

DOM PEDRO II

The Proposed Visit of the Emperor of Brazil to Europe and the United States.

The Troubles Which Beset a Monarch.

Opening of the General Assembly of the Empire.

Remarkable Speech from the Throne.

The Emperor Assails the Bugbear of Slavery—A Splendid Programme of Reform—Description of the Opening Ceremony.

Rio Janeiro, May 11, 1871.

The long-mooted subject of a foreign trip by His Majesty Dom Pedro II, Emperor of all the Brazils, has within the past week been brought almost to a fait accompli, and there is now little doubt that before the close of the present month he will be governed by a regent in the person of the Princess Imperial, Donna Isabel.

The Legislative Chambers were opened by the Emperor in person on the 3d of the present month, and on the 5th the Minister of the Empire submitted to the Chamber of Deputies a bill asking, as is required under the constitution, permission for His Majesty to leave the empire, and that the Princess Imperial be appointed Regent during the interval of absence, with all the attributes of the Moderative and Executive Powers. The Minister also recommended that a sum of two million milreis be appropriated for the expenses of the imperial voyage, and stated that His Majesty would not require the leave to extend beyond the 1st day of April, 1872.

On the 7th inst. the bill was passed, after some discussion and slight modification, allowing \$200,000 for the expenses, and directing that three ships of war of the Brazilian navy be detached to act as an imperial escort.

The Emperor officially assigned as the great object of the trip is the restoration of the health of her Majesty the Empress; but it is very well known that the project of a European tour has been prevailing in the imperial mind for about two years, and if her Majesty's health was the cause which first suggested it it is indeed severe that permission to seek restoration had not been accorded long since. Of course the quinquages has not been slow to snuff up the rumor-laden atmosphere which always surrounds the unhappy mortals whose mortality is infused with the purple blood, and there are numerous wise waggings of the head and stretchings of the neck, as it is confidentially hinted, by everybody that "his Majesty will never return to these shores." Certain it is that the wish of the Emperor has not met with much popular favor, and there are few indeed of his subjects who will not regret deeply his departure, even though only temporary.

Dom Pedro II. is probably as popular a monarch as any the world has ever seen, and it is well known that there exists a sentimental attachment to the person of the Emperor, and that he would gladly revolutionize the empire, still even these turbulent spirits will never attempt such a crime during his reign. And in this spirit of forbearance they are governed quite as much by personal regard for the Emperor, who is a wise, just and benign sovereign, as by fear of his power.

But it is asserted that Dom Pedro is tired of Brazil. He is a man of advanced years, liberal and enlightened politics, always expressing the most earnest desire for the social, political and material development and welfare of the nation. In his efforts to give effect to his expressed views in these regards he has unquestionably never been aided by his ministers or any department of the government. He is a hundred years in advance of his Cabinet and deputies, courtiers and all. He would be a fitting monarch for a people of Anglo-Saxon stock, and the sluggish, suspicious, factious blood of the Latin is by no means his natural element.

And here again crops out another peculiar vein of the strata of ill-omened gossip which underlies the whole project. The Princess Imperial is the wife of the Count d'Eu, son of the Duc de Nemours, and the only child of the Emperor's first wife, who, fearful of the imperial absence, says that the Count will exercise too important an influence over the Emperor, and that he will be a man of considerable activity and ability, and harmonizes with the ideas of the Emperor. In the second place he is a soldier by profession, and reputed to be a good one, and it is said that he will be present and able in the field that the recent Paraguayan war, which had long embarrased the national pride, and which was a triumphant termination. In him, it is claimed, the slow march of the government see a menace to their blissful torpidity of ideas.

THE COURTS.

Rights of Assignees in Bankruptcy of the Alabama and Chattanooga Railroad Company in Court—Stabbing on Board Ship—Friday Gold Transactions—Important Jurisdictional Decision—The Baird Will Case—Business in the Court of General Sessions.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT—IN BANKRUPTCY.

Rights of Assignees—Hills of Sale. James R. Clark, Jr., Assignee, vs. Wm. A. Baird and Others—Judge Blatchford, in rendering his decision in the bankruptcy proceeding, says—

In this case there must be a decree for the plaintiff for the property transferred to the assignee by the bill of sale of May 1, 1869, and for the \$1,900 paid to them on that day, and for the value of the securities referred to in the confession of judgment of February 25, 1869, beyond the amount paid in redemption of the same by the assignee. There must be an accounting in respect to the above matters before a master if the parties do not agree on the amount. The defendants will be charged with the costs of the suit. In all other respects the prayer of the bill is denied.

The Alabama and Chattanooga Railway Company. The case of Thomas Buckley and Others vs. The Alabama and Chattanooga Railway Company came on for motion, before Judge Blatchford, for leave to withdraw the general appearance on the part of the railway company and to enter a qualified appearance.

Mr. Gray and Mr. Davison appeared for the petitioning creditors, and Mr. Seward and Mr. Crosby for the railway company. The question in the case is whether the railway company being a foreign corporation, it is necessary to file a certificate of incorporation with the court, and if so, what is the effect of the certificate. The court gave an order to the petitioning creditors to withdraw the general appearance and put in a qualified appearance, as asked for, so that the court might have jurisdiction of the case.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER'S COURT. Charge of Stabbing on Board Ship. Before Commissioner Shields.

The United States vs. John Arco.—The defendant, who is Chinaman, was yesterday charged before Commissioner Shields under the following circumstances—N. Guplin is captain of the ship Thomas Owens, of Portland, Me. Toward evening of the 29th of May, while the vessel was off the Delaware, a fight or scuffle occurred between the seaman, Sidney Baldwin, and John Arco, the cook. The defendant immediately stopped the quarrel, and after it was hushed up nothing more appeared to be thought of until the next morning, when the defendant, swearing that he would leap overboard and drown himself, he stayed in the galley a few minutes and then went to his cabin. Next morning, about six o'clock, when Baldwin was relieved at the wheel to get his coffee, and as he went to the galley for that purpose, Arco said to him, "I have something to settle with you." Baldwin replied, "Here I am; you can have me," proceeding at the same time to get his coffee. He did not know that he was suspected that the Chinaman had poisoned it. Baldwin was in the act of going away, when he was met by the forward part of the forward house by Arco, who seized him by the collar and pulled him into the cabin. Baldwin with a dagger and cut him on the left arm. Baldwin seized the Chinaman by the throat, knocked him down, and then drew a large sheath-knife into Baldwin's side, giving the blade a couple of turns. The vessel arrived in this port on Saturday next, and yesterday morning the defendant was brought on board by the Commissioner and complained to the effect above stated. The accused was held in \$5,000 bail to await an examination on the 10th inst.

Alleged Illegal Removal of Whiskey. The United States vs. Edward Lorry.—The defendant, who had been arrested for transporting a quantity of whiskey between the hours of sunset and sunrise, was held by Commissioner Shields in the sum of \$500 bail to await the action of the Grand Jury.

The United States vs. Michael Duffy and Thomas Hagan.—The defendants were each held in \$1,000 bail to await examination on a charge of removing about six hundred gallons of whisky from a boat, which had been paid. The defendants were arrested on Saturday night.

A Lottery Case. Before Commissioner Johnson.

The United States vs. Peter Johnson.—The defendant, who had been arrested by Deputy Marshal Purdie, was held in \$1,000 bail to await the action of the Grand Jury on a charge of dealing in lottery tickets without paying the special tax.

Supreme Court. Lachner vs. Lachner.—Granted. Hall vs. Hall.—Granted.

Goodman vs. Spencer.—Motion denied. Costs to abide event of trial. The Matter of the Petition of William Dunning.—Motion granted.

Superior Court—Trial Term—Part 2. A Reminiscence of the Black Friday Stock Transactions.

Before Judge Burghart.

Peter S. McCormick vs. Morgan, Keene & Co.—This is an action for alleged unlawful sales of stocks and overcharges for carrying stocks through the period of the "Black Friday" panic. The plaintiff had previous transactions with the defendants in which sales and charges, similar to the ones now complained of, were made; but those accounts had been settled without objection; but the losses of the "Black Friday" transactions, during which time the plaintiff was absent from the city, forms the ground of the present action. He now seeks to recover under the plea of unauthorized sales and usurious charges. The stock of the Morgan, Keene & Co. was sold on under a general discretion, and especially that during the panic they did the best they could for the plaintiff in his absence, and in fact saved him by selling the stock at a price which would have been a total loss. Joseph C. Jackson appears for the plaintiff, and Judge Parker, Mr. Bennett and Mr. Church for the defendant. The case is set for trial on the 10th inst.

Superior Court—Special Term. Decisions. Bradley vs. Wheeler.—Order granted. Grobeck vs. Grobeck.—Same. McKitt vs. Becker.—Same. Robert Barclay et al. vs. Louis Walter et al.—Order granted. Moran vs. Chipman.—Same.

Court of Common Pleas—Special Term. Decisions. By Judge J. Daly. Adair vs. Ogden.—Motion granted. Leticia vs. Robinson.—Motion denied. Gottlieb et al. vs. Pittler.—Defendant fined fifty dollars.

Marine Court. In re Matter of Jurisdictional Decision. By Judge Shea.

Flood vs. Noonan.—In this case Judge Shea has given the subpoenaed decision as to the jurisdiction of the Marine Court—

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

THE COURTS.

Rights of Assignees in Bankruptcy of the Alabama and Chattanooga Railroad Company in Court—Stabbing on Board Ship—Friday Gold Transactions—Important Jurisdictional Decision—The Baird Will Case—Business in the Court of General Sessions.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT—IN BANKRUPTCY.

Rights of Assignees—Hills of Sale. James R. Clark, Jr., Assignee, vs. Wm. A. Baird and Others—Judge Blatchford, in rendering his decision in the bankruptcy proceeding, says—

In this case there must be a decree for the plaintiff for the property transferred to the assignee by the bill of sale of May 1, 1869, and for the \$1,900 paid to them on that day, and for the value of the securities referred to in the confession of judgment of February 25, 1869, beyond the amount paid in redemption of the same by the assignee. There must be an accounting in respect to the above matters before a master if the parties do not agree on the amount. The defendants will be charged with the costs of the suit. In all other respects the prayer of the bill is denied.

The Alabama and Chattanooga Railway Company. The case of Thomas Buckley and Others vs. The Alabama and Chattanooga Railway Company came on for motion, before Judge Blatchford, for leave to withdraw the general appearance on the part of the railway company and to enter a qualified appearance.

Mr. Gray and Mr. Davison appeared for the petitioning creditors, and Mr. Seward and Mr. Crosby for the railway company. The question in the case is whether the railway company being a foreign corporation, it is necessary to file a certificate of incorporation with the court, and if so, what is the effect of the certificate. The court gave an order to the petitioning creditors to withdraw the general appearance and put in a qualified appearance, as asked for, so that the court might have jurisdiction of the case.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER'S COURT. Charge of Stabbing on Board Ship. Before Commissioner Shields.

The United States vs. John Arco.—The defendant, who is Chinaman, was yesterday charged before Commissioner Shields under the following circumstances—N. Guplin is captain of the ship Thomas Owens, of Portland, Me. Toward evening of the 29th of May, while the vessel was off the Delaware, a fight or scuffle occurred between the seaman, Sidney Baldwin, and John Arco, the cook. The defendant immediately stopped the quarrel, and after it was hushed up nothing more appeared to be thought of until the next morning, when the defendant, swearing that he would leap overboard and drown himself, he stayed in the galley a few minutes and then went to his cabin. Next morning, about six o'clock, when Baldwin was relieved at the wheel to get his coffee, and as he went to the galley for that purpose, Arco said to him, "I have something to settle with you." Baldwin replied, "Here I am; you can have me," proceeding at the same time to get his coffee. He did not know that he was suspected that the Chinaman had poisoned it. Baldwin was in the act of going away, when he was met by the forward part of the forward house by Arco, who seized him by the collar and pulled him into the cabin. Baldwin with a dagger and cut him on the left arm. Baldwin seized the Chinaman by the throat, knocked him down, and then drew a large sheath-knife into Baldwin's side, giving the blade a couple of turns. The vessel arrived in this port on Saturday next, and yesterday morning the defendant was brought on board by the Commissioner and complained to the effect above stated. The accused was held in \$5,000 bail to await an examination on the 10th inst.

Alleged Illegal Removal of Whiskey. The United States vs. Edward Lorry.—The defendant, who had been arrested for transporting a quantity of whiskey between the hours of sunset and sunrise, was held by Commissioner Shields in the sum of \$500 bail to await the action of the Grand Jury.

The United States vs. Michael Duffy and Thomas Hagan.—The defendants were each held in \$1,000 bail to await examination on a charge of removing about six hundred gallons of whisky from a boat, which had been paid. The defendants were arrested on Saturday night.

A Lottery Case. Before Commissioner Johnson.

The United States vs. Peter Johnson.—The defendant, who had been arrested by Deputy Marshal Purdie, was held in \$1,000 bail to await the action of the Grand Jury on a charge of dealing in lottery tickets without paying the special tax.

Supreme Court. Lachner vs. Lachner.—Granted. Hall vs. Hall.—Granted.

Goodman vs. Spencer.—Motion denied. Costs to abide event of trial. The Matter of the Petition of William Dunning.—Motion granted.

Superior Court—Trial Term—Part 2. A Reminiscence of the Black Friday Stock Transactions.

Before Judge Burghart.

Peter S. McCormick vs. Morgan, Keene & Co.—This is an action for alleged unlawful sales of stocks and overcharges for carrying stocks through the period of the "Black Friday" panic. The plaintiff had previous transactions with the defendants in which sales and charges, similar to the ones now complained of, were made; but those accounts had been settled without objection; but the losses of the "Black Friday" transactions, during which time the plaintiff was absent from the city, forms the ground of the present action. He now seeks to recover under the plea of unauthorized sales and usurious charges. The stock of the Morgan, Keene & Co. was sold on under a general discretion, and especially that during the panic they did the best they could for the plaintiff in his absence, and in fact saved him by selling the stock at a price which would have been a total loss. Joseph C. Jackson appears for the plaintiff, and Judge Parker, Mr. Bennett and Mr. Church for the defendant. The case is set for trial on the 10th inst.

Superior Court—Special Term. Decisions. Bradley vs. Wheeler.—Order granted. Grobeck vs. Grobeck.—Same. McKitt vs. Becker.—Same. Robert Barclay et al. vs. Louis Walter et al.—Order granted. Moran vs. Chipman.—Same.

Court of Common Pleas—Special Term. Decisions. By Judge J. Daly. Adair vs. Ogden.—Motion granted. Leticia vs. Robinson.—Motion denied. Gottlieb et al. vs. Pittler.—Defendant fined fifty dollars.

Marine Court. In re Matter of Jurisdictional Decision. By Judge Shea.

Flood vs. Noonan.—In this case Judge Shea has given the subpoenaed decision as to the jurisdiction of the Marine Court—

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

On reading all the act entitled "An act to facilitate the service of process in certain cases," Laws of 1868, chap. 411, it is the opinion of the court that the jurisdiction of the Marine Court of the city of New York, if there could be any doubt as to this, the subsequent amendatory act, Laws of 1869, chap. 412, contains no provision which would affect the jurisdiction of the court, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1868, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1869, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1870, and that the jurisdiction of the court is not affected by the provisions of the act of 1871.

THE COURTS.

Rights of Assignees in Bankruptcy of the Alabama and Chattanooga Railroad Company in Court—Stabbing on Board Ship—Friday Gold Transactions—Important Jurisdictional Decision—The Baird Will Case—Business in the Court of General Sessions.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT—IN BANKRUPTCY.

Rights of Assignees—Hills of Sale. James R. Clark, Jr., Assignee, vs. Wm. A. Baird and Others—Judge Blatchford, in rendering his decision in the bankruptcy proceeding, says—

In this case there must be a decree for the plaintiff for the property transferred to the assignee by the bill of sale of May 1, 1869, and for the \$1,900 paid to them on that day, and for the value of the securities referred to in the confession of judgment of February 25, 1869, beyond the amount paid in redemption of the same by the assign