeed I know, that my friend from Suffolk would have acted up to every word he had said if the course he contemplated had been pursued, and I, as a republican, would have voted to sustain him in that action in caucus or elsewhere, and I would have been willing to have been designated as the member who should vote with the democratic party in pursuance of that understanding; but the circumstances are entirely different, and I think that, in justice to myself and others similarly situated, the distinction ought to be distinctly drawn. I withdraw my request to be excused and vote in the negative.

Mr. SCRIBNER followed with some remarks.

The bill was lost by a vote of 63 to 64.

Mr. JACOBS, who had changed his vote to the negative for that purpose, moved a reconsideration, and that that motion lie on the table.

The bill was then lost by the following vote:—

AYES—Messrs. Aiken, Banker, Bartlett, Bayliss, Bennett, Blair, J. Brown, Buck, Buckley, D. Burns, Campbell, Carey, Chamberlain, Chambers, Cole, Connelly, Conselyea, Cook, Coon, Coyle, Curtis, Decker, Drew, Fields, Flagg, R. Flanagan, Fleck, Frear, Fuller, Griffin, Haver, Hayes, D. B. Hill, Howe, Howell, Joy, Kelley, Krack, G. D. Lord, Loutrel, Madigan, Montanye, Moseley, Mulhall, Murphy, Nachtman, Nelson, Nicholas, Oakley, O'Brien, O'Neill, Randall, Ransom, Ray, Roche, Speaker, Sweet, Ten Eyck, Van Steenburgh, Wainwright, Waterbury, Weed, Wiley—63.

NOES—Messrs. Alberger, Alvord, Baker, Barney, Barse, Bemus, Berry, Bignall, Blackall, Bolt, Bradford, V. P. Brown, Bunce, Burhans, P. Burns, Cady, Carman, Chadwick, Delano, Durfee, Ely, Fisk, C. N. Flenagin, Gifford, Gleason, Goodrich, Graham, Green, Hewitt, Hill, Husted, Jacobs, J. Johnson, R. Johnson, Kilham, Knapp, Littlejohn, G. P. Lord, Lynde, McDougal, Mulford, Northup, Pahud, Pierce, Pound, Prince, Sage, Sanborn, Scribner, Selkreg, Seward, Shepardson, Sniper, Stevenson, Strahan, Sunderlin, Tucker, Wade, Wagner, Wilson, Winans, Wood, Woolsey, Wyman—64.

Mr. JACOBS, who had changed his vote to the negative for that purpose, moved a reconsideration and that that motion lie on the table.

On that Mr. ALVORD called for the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and the motion was agreed to—yeas 64, nays 55.

The House then took a recess until half-past seven P. M.

Evening Session.

The House met at half-past seven o'clock.

Mr. FREAR moved that the House adjourn. Carried.

The House then adjourned till eleven o'clock to-morrow morning.

PROCEEDINGS IN THE STATE SENATE.

ALBANY, April 14, 1871.

A bill to authorize a tax of [illegible] mills per dollar of valuation of the year 1871 for the construction of new work upon and extraordinary repairs of the canals of this State was considered in the Committee of the Whole and ordered to a third reading.

THE NEW HAMBURG SENATE.

Mr. GENET, from the Joint Committee investigating the New Hamburg disaster on the Hudson River Railroad, submitted a written report stating that they had taken much testimon (which they present with the report) and had given the matter a full investigation, in which they were aided, so far as known, by the efforts of the Hudson River Railroad Company. So complicating, however, is the testimony taken, and so different is the impression left by it on the different minds, that the Joint Committee find themselves unable to agree on a report that will command the support of a majority of the committee, and they therefore simply and respectfully report to the Senate and Assembly the testimony itself, inviting to it the attention of both Houses of the Legislature, with whom it rests to take such action as may be deemed just and proper. The report is signed by all of both committees.

The Senate then went into committee on

THE GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The bill was subjected to a lengthy discussion, but no material amendments were made to it. It was reported to the Senate and then passed—yeas 25, nays 0.

PLYMOUTH LECTURE ROOM.

A Bit of Mr. Beecher's Experience.

The usual large congregation were in attendance at the Plymouth prayer meeting last evening. Mr. Beecher was in his familiar place, a cluster of trailing arbutus lying on the Bible at his elbow, given him by some brother or sister (sister probably) who knows the Plymouth pastor's love of flowers.

After the usual prayers and hymns Mr. Beecher said that he had received a letter asking him to give his idea of what is meant by coming to Christ, and by a man's not being able to get the victory over self except by

LEANING ON CHRIST.

We are to come to Christ as we would come to any one heard of but not present. Friends are separated; the wide world sunders them for years, yet true hearts never grow cold. The love that begins with the senses passes into the realm of the imagination, and learns to work through faith. The power of Goethe, of Shakspeare, of far-off, unforgotten Plato, is felt to-day—the power of great natures abides. Christ is God revealed in manifestations toward the weak and wicked. That part of the divine Father which is adapted to imperfection is Jesus Christ. Men say that they can apprehend the Father, but that it is difficult to apprehend Christ. That which in God is

PITY, LOVE, FORGIVENESS,

that view of God which makes him the nurse, the mother, the father, the friend that we need, is Christ, whatever name we call it by. Now, is it difficult to form conceptions of Christ in all these elements? It ought not to be difficult from any intrinsic reason. Personal experience in this respect is extremely varied. I remember when it was thought necessary to stir up the human heart as the doctor stirs up the bile. The patient was made awful sick before he was allowed to get better. It was thought necessary for a man to go through a terrible conflict before he could be a true Christian. I strove after this experience for years. I sought for horrors, for

A TERRIFIC WHIRL OF CONVICTIONS,

but finally gave it up. I was at last swept into the Church. Well, the Church proved a restraint; but I had no clear conception of Christ for a long time after. It was not till I had begun to study theology, and then not on purpose, but accidentally, if any experience of the soul can be called accidental. But I finally got a view of Christ, by surprise, a conception that has never left me. Let each come to Christ as God appoints, and let neither doubt the other's experience. The action of bringing the mind into sympathy with Christ is subject to the same laws as all other mental effort. We have the same mind to be religious with that we have to use in other directions. The love of Christ is the same as other loves.

THE HEART HAS ITS TIDES,

like the bay; they rise and fall. We have not vitality enough to keep all the machinery of the soul in activity at once. Each emotion must have its turn. Many persons weary themselves vainly because they cannot think of Christ all the time. The soul is so constituted that it cannot think of any one thing continuously. When the father leaves his home in the morning the love lies down while the love instrument works.

LOVE RESTS SOMETIMES,

as the flowers shut at night that they may open in the morning all bedewed. In loving Christ the soul does not act under new laws. Love is not extinguished because it subsides. It is latent and breaks forth at opportunity. Duties inspired by love never smother love.

A. T. Stewart has responded most readily and handsomely to an invitation from a lady in Holyoke, Mass., to contribute towards an extensive fair to be held in Springfield, Mass., during the first week in May, for the benefit of "A Home for Friendless Children," by sending an elegant camel's hair India shawl to be disposed of for the benefit of the fair.

CUBA.

Herald Special Report from Havana.

Several Severe Engagements---Heavy Losses on Both Sides.

Operations of the Guerillas Near Santiago.

Trains Attacked, Bridges Destroyed, Estates Burned.

TELEGRAM TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

HAVANA, April 13,
KEY WEST, April 14, 1871.

A column of Spanish troops, commanded by Colonel Bascones, had a very severe engagement, on the 27th of March, at Los Desiquia, near the River Nejasa, with the rebel forces commanded by Generals Ignacio Agramonte and Julio Sanguili. The Spanish loss was numerous. Among those dangerously wounded were Captain Laso and Lieutenant Morales de Roda; the latter has since died. At a later date some rebel forces encountered the El Rayo column of Spanish troops under Colonel Montaner. The fighting was very severe, and heavy losses were sustained on both sides.

It is reported that the Spanish column commanded by Colonel Morin encountered a rebel force under General Vicente Garcia, intrenched at Naraujae and Monte Oscuro, and the latter were driven from their positions with a loss of eighty Spaniards and twenty-one rebels.

A party of rebel bushwhackers near Santiago are engaged in burning bridges, attacking trains, firing estates and committing other depredations with impunity. Numerous minor engagements have taken place in the rebel districts, with contradictory statements as to the results. The *Diario* admits the news from Santiago to be painful, and admitted the same last week regarding the news from Santi Espiritu, and says that the rebels, disembarrassed of the women, children and old men, who impeded their movements, have effected a more systematic organization of guerilla warfare, causing thus much damage by ambuscades and surprises.

Four rebel prisoners captured by Major Recarey's column in an engagement were immediately executed.

Neue Lerdarro, Emilio Nuñez, Tomas Orie and Fernando Seayas lately surrendered and were imprisoned at Puerto Principe.

RUSSIA.

Religious Persecution of the Jews and Riot in Odessa.

OUTRAGE AGAINST THE ISRAELITES.

Serious Despoilment of Property—Migratory Movement of the "Chosen" People.

TELEGRAM TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

LONDON, April 14, 1871.

Telegraphic despatches have been received in this city to-day from the banks of the Danube, which convey intelligence of a very serious and exciting character.

The festivities of Easter have been marred and clouded in the Russian territory by religious persecution and outrage.

I have been informed, for the service of the HERALD, that the London *Standard* received a news telegram this morning from Vienna, which states that "a religious riot had occurred at Odessa. The Jews were despoiled and great devastation committed."

The local authorities were powerless against the rioters or for the prevention of the first tumult or the suppression of the subsequent disorder.

It is alleged that the Israelites have been regarded with a considerable share of public and political disfavor in Russia and along the line of the Danube during some time just past. I have been told that the Israelites have aggregated in great numbers suddenly, at different points by migration from the more disturbed districts of Europe, particularly from France. This movement has excited the attention of the natives, and their jealousy also.

Statistical returns say that there is one Jew to each 33 resident inhabitants in Austria: 1 to 42 in Russia; 1 to 62 in Turkey; 1 to 105 in Germany; 1 to 333 in Belgium; 1 to 412 in Italy; 1 to 436 in England; 1 to 463 in France; 1 to 595 in Switzerland; 1 to 664 in Scandinavia; 1 to 52 in Holland, and 1 to 7 in Poland.

During some eighteen months just ended, the Jews in Russia, like their neighbors of Moldavia, have been in great distress, and applied for assistance to their more prosperous co-religionists in Western Europe. A short time ago all Jews residing within forty miles of the Moldavian frontier were ordered to remove into the interior of the empire, and the order was executed with such severity that only a few days were allowed even for large families to dispose of their houses and leave the country. The population which had to perform this new exodus amounted to 100,000, and the heavy losses caused by their sudden removal reduced many of them to a state of destitution. In other parts of the empire the Jews, of whom there were then 2,550,000 in Russia, complained bitterly of the persecution which they suffered at the hands of the authorities. A Russian soldier at Odessa accepted the Jewish religion and was surprised by his officer at prayers in a synagogue. The man was arrested and banished to Siberia under the Russian criminal code, which makes "secession from the Russian faith punishable in the same way as high treason." At St. Petersburg several wealthy Jewish merchants were forbidden to employ Jews in their offices as clerks; and in the Jewish government schools religion was and is taught by professors belonging to the orthodox (Russian) faith.

FIRE IN SOUTH BROOKLYN.

The alarm of fire given between twelve and one o'clock yesterday was caused by the discovery of flames issuing from the factory of the Patent Elastic Felt Company, King street, near Van Brunt, South Brooklyn. Owing to the combustible character of the contents the flames spread with rapidity, and in a few minutes the whole of the upper story was enveloped by the devouring element. The fire took place in the drying room and was caused by the over-heating of the steam apparatus. The office of the firm (which is composed of Messrs. Osterman, Bloodgood & Spencer) is at No. 95 Duane street, New York. Loss on stock and machinery, $15,000; on the building, $5,000. The property is fully insured.