guilty to assault and battery, and was sentenced to one year's imprisonment in the Penitentiary.

Grand Larceny.

David A. Clarke, indicted for stealing an overcoat, a gold watch, a pencil and a revolver, the aggregate value of which was $247, pleaded guilty to an attempt at grand larceny. The prisoner was sentenced to the Penitentiary for one year.

Alleged Forgery of a Deed.

The rest of the day was occupied in the trial of an indictment for forgery preferred against Patrick Mullins, who was charged with forging his wife's name to a mortgage given in December, 1871, to the Mutual Life Insurance Company for a loan of $4,000. Mr. Work, of the firm of Davis & Work, the attorneys for the company, detailed the circumstances under which the loan was effected, and how it was subsequently discovered; that the signature of Susan M. Mullins was a forgery. Two witnesses from Morrisania, Westchester county, where the property in question is located, who had seen Mrs. Mullins write but once, could not positively swear that the signature of her name on the mortgage was a forgery.

George Stampson, an expert in the matter of handwriting, testified that in his opinion the signature of Patrick Mullins and what purported to be the signature of his wife were written by the same person. The witness was cross-examined at great length by Mr. Clinton, the counsel for the defendant, after which the Court adjourned.

The case will probably be finished to-day.

A Bogus Reporter Sent to the Penitentiary.

Henry S. Bogart, the bogus reporter, who pleaded guilty in December to obtaining money by false pretences from Rufus F. Andrews, was brought up for sentence. Evidence had been furnished the Recorder of the respectable connections of the accused and his previous good character, and he mitigated the sentence to imprisonment in the Penitentiary for three months.

JEFFERSON MARKET POLICE COURT.

Felonious Assaults.

Thomas Richards, of 91 Varick street, was charged, before Justice Ledwith, with stabbing Henry Holliday in the left shoulder with a dirk knife. He was committed to answer.

Thomas Crawford, a sailor on the steamer City of Paris, stabbed his messmate, Patrick Driscoll, in the foot, with intent to kill, as Patrick charged. He was arraigned before Justice Ledwith and locked up to answer.

A Remarkable Criminal.

It will be recollected that on Friday last a woman, giving her name as Caroline Welsh, was arrested on Sixth avenue, having a basket containing silverware, which she was trying to sell. Upon being taken to the station house a large number of pawn tickets were found upon her person, which showed, upon investigation, that a great variety of valuable property had been pledged by her. She was retained in custody, and the officers set about finding the owners, in which they met with signal success. She was brought up before Justice Ledwith, at Jefferson Market, yesterday, when no less than six complainants appeared against her. It seems her habit had been to seek a situation at some one of the employment offices, and her respectable appearance and quiet demeanor soon caused her to be engaged. Once in a house she took the earliest opportunity of collecting all the valuables possible and decamping, as it turned out, much to the astonishment of her employers, all of whom believed they had secured a treasure in the way of a servant. When placed at the bar she stood a short, sad, silent woman, decently clad, with a face resembling that of a corpse, with immense development of forehead, the face tapering to a sharp, pointed chin. When questioned she admitted her guilt in every case, manifesting no emotion save when accused of having been before the Court before, which she stoutly denied. In her examination she stated she was forty-two years of age, a native of France, residing at 242 Eighth avenue. She signed her name in a clear, round hand. As shown in the complaints her operations commenced in November last, and have been continued at intervals until very recently in this city, in Brooklyn and Flushing. The property taken by her, mostly consisting of silverware, jewelry and wearing apparel, amounted in the aggregate to more than seven hundred dollars. She was committed without bail to answer.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY.

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM—Held by Judge Van Brunt.—Demurrers—Nos. 6, 31, 2, 17, 35, 40. Law and Fact—Nos. 245, 246, 1, 6, 42, 47, 50.

SUPREME COURT—CIRCUIT—TRIAL TERM—Part 2—Held by Judge Barrett.—Nos. 772, 556, 2182, 662, 668, 1010, 1062, 1176, 654, 954, 2223, 508, 1066, 1122, 1718, 168, 336, 680, 714, 730½.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Davis.—Nos. 29, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 72½. Call 73.

SUPREME COURT—GENERAL TERM—Held by Judges Ingraham and Fancher.—Nos. 212, 217, 261, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 144, 175, 176, 186, 188, 229, 231, 233, 234, 235, 237, 239, 241.

SUPERIOR COURT—TRIAL TERM—Part 1—Held by Judge Monell.—Nos. 2235, 1859, 1923, 1921, 751, 1575, 1899, 257, 1435, 1275, 1695, 479, 337, 1947, 1953. Part 2—Held by Judge Van Vorst.—Nos. 1940, 1288, 726, 1360, 1526, 1540, 1454, 1602, 314, 1612, 1140, 1584, 1570, 1580, 1596.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS—EQUITY TERM—Held by Judge Larremore.—Nos. 46, 64, 50.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS—TRIAL TERM—Part 1—Held by Judge Loew.—Nos. 1256, 1598, 3103, 506, 290, 1821, 1835, 1870, 1859, 1874, 1903, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913. Part 2—Held by Judge J. F. Daly.—Nos. 1772, 1902, 1689, 977, 1790, 1777, 769, 1596, 1802, 1821, 1760, 1352, 1914, 1915, 1917.

MARINE COURT—TRIAL TERM—Part 1—Held by Judge Joachimsen.—Nos. 1298, 1424, 1526, 1304, 1902, 434, 1318, 1374, 1416, 1364, 1448, 1466, 1468, 1470, 1472. Part 2—Held by Judge Shea.—Nos. 1433, 1427, 115, 1451, 1477, 1493, 651, 1833, 1275, 823, 1473, 1454, 1145, 1437, 1455, 1319, 1373, 1763. Part 3—Held by Judge Spaulding.—Nos. 1740, 982, 930, 1478, 1479, 836, 1687, 2080, 961, 966, 970, 971, 975, 990, 122.

COURT OF APPEALS CALENDAR.

ALBANY, Feb. 17, 1873.

The following is the Court of Appeals day calendar for February 18:—Nos. 40, 89, 59, 267, 268, 64, 638, 42.

THE TRAINERS AND DRIVERS OF TROTTING HORSES.

The trainers and drivers of trotting horses in the United States having formed themselves into a protective association to guard their interests against what they consider offensive and oppressive rules and rulings of the National Associations and Board of Appeals, are now engaged in making a code of rules for their own government on and off the trotting track in the future. As the interests of the managers of the national associations throughout the land are identical with those of the trainers and drivers, we would advise the latter when they have perfected a code of rules to have a joint meeting with the leading members of the various national associations, so that some amicable arrangement can be made for their mutual benefit. A code of rules should be adopted so concise and simple that "all who run may read," and all who trot can understand. There are doubtless too many rules in the old code, many of them incomprehensible to those most interested in them, there being altogether too much law and too little equity for honest men. In the framing of the trainers' and drivers' code we hope to see rules that can be easily understood and earnestly carried out by all well wishers of the trotting turf.

SOUTHSIDE SPORTSMEN'S CLUB.

A large number of the members belonging to the Southside Sportsmen's Club, of Long Island, met last evening at 66 East Fourteenth street to elect officers for the year ensuing the 1st of May next. Without the least ceremony, and dispensing with all other business, the election was held, with the following result:—President, John K. Hackett; Vice President, George G. Wilmerding; Treasurer, William M. Johnson; Counsel, John E. Develin; Secretary, W. R. Beebe; Executive Committee, A. P. Montant, Charles Banks, Samuel Shaw.

AQUATIC.

Ellis Ward to John Biglin, Greeting—Will John Respond to Ellis?

Feeling that to determine the champion oarsmen's abilities of this country requires another trial between himself and John Biglin, Ellis Ward has addressed the latter, through the HERALD, the following challenge, with the hope that it may be at once accepted:—

NEW YORK, Feb. 7, 1873.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

Be pleased to permit me, through the HERALD, to propose to Mr. John Biglin to row a concluding race, as we now stand on the record two and two.

I am not satisfied with the condition that I was in during our last contest, and thus wish to again try our skill. I will row Mr. Biglin over the same course and on the same terms, about the middle of May next. If this is agreeable to him an early reply will be attended to at the office of Mr. Frank Queen, where the match can be fully arranged. Very respectfully, ELLIS WARD.

Rowing on the Tyne—Winship and Lally.

The third deposit of £10 a side, in the skin match on the Tyne, for £200, between Thomas Winship and James Lally, both of Newcastle, has been made good, at J. Taylor's (the Trafalgar Inn), New Bridge street, Newcastle. The race is to take place from the High Level Bridge to Scotswood Suspension Bridge, according to such of the Thames National Regatta Rules as are applicable, on Monday, March 10. Both men are taking gentle exercise, but in the course of a few days it is expected that they will get into hard work for the engagement.

CORRUPT CALDWELL.

Report of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The Kansas Senator Held Up to Scorn.

Review of the Testimony Taken and Views of the Committee.

"EVERY MAN HAS HIS PRICE."

Proof That $50,000 Were Expended in Caldwell's Election.

WHAT THE SENATE CANNOT TOLERATE.

The Committee Recommend a Resolution Declaring Caldwell's Election Invalid.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17, 1873.

The following is the full report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections in regard to the election of Alexander Caldwell in 1871 to the Senate of the United States:—

On the 11th day of May, 1872, the Senate adopted the following resolution:—

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be authorized to investigate the election of Senator S. C. Pomeroy by the Legislature of Kansas in 1867, and the election of Alexander Caldwell in 1871; that the committee have power to send for persons and papers; that the chairman or acting chairman of said committee or any sub-committee thereof have power to administer oaths, and that the committee be authorized to sit in Washington or elsewhere during the session of Congress and in vacation.

In obedience to this resolution the Committee on Privileges and Elections have had under consideration the election of Alexander Caldwell to the Senate of the United States in January, 1871, have taken testimony and beg leave to submit the following report:—

It is testified by Mr. Lem T. Smith, a former business partner of Mr. Caldwell,

HIS ACTIVE FRIEND

at the time of his election, during this investigation, that he made an agreement with Thomas Carney, of Leavenworth, by which, in consideration that Mr. Carney should not be a candidate for United States Senator before the Legislature of Kansas and should give his influence and support for Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Caldwell should pay him the sum of $15,000, for which amount notes were given and afterwards paid, at the same time taking from Mr. Carney a written instrument, in which he pledged himself in the most solemn manner not to be a candidate for the office of Senator in the approaching election. This instrument is in the words following:—

I hereby agree that I will not, under any condition of circumstances, be a candidate for the United States Senate in the year 1871, without the written consent of A. Caldwell, and in case I do to forfeit my word of honor hereby pledged. I further agree and bind myself to forfeit the sum of $15,000 and authorize the publication of the agreement. THOMAS CARNEY.

TOPEKA, Jan. 13, 1871.

Mr. Smith's testimony is fully corroborated by that of Mr. Carney, who admits the execution of the paper, the making of the arrangement, the taking of the notes and the subsequent receipt of the money. The notes for the money were signed by Mr. Smith, but paid by Mr. Caldwell, and one of them, for $5,000, was made consequent upon Mr. Caldwell's action.

THE SUBSTANCE OF THE WHOLE AGREEMENT,

only part of which was expressed in the writing, was that Mr. Carney should not be a candidate for the Senate against Mr. Caldwell, that he should use his influence for Mr. Caldwell, go to Topeka, meet the Legislature and do all he could to secure his election.

The first question to be considered is, Was this arrangement corrupt—was it the use of corrupt means on the part of Mr. Caldwell to procure his election? The committee are of opinion that it was corrupt, was against public policy, was demoralizing in its character, directly contributed to destroy

THE PURITY AND FREEDOM OF ELECTIONS,

and not to be tolerated by the Senate of the United States as a means of procuring a seat in that body. To understand the full nature of the transaction it must consider the character and position of Mr. Carney. He had been a Governor of Kansas. He had once been elected a Senator of the United States by the Legislature of that State, but the election was premature, being at the wrong session. He had been a candidate for the Senate at another time and had come within ten votes of being elected. He was well known throughout the State; had a large body of active friends, many of whom were warmly devoted to his political fortunes. His being a candidate would greatly endanger the success of Mr. Caldwell, if not certain to result in his defeat. He was from the same city with Mr. Caldwell, and his candidacy would be the more dangerous on that account. When Mr. Caldwell agreed to give him $15,000 under this agreement it was an attempt to purchase the votes of the friends of Mr. Carney. He doubtless expected that Mr. Carney, through his influence over his friends, could bring them over to his support. They would naturally become friends to the man with whom Mr. Carney was friendly. It was at least a tacit part of this arrangement that Mr. Carney should conceal

THE MERCENARY PART OF THE TRANSACTION

and place his withdrawal from the canvass and his support of Mr. Caldwell upon personal and political considerations that were honorable to himself and would be attractive to his friends, and this he did. Mr. Carney went to Topeka before the Senatorial election and remained there until it was over, working industriously for Mr. Caldwell and exerting all his personal and political influence to secure his election. Looking at this transaction in its real character it was a sale upon the part of Mr. Carney of the votes of his personal and political friends in the Legislature, to be delivered by him to Mr. Caldwell as far as possible. If it were legitimate for Mr. Caldwell to buy off Mr. Carney as a candidate it was equally legitimate to buy off all the other candidates and have the field all to himself, by which he would exert a *quasi* coercion upon the members of the Legislature to vote for him, having no other candidate to vote for. It was an attempt to buy the votes of members of the Legislature, not by bribing them directly, but through the manipulation of another. The purchase money was not to go to them, but to Mr. Carney, who was to sell and deliver them without their knowledge. That Mr. Caldwell did procure the votes of members of the Legislature, friends of Mr. Carney, ignorant of the fact that Mr. Carney was making merchandise of his political character and influence and of their friendship for him, for which he was to receive a large sum of money, the evidence leaves no reasonable doubt. Buying off the opposing candidates and in that way securing the votes of all or the most of their friends is

IN EFFECT BUYING THE OFFICE.

It recognizes a candidacy for office as a merchantable commodity, a thing having a money value, and is as destructive to the purity and freedom of elections as the direct bribery of members of the Legislature. A candidate for the Senate without strength or merit may, by purchasing the influence and support of all or a part of his competitors and withdrawing them from the canvass, succeed in an election, thus not only committing a fraud upon the friends of the candidates who were purchased off, but a greater fraud upon the people of the State who may be thus saddled with a representative in the Senate of the United States about whom they know little, for whom they care nothing, and who possesses little ability to represent their interests.

Mr. Smith, the friend of Mr. Caldwell, testifies that he paid Mr. Carney the further sum of $7,000 while at Topeka and just before the Senatorial election to meet Mr. Carney's alleged expenses while there, and through fear that Mr. Carney would after all withdraw from the arrangement and become a candidate. Upon the check for this sum the money was drawn from the bank at Topeka in the evening by one T. J. Anderson, who testified that he gave it to Mr. Carney, and that he was ignorant of the consideration for which it was paid. Other testimony impeaches that of Mr. Anderson, and raises a strong presumption that he was

ENGAGED IN THE PURCHASE OF VOTES

for Mr. Caldwell, and for which this $7,000 was used, and that for his services he afterwards received the sum of $5,000 from Mr. Caldwell. Mr. Carney swears positively that he did not receive this $7,000 or any part of it, but he endorsed the check at the request of Mr. Smith to enable him to procure the money from the bank; that the money was to be used in procuring votes for Mr. Caldwell, and that a package containing the money, as he believes, was placed by Mr. Anderson on a table in Mr. Carney's room, where it could be and was conveniently carried off by the parties for whom it was intended. Taking all the testimony together, the probability is that Mr. Carney did not get the $7,000, as no good reason was presented by Mr. Smith why, when Mr. Caldwell was holding Governor Carney's written promise not to be a candidate, and Mr. Carney holding notes to be paid by Mr. Caldwell for $15,000, a new arrangement should be made by which Mr. Smith should pay Mr. Carney $7,000 more, making $22,000 in all. We now come to the consideration of

THE TRANSACTION WITH MR. SIDNEY CLARKE.

He had been a member of Congress and had been a candidate for the United States Senate during the preceding canvass before the people, and many members of the Legislature were elected on personal pledges to vote for him for Senator. When the first vote was taken in the separate houses Mr. Clarke received twenty-seven votes, the largest number given for any candidate but one, but the vote satisfied him and his friends that he could not be elected. An arrangement was concluded between Mr. Caldwell and a Mr. Stevens, a friend of Mr. Clarke's, at a late hour in the night before the joint convention of the two houses, by which Mr. Caldwell was to pay Mr. Clarke's expenses in the canvass—estimated at from $12,000 to $15,000—and Mr. Clarke was to withdraw in favor of Mr. Caldwell. At a caucus of the friends of Mr. Clarke, held at nine o'clock on the morning of the joint convention when Mr. Caldwell was elected, Mr. Clarke made a speech and urged them to vote for Mr. Caldwell, and in the joint convention his name was withdrawn, and all his friends but one voted for Mr. Caldwell. Subsequently, in this city, Mr. Clarke had several conferences with Mr. Caldwell, in which the latter promised to comply with his engagement with Mr. Stevens and pay Mr. Clarke's expenses, estimated at from $12,000 to $15,000, but never did. Mr. Clarke was unwilling to admit that he had made an arrangement to transfer his friends to Mr. Caldwell in consideration of the latter's promise to pay this money; but, taking all the testimony together, the committee have no doubt that the transaction between him and Mr. Clarke was as has been stated. Mr. Caldwell's subsequent refusal to pay the money to Mr. Clarke does not relieve

THE CHARACTER OF THE TRANSACTION,

and very probably resulted in the exposure of Mr. Caldwell and the institution of this examination. There was nothing in the evidence to show that Mr. Clarke's expenses in the Senatorial canvass, or in the preceding canvass before the people, amounted to half the sum which Mr. Caldwell was to pay him. Mr. Clarke and Mr. Carney each testifies that Mr. Caldwell told them after the election that his election had cost him $60,000. Mr. Anthony, the Mayor of the city of Leavenworth, testified Mr. Caldwell admitted to him that the election had cost him over sixty thousand dollars. Mr. Burke, editor of the Leavenworth *Herald* and a supporter of Mr. Caldwell in his canvass, testifies that after the election Mr. Caldwell told him the money he had paid Mr. Carney was not more than ten per cent of the whole amount which the election had cost him, and on another occasion that the election had cost him more than twice his entire salary.

The committee have had much difficulty in tracing the money transactions, but the evidence shows that various sums, amounting to over fifty thousand dollars, were drawn under circumstances that make it probable they were used to procure Mr. Caldwell's election. The sum of $15,000 paid to Mr. Carney has already been stated;

THE SECOND SUM OF SEVEN THOUSAND DOLLARS,

which Mr. Lem T. Smith swears was paid to Mr. Carney, and which Mr. Carney denies receiving, and testifies to circumstances showing it was used for the bribery of members of the Legislature, has also been referred to. It is further shown that three or four days before the election took place Mr. Caldwell's agent went into the banking house of Scott & Co., at Leavenworth, and drew the sum of $10,000 upon Mr. Caldwell's check for the avowed purpose of taking the money to Topeka by the train that morning, which was given as the reason for presenting the check before bank hours. Mr. Jacob Smith, banker, at Topeka, testified that at nine o'clock in the evening, before the election took place, Dr. Morris, of Leavenworth, a very active friend of Mr. Caldwell, drew $5,000 from his bank, and that Judge Crozier, of Leavenworth, an influential supporter of Mr. Caldwell, and then at Topeka laboring for his election, drew $1,200 from the bank after banking hours, at the request of Mr. Smith. The testimony left no doubt upon the minds of the committee that the bankers who honored these different checks at Topeka after banking hours understood that the money was to be used for political purposes. The evidence further shows that Mr. T. J. Anderson subsequently received from Mr. Caldwell the sum of $5,000 for his services in the election. A draft for $10,000, drawn by

THE SOLICITOR OF THE KANSAS PACIFIC RAILROAD

Company upon the Treasurer of that company, was presented at the Kansas Valley Bank of Topeka by Mr. T. J. Anderson on the 23d of January, the day before the election, and the money drawn upon it under circumstances which, taken in connection with other testimony, make it probable that the money was used for Mr. Caldwell's election. The committee have no reason to believe that they have traced all the money that was used, and in the foregoing statement have taken no account of several small sums shown to have been paid by Mr. Caldwell for the expenses of his friends while at Topeka. Mr. William Spriggs testified in regard to a self-constituted committee of six of Mr. Caldwell's leading friends, who met from time to time at Topeka, during the day and evening, for five or six days before the election, to confer and report progress in

ELECTIONEERING FOR MR. CALDWELL,

that during the meetings of this committee it was reported by Mr. Smith what members of the Legislature had been secured to vote for Mr. Caldwell, how much was offered to others, and how much was asked by others.

We quote from his testimony:—"We usually met at ten o'clock in the morning. We had a roll of the Senate and of the House, and kept them, and we would compare notes, and then such a member of the committee would be sent that day at such a time to see such a member of the House, and such another one to see somebody else, whoever we thought would be the best man for that particular place, and then we would meet again at such another hour, and report what we had done and what success we had had, and in some—quite a number of times—I do not know how many—in making the report and comparing notes there was one member of the committee who would read the report, and in calling over the names, when he would come to such and such a man, he would say, 'We had better not count that man yet; that is under negotiation, and is a little too high. I think I can

BRING HIM DOWN SOME.'"

This witness testified to several interviews with Mr. Caldwell, and we quote from his testimony:—"I will just tell you what Mr. Caldwell said to me about it. He asked me if I knew any members of the Legislature that could be influenced by the use of money for their votes, and I told him that I knew two members I believed that had the reputation of having been influenced in their votes on former occasions. And further on he said if I found any members that wanted a little money for votes to send them to him and Lem Smith. Mr. Caldwell said there was another class of high-toned gentlemen there in the Legislature that would not sell their votes, but they put it in this way, that they had been to a pretty heavy expense in carrying their elections and they would want their expenses paid, and if I met any of that class to send them to him or to Lem." The testimony of Mr. Spriggs is very full, and shows that the canvass of Mr. Caldwell was thoroughly corrupt, and that money was the chief argument relied upon. Among many other things he stated that T. J. Anderson told him that he had paid Mr. Crocker, a member of the House, $1,000 for his vote, and that Mr. Crocker afterwards backed out and handed the money over to a Mr. Carson, to be returned to Mr. Anderson, and that Carson got on the cars, went home and kept the money. Mr. Carson was afterwards called by the committee and corroborated the statement, admitting that he had received the $1,000 back from Mr. Crocker to be returned to Mr. Anderson, but that he had kept the money himself for his services to Mr. Caldwell.

Mr. Carney testifies that in an interview with Mr. Caldwell after the election, in which he was urging him to procure an appointment for one of Mr. Carney's friends who had voted for him, Mr. Caldwell took from his pocket a memorandum book and appeared to run over a list of names, and coming to the man referred to said, "That man has been paid," and Mr. Carney understood from his manner that he had in this memorandum book

A LIST OF MEMBERS

with the sums paid to each; that Mr. Caldwell told him upon another occasion that he had paid Mr. Bayers the sum of $2,500 for his vote, and Mr. James F. Legate the sum of $1,000 for his vote.

Mr. Anthony also swears that in a conversation with Mr. Caldwell that gentleman admitted to him that he had paid $2,500 for the vote of Mr. Bayers. There is much testimony showing that Lem T. Smith, Frank Drenning, James L. McDowell, George A. Smith and T. J. Anderson, among the most active friends of Mr. Caldwell during the canvass, admitted at different times that they had offered money to members of the Legislature to vote for Mr. Caldwell, in some cases specifying the members to whom it was offered and paid, and in other cases that offers had been made that had not been accepted, and that negotiations were on hand with others which had not been completed. These men have denied before the committee all conversations and admissions of this character, and all payment of money to members, or offers to pay them, and several members of the Legislature who were implicated have expressly denied that they received the money, or that offers were made to them. Mr. Caldwell offered testimony showing that Mr. Carney had made

THREATS TO HAVE HIM OUSTED FROM THE SENATE;

that Mr. Anthony was hostile to him; that Mr. Burke had a lawsuit with him, growing out of money furnished to Mr. Burke about the time of the election, and to contradict several statements of Mr. Clarke. The most important contradictions of the testimony produced against Mr. Caldwell are made by the agents of Mr. Caldwell, who were themselves implicated, or by the agents of Mr. Caldwell who were directly charged with taking a part in these corrupt practices, and there are some contradictions made by witnesses against whom there is no cause of suspicion; but, taking the testimony altogether, the committee cannot doubt that

MONEY WAS PAID TO SOME MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE

for their votes, and promised to others, which was not paid, and offered to others who did not accept it. By the constitution each house of Congress is made the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its members. If a person elected to the Senate has not the constitutional qualifications, or if the election is invalid by reason of fraud or corruption, the jurisdiction to examine and determine is expressly vested in the Senate. Another clause of the constitution authorizes the Senate to expel a member by a two-thirds vote. The causes for which a Senator may be expelled are not limited or confined, but rest in the sound discretion of the Senate. It has been a subject of discussion in the committee whether the offences for which they believe Mr. Caldwell to have been guilty should be punished by expulsion or go to the validity of his election, and a majority are of the opinion that they go to the validity of his election and had the effect to make it void. Wherefore

THE COMMITTEE RECOMMEND

to the Senate the adoption of the following resolution:—

Resolved, That Alexander Caldwell was not duly and legally elected to a seat in the Senate of the United States by the Legislature of the State of Kansas.

In conclusion, the committee remark that while Mr. Caldwell did things to procure his election which cannot be tolerated by the Senate, they believe he was as much sinned against as sinning. He was a novice in politics and evidently in the hands of men who encouraged him in the belief that Senatorial elections in Kansas were carried by the use of money.

PATTERSON'S PREDICAMENT.

Damaging Testimony Elicited by the Senate C. M. Committee.

The Mystery of Morton, Bliss & Co.—They Find in Their Safe C. M. Shares Belonging to Patterson—Oakes Ames' Evidence Corroborated—Senator Grimes One of the Tempted.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17, 1873.

The special committee of the Senate, of which Senator Morrill is chairman, to examine into the charge of Crédit Mobilier stock having been distributed among Senators, resumed its session at half-past ten o'clock this morning.

After an examination of certain portions of the printed testimony taken before the Poland Committee, Mr. L. P. Morton, of the firm of

MORTON, BLISS AND CO.,

of New York, was sworn, and testified that his firm had no transactions whatever with Senator Patterson in reference to Credit Mobilier stock; he addressed a letter to witness some time ago making such inquiry, and witness replied in the negative; since then he discovered in their safe an envelope containing twenty shares of Credit Mobilier stock, of which he had no knowledge before; he immediately advised Mr. Patterson of the fact and sent him the certificate; the stock was endorsed by Mr. Ames to J. W. Patterson or Morton, Bliss & Co.; witness did not know how the stock came in his possession, but had an impression it was

HANDED TO THEM BY MR. AMES.

Q. Who was the stock issued to on its face? A. To Oakes Ames or Oakes Ames, trustee, I forget which; on his way to New Hampshire Senator Patterson called upon witness and they had a conversation, but witness was unaware of the existence of the envelope at that time in the safe; he thought the envelope bore the date of May, 1871, on it, besides the name of Senator Patterson; he was not sure of that, however; the name of Senator Patterson was endorsed on the envelope by a clerk in the employ of the firm who is not with them now; the firm of which witness is a member had frequent business transactions with Mr. Ames, but none in reference to Credit Mobilier; at one time Mr. Ames handed them 300 shares of Union Pacific Railroad stock, with the request that it be sold on a favorable market, which was done; it was not possible for witness to establish the fact as to how the envelope came into their possession, it having remained with them for several years; it was almost a daily occurrence to have parcels left with them for safe keeping; witness had no knowledge of Mr. Patterson's having written to the firm since the stock was sent to him.

HON. OAKES AMES

was sworn—He had no recollection of leaving Credit Mobilier stock with Morton, Bliss & Co.; he endorsed the stock over to Mr. Patterson and delivered it to him, but could not tell when; he thought it took place in Boston; one of the receipts of Mr. Patterson would show the date. Witness further testified as follows:—I saw the envelope Mr. Patterson received; he showed it to me on Thursday or Friday of last week, and said he was mistaken; he thought he never had the stock, but found that he had, and had come to rectify his statement, and to state I was correct in my testimony.

By Mr. Stevenson—Witness could not remember the date of the first conversation he had with Mr. Patterson about purchasing Credit Mobilier stock; Mr. Patterson paid for it, however, on the 31st of August, 1867.

Q. Did he tell you what the $3,000 was for when he gave it to you? A. Why, of course.

Q. By Mr. Stockton—When Mr. Patterson called on you on Thursday or Friday, did he say anything to you to indicate how he had changed his mind? A. He showed me the letter from Morton and the stock certificate endorsed in my handwriting; he said he thought I must have put it there, but I cannot bring anything to mind to convince me that I ever did; witness had never known Credit Mobilier to sell higher than 200; had also received $4,000 from Mr. Paterson to invest in income bonds and stock of the Union Pacific Railroad.

Q. After you invested the first $3,000 did you inform Mr. Patterson? A. I presume so; I gave him his dividends in February, and he must have known then that I had invested it; the names of Morton, Bliss & Co. were endorsed on the stock by witness at the request of J. W. Patterson in order to enable to sell it as well as Mr. Paterson.

The committee, a few minutes before twelve o'clock, took a recess until half-past one o'clock.

PATTERSON PRESENT.

The committee reassembled at a quarter to two P. M., and Senator Patterson being present, the testimony of Mr. Ames before the recess was read to him. Mr. Patterson was then asked if he desired to ask Mr. Ames any questions, but he replied that he would not do so until after the committee should have finished.

ROAX AMES BACK AGAIN.

Mr. Ames then testified, in answer to questions by Mr. Scott, that he found by his memorandum book that Mr. Patterson paid for the stock on the 31st of August, but he had not the memorandum book with him now; all transactions between Mr. Patterson and witness were settled in May, 1871, and were covered by the receipt of that month.

Mr. Ames was then questioned at some length as to his previous testimony before the House Committee, and said that he gave Mr. Patterson 200 shares of Union Pacific stock at one time and 100 at another—the first being an open purchase and the second

ON ACCOUNT OF THE CREDIT MOBILIER;

Mr. Patterson did not agree with Mr. Ames; he remembered getting 300 shares of stock as the result of the $4,000 investment, as he thought; when Mr. Patterson called on witness on Friday last he said that he (Patterson) was mistaken in saying he never had Credit Mobilier stock, as he had now found out that he did have it.

Mr. Patterson said he had sent for the envelope received from Morton, Bliss & Co., and would soon have it.

In answer to questions of Senator Stockton Mr. Ames testified that he had known Senator Patterson ever since he had been in Congress, but did not remember how the conversation about investing money first came up; he offered these inducements to Mr. Patterson

SOLELY ON ACCOUNT OF FRIENDSHIP;

he also induced Senator Grimes to go in, and guaranteed him against loss. The witness mentioned the names of the Congressmen whom he had induced to go in as given before the Poland committee, together with other parties, among them Ezra H. Baker, Josiah Bardwell, Thomas Nicholson, J. M. S. Williams and others; he did not ask any members of Congress to go in to secure favorable legislation, as the road had all the legislation it wanted at the time; he induced them to go into the concern through personal friendship only.

Mr. L. P. Morton was recalled, and produced the Credit Mobilier stock certificate, with the envelope enclosing it, left on deposit with him, which he said he had just received from Mr. Patterson. He identified the envelope and certificate. On the former was the following:—

"Property of Hon. J. W. Patterson; see letter to him, May 12, 1871; 30 shares Credit Mobilier of America; 2,000 Union Pacific Railroad Company and income bonds Nos. 1,355 and 1,356; 300 shares Union Pacific Railroad Company, sold. Remarks—Delivered 2,000 Union Pacific Railroad to Hon. J. W. Patterson, August 10, 1871. C. E. M."

There also appeared on the envelope the following words, which were scratched over:—"Delivered 300 Union Pacific Railroad Company to Hon. J. W. Patterson, January 15, 1872."

Witness further testified that he had a conversation with Senator Patterson before this investigation began, and the Senator then said he never had held Credit Mobilier stock, but had Union Pacific Railroad bonds.

Oakes Ames was recalled and identified the handwriting on the stock certificate as his; he delivered the stock certificate to Mr. Patterson.

At half-past four o'clock the committee adjourned to half-past ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

LOBBY LEGISLATION.

The Investigation Concerning the New York Stock Exchange.

A Broker's Opinion of Congressional Morality—How the Pacific Mail Subsidy Was Obtained—Explanatory Statement of Judge Sherman.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17, 1873.

Legrand Lockwood was before the Committee of Ways and Means to-day. He produced several letters from Judge Sherman, and stated that he had no personal knowledge in regard to the claim of that gentleman on the New York Board of Brokers, except what he derived from a conversation with his (Lockwood's) father, and that the tenor of this conversation was embraced in the letters already made public; he was asked whether he had an impression, or whether there was an impression on the part of the New York Stock Board, that valuable legislation could be secured in Congress by the use of money, to which question he made an affirmative reply. Having been asked what facts he had on which to base his opinion, he replied "Nothing except general rumor," and having also been interrogated more particularly on this point, he said it was generally understood that about one million dollars were spent last session to procure

THE PACIFIC MAIL SUBSIDY.

He knew of no facts on which to base his opinion except general report.

Captain Nares, a messenger of the House, to whom Colgate referred as having repeated his conversation with Bassett a year ago, was called and stated that Colgate, on leaving the committee room, asked who Bassett was, and replied he was Clerk of the Committee of Ways and Means, and an honest, straightforward man; Colgate said he should judge from conversation with Bassett that he could be used for money, to which Nares replied he could find plenty of men in Washington who could be used for money, but no attention should be paid to any of them, and that if he had any honest matters before Congress he could obtain legislation without money.

JUDGE SHERMAN'S STATEMENT.

The following is a written statement submitted by Judge Sherman to the Committee on Ways and Means explaining his agency in the matter:—

In the Summer of 1861, while sitting in the office of Lockwood & Co., in New York city, Mr. Lockwood, an old friend and acquaintance, remarked that there was a controversy between the brokers and the Revenue officers in regard to the true construction of a section of the Internal Revenue law as to the taxes imposed on the capital employed by them; he asked me to look at the law, go to Washington and join with others in an argument about to be made before the Commissioner: I answered him promptly that I could not with propriety take such a step, but informed him that I could give him the name of an excellent lawyer, a resident of Washington, who frequently appeared before the Departments and argued with great intelligence legal questions;

I NAMED JUDGE BARTLEY.

Mr. Lockwood not being acquainted with him, I, at his request, wrote Judge Bartley, stating the question; asked him to investigate and go before the Commissioner, and, if necessary, prepare an argument; in a short time he answered me by saying that he had examined the question; that the brokers were right in their construction of the law; that he had seen the Commissioner, and that it was decided in their favor, but that the Secretary of the Treasury had disapproved the decision and set it aside; he advised the brokers to make a case, and take it to the Supreme Court or seek redress by legislation; this letter I forwarded to Mr. Lockwood; I heard nothing further until in the month of November or December of the same year, when I received a letter from Mr. Lockwood saying that the New York parties were about applying to Congress for legislation, and that he was

AUTHORIZED BY THE BOARD OF BROKERS

to offer a fee of $10,000 for my services; I replied that I could not personally attend to it, for want of time, and the reasons that I had formerly given him; but that, if he had no objections, I could furnish him the services of other persons, equal, if not better men than myself, in that business; the persons I meant were Judge Bartley, and my neighbor in Cleveland, Colonel R. C. Parsons, who was then Marshal of the Supreme Court; I accordingly wrote to him, or both of them, stating what the New York parties wanted, and that I was informed that the matter was then or would be soon before the Committee on Finance in the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means in the House, and on application to Senator Sherman or General Garfield, who, I then supposed, was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the claims and arguments urged by the revenue department could be ascertained and met; I paid no further attention whatever to the matter, knowing

IT WAS IN GOOD HANDS,

and that my friends thought we would get a good fee; when the revised Revenue law was passed and published I examined and found that by its provisions the New York brokers had succeeded and that my friends were entitled to their fees; in the meantime Mr. Lockwood had died; I then wrote to Mr. Legrand Lockwood, his son and successor in business, enclosing his father's letter making the offer, and stating in brief the services rendered, and being aware that he, the younger Mr. Lockwood, knew nothing of my turning over the business with his father's knowledge and consent to other counsel, and his father's letter showing that the offer was made to me alone, I claimed to him that the services were rendered by me; I made the claim in this manner without due reflection, though, in fact, the services were rendered by my friends at my request and procurement, and I was

MORALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR COMPENSATION;

I used the same language to Mr. Legrand Lockwood on that subject; the last letter I received from him informed me that one Mr. Colgate denied that any services were rendered at Washington except by himself, and that the matter was before a committee, with privilege to myself to be present and contest the matter with Mr. Colgate; not wishing for myself and friends to have a question of veracity with Mr. Colgate on this or any subject, I instructed Mr. Lockwood to withdraw the claim, intending to advise my friends to enforce it in another form; I will here state that I was not in Washington last Winter, nor have I been in the city for more than three years until last week; I will further state that in my letter to Mr. Lockwood I alluded to Senator Sherman and General Garfield, because in my instructions to my friends in Washington, to whom I gave the business, I named those gentlemen as the persons in whose custody the papers might be found that would show the points made and

THE ARGUMENTS USED BY THE REVENUE DEPARTMENT,

and I assert with perfect confidence in its truth that I never spoke a word or wrote a letter or an argument, or caused one to be written, to Senator Sherman or General Garfield on that matter, or any other that had or might come before them in their legislative capacity. It has been a principle with me, ever since John Sherman has been in public life, never to solicit his vote or influence on any matter of legislative action; I am a friend and admirer of General Garfield, and for the same reason I have not and would not approach him on such subjects; I will further state that not a dollar was ever paid by the counsel in whose hands I placed the business, or to me for their use, as was promised, and if any is ever realized it will go to them and not to me.

The committee then adjourned.

BROOKLYN RAPID TRANSIT WORK TO COMMENCE.

All the stock necessary for the present in order to commence the work of organization and survey by the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Corporation has been subscribed. The amount of stock taken up by the books of the company is $500,000, which will suffice for the initiatory steps in the enterprise of constructing a railroad tunnel from the Fulton ferry to the city line (Flatbush), and from the latter point on the surface to East New York. The committee appointed to solicit subscriptions to the stock—Messrs. Simeon B. Chittenden, Robert Turner and W. H. Taylor—claim that the tunnel to Prospect Park (bringing that place within ten minutes of the bridge) will double the value of the 127 acres the city has to sell by the Park. The road will be, in fact, another Harlem Road, in its relations to New York, and that it cannot fail but be remunerative to shareholders.

AN ITALIAN'S VENGEANCE.

The Trial of Luigi Lusignani for the Murder of His Wife at Dover, New Jersey.

JEALOUSY THE MOTIVE.

MORRISTOWN, N. J., Feb. 17, 1873.

The trial of Luigi Lusignani, the Italian who murdered his wife in Dover, on the 7th of November last, was commenced in the Court of Oyer and Terminer, before Judge Dalrymple, at half-past eleven o'clock this morning. The circumstances of the murder have already been fully narrated in the HERALD, the affair having caused a widespread sensation at the time of the occurrence. Jealousy, as in most Italian murders, seems to have been the motive which prompted Lusignani to the commission of the crime with which he stands charged, his wife having deserted him and gone to live with Baretti, another Italian, in whose house, at Dover, the murder was committed.

The court room was crowded, as usual, when the case was called on. Attorney General Gilchrist and the District Prosecuting Attorney, Mr. De Mott, appeared for the State, and Messrs. Vanetta, Wurts, Church & Childs for the defence. The prisoner was brought in in the custody of the Sheriff. He is one of the

MILDEST LOOKING ITALIANS

I have ever seen, and looks very little like a man capable of committing a double murder. He is about five feet six inches high and of spare frame. His long confinement seems to have told upon his health, and his face is pale to ghastliness. His forehead, as is usual with Italians, is high and broad, and his hair and eyes of a dark brown. The chief expression of his face is that of vacancy, and it is difficult to imagine that it could be kindled with ferocity. An interpreter sat beside him and his counsel, and another interpreter sat beside the counsel for the prosecution. It is expected that the trial will be a very interesting one, the defence promising some curious revelations of domestic infelicity. They claim that Luigi's wife left him and was living in adulterous intercourse with Baretti at Dover, and that when Luigi went to claim her he was assailed by the man and woman, and, in defence of his life, he was compelled to inflict the wounds which caused the death of Johanna Moosi.

At the opening of the Court Mr. Vemetta, senior counsel for the prisoner, asked that the trial be put off until the next term of Court on account of the absence of a material witness for the defence, an Italian organ grinder by profession, who is at present in Savannah, Ga. This witness, it is alleged, heard Baretti acknowledge the

ADULTEROUS INTERCOURSE

which he had with the woman Moosi, and also heard Baretti say that she was useful to several of these men besides. The Attorney General contended that this evidence was not material, and afforded no just ground for a postponement of the case. Judge Dalrymple, upon consideration of all the circumstances, thought it better that the case should go on, as neither side would ever be better prepared to go on than they were at present.

The jury list was then called over, and after (for Jersey) considerable delay a jury was obtained. Many challenges were made by the defence on account of favor, and Judge Dalrymple, in charging the triers, cautioned them against the danger of rejecting a man merely because he had formed an opinion. If they did so they would be in the position of a sister State, which, according to its law, gives the prisoner a right to reject a man who had formed an opinion or read a newspaper. In Jersey they wanted an intelligent jury and not a jury of blanks.

Mr. De Mott opened the case for the prosecution, and stated the circumstances, which have been already narrated. On the 7th of November two men came to the shop of Baretti, in Dover, one of whom was the prisoner. He claimed the woman as his wife, but she refused to go with him, alleging, as her reason, the fact that she had been badly treated. When the prisoner found that the woman

WOULD NOT GO WITH HIM

he drew a knife from his coat, plunged it into her breast and killed her instantly. Baretti then attempted to interfere and a struggle ensued, in which Baretti received several severe wounds.

The knife with which the crime was committed was here produced, a large butcher knife, bent in the handle. The prosecution stated that they expected to prove that the case was one of deliberate murder.

Giovanni Baretti, a low sized Italian, with black hair and mustache, with whom the woman Moosi lived, was the first witness. The following is his testimony:—I was born in Italy; am twenty-nine years old; I have lived in Dover for the past two years; I am a shoemaker by trade; the woman Moosi lived with me as housekeeper; on the morning of the 7th of November the prisoner and Phillipi Massilleni came into the house; the prisoner said he wanted to speak to that woman I said, "Well, all right;" I was behind the counter; they were outside; he went into the back part of the house; Luigi said he wanted his wife; she said, "I was your wife, but since you sent me away you robbed me of all my things which I brought from Italy, and took away my marriage ring; I am your wife no more;" he said, "Come in the room alone, I have something to tell you;" she said, "anything you have to say you might tell here in the presence of anybody;" he said, "No, come in the room alone;" he said so five or six times; she said, "I won't come; you have got a knife; you want to kill me; I will go out upon the stoop;" they went out and talked together, and after that they came inside, and Phillipi called out Luigi, and they talked a few words together; they came inside and Phillipi sat down by the machine; Luigi and the woman were near the counter; Luigi said, "Well, you must come," and then he pulled the knife from his coat

AND KILLED HER;

I called out to stop, and when I got near him he stabbed me in the breast; after that I tried to catch his right hand; he then got his knife in his right hand; I held his right hand with my left; I then got him with both hands; I thought he would kill me; I called out to Philip to take the knife away; the woman was at this time dead upon the stoop; I called for help, and the first man I met was Mr. Cox and then James Kelly; we secured Luigi; I lifted the woman up and carried her inside; Dr. Crittenden came up and said there was no help for her, it was too late; I remember nothing more after that, as I got insensible.

Cross-examined—I don't remember to have ever seen the man before that day; I had no knife in my hand; if I had the woman would not have been killed; the woman was my housekeeper; the way I came to hire her was this:—I went to New York looking for a servant, and was recommended to this woman by a friend; she lived in Baxter street; I did not know she was a married woman; I got married to the woman afterwards in New York; I don't recollect the name of the priest, the names of the witnesses or the name of the church; she lived with me some time as a housekeeper, but then she wanted me to marry her, and I did; I never said I was not married to her since the occurrence; I was convicted of stealing in Italy before I came to this country, and was in prison for some time; I was never in prison for stabbing my father; I never told any one I was in for that offence; I never told any one in New York that I would take $1,000 and get any one in this case clear.

Dr. Crittenden, sworn, deposed to having made the post-mortem examination on the body of the woman, Johanna Moosi; was called and found the woman lying on the stoop dead; I made the post-mortem the same day, assisted by Dr. Condit; there were two wounds on the chest; the wounds could have been made with a knife; one wound penetrated the left lung; it caused death almost instantly.

Dr. Condit corroborated the testimony of Dr. Crittenden, and the case was then adjourned until this morning.

THE JERSEY CITY MURDER.

Doris Sentenced to Thirteen Years in State Prison.

In the Court of Oyer and Terminer of Jersey City yesterday John Doris, convicted of murder in the second degree, was called up for sentence. Mr. Abbett, his counsel, made an appeal for clemency, urging the previous good character of the prisoner. Judge Bedle, addressing Doris, said that the jury arrived at a very proper conclusion, and that the provocation which the prisoner received saved him probably from a conviction of murder in the first degree. As a rule the revolver is a most dangerous weapon to him who carries it. A man who uses liquor freely has no right under any circumstances to carry one. A good citizen ought to be able to put his trust in the law. The Court was unwilling to impose the full penalty of the law, but the punishment would be such as to stamp the crime with the disapprobation of the law. The Judge concluded by sentencing him to thirteen years at hard labor in the State Prison.

THE VERY REV. DR. STARRS' SUCCESSOR.

Father Preston the New Vicar General.

The Most Rev. Archbishop McCloskey has appointed the Rev. Father Preston, pastor of St. Ann's, East Twelfth street, to the vacant Vicar-Generalship of the archdiocese of New York. As Vicar General Father Preston will have the same jurisdiction and authority as the Archbishop, but will not exercise it except during the absence or ill health of the Most Rev. Dr. McCloskey. Father Preston will continue pastor of St. Ann's, and Father Kearney will officiate as pastor of the Cathedral until a successor to the spiritual directorship of the Sisters of Charity and pastorship of St. Patrick's is appointed.

THE GRAHAM MYSTERY.

Burial of the Body of the Slaughtered Shoemaker.

Letter from a Lady in Maryland Who Claims To Be His Sister—The Slayers Suspected—A Variety of Strange Facts—When the Arrest Will Be Made—Squire Prevost Bails the Prisoners of Last Wednesday.

The excitement in Little Neck in regard to the butchery of James Graham rather increases than diminishes as the time removes the period at which the terrible crime was committed further away from the present. In the minds of the neighbors of the victim the mystery every day assumes a somewhat darker and more opaque complexion, and the belief has become current that it never will be solved until the last trump sounds and all things are made clear by the light of destiny. On Saturday morning, the Coroner being absent from Flushing, District Attorney Downing informed the three prisoners, John and Thomas Macreary and James McCollins, whose worst misfortune it has been not to be possessed of an extraordinary endowment of wit, that he was very willing to release them if they would procure the requisite amount of bail. The sum fixed upon for each was $2,000. He assumed the responsibility of their arrest himself by this action, although it had been made in opposition to his expressed wishes. Squire Prevost, the employer of the incarcerated innocents, came to Flushing and he and his son, a lawyer, offered themselves as bondsmen. The Squire was mainly anxious about his "stock" in his barn at home, which had not been cared for as of old since his men had been arrested, and he complained that his cows were becoming attenuated and melancholy in appearance.

THE FUNERAL OF GRAHAM.

The Macrearys and McCollins were accordingly set at liberty and went home to attend the funeral of him whom they claim as having been their half-brother, James Graham.

This sad ceremony took place on Sunday, and was doubly affecting because of the fact that besides the two released prisoners, his half-brothers, there was no one present who claimed the right of blood to mourn for the dead. A few simple rites took place and the mutilated remains of James Graham, enclosed in a cheap deal coffin, were consigned to the earth in the Little Neck churchyard, where the spot of his burial will doubtless in future years be viewed with awe by persons who may know by memory or tradition of his fearful fate. The features as they lay in death were calm and handsome, wearing an expression of manliness which had eliminated whatever look of agony or horror may at first have rested upon them. Graham was a man of strong and robust form, and one who, had he had a chance for his life, would not have died without a struggle. After the funeral a depressed and almost sullen calm seems to have settled over the little village like a black pall. The men who assemble in the barroom and store as usual are silent and uncommunicative, and every one seems distrustful or suspicious of his neighbor. A stranger is looked upon almost with fear, as if every man dreaded being seized upon and lynched without defence or delay for the murder of Graham. It would not be hard for any imaginative observer coming suddenly upon such a scene to form in his mind all sorts of theories about the dread secrets one might fancy lurked behind the singular faces scattered through the crowd. Having awakened to a sense of this fact the whole community is apparently in mortal fear of being indicted *en masse* on a charge of murder, and hence even the detectives are at a loss to glean any fresh facts from the dumb lips and sullen looks of the barroom tipplers, among whom ordinarily the news of the day is always most quickly exchanged.

A FEW SUSPICIOUS FACTS.

The clue mentioned before in the HERALD as being without doubt the right one has never been abandoned since first espied, and immediately after the close of the Coroner's inquest an arrest, which would be impolitic at present, is to be made, and it is confidently expected will result in the crimination of the murderers of James Graham. The names of those suspected have already been withheld for several days from the public, and cannot even yet be given. While there is not the slightest direct evidence to support this theory, which is that most favorably entertained by the District Attorney, it appears very probable indeed, if the circumstantial facts upon which it is founded are examined. On the night of the tragedy an incident was noticed by several persons happening on the premises of a neighbor of Graham which has never yet been rationally explained, and, without doubt, it never can be without involving the self-confession of the principal murderer. On the day of the discovery, and on the day following also, the man who is supposed to be chief in the crime displayed a most wonderful degree of nervousness, restlessness and excitement, which was directly contrary to his everyday character. Always a hard working and very diligent man he neglected his labor on this occasion, and has ever since, seeming to be ever pursued by some phantom or dread, wandered back and forth and apparently unmeaningly between his home and the hotel in the hamlet. He harnessed his horse in the afternoon, and drove a quarter of a mile to Douglaston, lounged about a few moments and returned without having shown any reason for making the empty journey. He then went to the hotel, and was heard in conversation to make directly opposite statements to different persons of the manner in which he thought the murder was committed. He was first positive that the instrument of death must have been a hatchet, and then when talking five minutes afterwards to another man expressed the opinion that it must have been a bar of iron. All this time his manner was noticed by a near observer, and the uneasiness that seemed to be consuming him was very palpable. He was afterwards heard to make remarks of such a character as to imply suspicion against one of his neighbors, upon whom, if he himself were the murderer, it would be comparatively easy, by strategy, to foist the guilt of the crime. The meagre descriptions of the men seen upon the road given on the witness stand by Constable Roe and John Bennem corresponded, as far as they go, with the appearance of the suspected persons, and the testimony of Bosworth, who saw two men enter the shoe shop coming from a certain direction, strengthens this impression. The man suspected of being the principal in the crime knew perfectly well the habits of Graham, where he kept his money, and that he had drawn $500 from the bank. His own pecuniary troubles were so great that they might well have driven him to a desperate crime if he possessed sufficient brute cowardice to commit it. By no means the least of the suspicious facts regarding him is that since the day of the discovery of the murder he has never once been near the body of his neighbor and friend, and that he never attended the inquest until finally subpœned as a witness and forced to come. In a rural place like Little Neck, where curiosity is the ruling passion, these are indeed unusual circumstances. On Thursday, in the inquest room, it was plainly to be seen that this man was constantly on his guard against the glances of those around him, and his manner was too studied and affected to be expressive, as it was intended to be, of conscious innocence. He was subject to sudden starts and moments of inexplicable embarrassment. He was not examined on that day, but will be compelled to testify on Friday of this week, if meanwhile he does not abscond.

Other points might be given which would more deeply impress the mind of the reader with the theory of the detective regarding the guilt of this man, but at their request they are reserved for the present the better to serve the ends of justice.

A SUPPOSED SISTER OF GRAHAM IN MARYLAND.

Mr. Van Nostrand's custody of the money, which was evidently supposed by the murderers to be in Graham's house, has caused his name to appear quite conspicuously, and as the story of crime has been copied by the Southern papers the fact of his having received the following letter is explained:—

GEORGETOWN, D. C., Feb. 13.

MR. VAN NOSTRAND:—

DEAR SIR—I saw a sketch in the Baltimore *Sun* of the murder of James Graham. I had a brother of that name, but have not heard from him for over twenty years. We are of Irish parentage, from the county Tyrone, Ireland; my parents resided a number of years in Scotland. I shall try and describe my brother as I last saw him, although I am not good at description:—He was low-sized, brown hair, high forehead (a little bare on the temple), blue eyes, short upper lip, and the chin a little sharp. The hair might have changed color in that length of time, as mine has done.

I hope it is not my poor brother that met with such a horrible death. I am very anxious to learn the particulars, and if you think that he might be my brother I will send you all the necessary information you may desire. I will leave the matter entirely in your hands. Yours, respectfully, MRS. ——.

The name of the lady who is the author of the above epistle is withheld by the lawyer, at her request. Many doubts are expressed of her identity with the sister of Graham. He often stated before his death that she lived in New York, often that she lived in Canada and often that she did not live at all. The mystery of this man's life is almost as singular as that of his death.

REWARDS FOR THE CAPTURE OF THE MURDERERS.

The Supervisors of the county of Queens yesterday came to the determination to offer a reward of $1,000 for the capture of the murderers; but have not yet made any official proclamation of the fact. A meeting of citizens of Little Neck was held in the village last evening, and the strongest measures for the accomplishment of the solution of the mystery were urged to them. A subscription of nearly five hundred dollars has already been raised among the neighbors of Graham for the discovery of his murderers.