

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT, PROPRIETOR.

THE DAILY HERALD, published every day in the year. Four cents per copy. Annual subscription price \$12.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.—On and after January 1, 1875, the daily and weekly editions of the New York Herald will be sent free of postage.

All business or news letters and telegraphic despatches must be addressed New York Herald.

Rejected communications will not be returned.

Letters and packages should be properly sealed.

LONDON OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK HERALD—NO. 46 FLEET STREET.

Subscriptions and advertisements will be received and forwarded on the same terms as in New York.

VOLUME XL.....NO. 14

AMUSEMENTS TO-NIGHT.

- San Francisco Minstrels, Broadway, corner of Twenty-ninth street.—NEGRO MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.
Robinson Hall, sixteenth street.—BROWN DULL CARE, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.
Globe Theatre, Broadway.—VARIETY, at 9:30 P. M.
Park Theatre, Brooklyn.—FRENCH FANCIOS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 11 P. M.
Lyceum Theatre, Fourteenth street and sixth avenue.—TWIST AXE AND CROWN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.
Walla's Theatre, Broadway.—THE SHAUGHRAUN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.
Wood's Museum, Broadway, corner of Third street.—EDMUND KLAN, at 8 P. M. and at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.
Metropolitan Theatre, No. 555 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.
Park Theatre, Broadway, between Twenty-third and Twenty-second streets.—Opera Comique.—LE VOYAGE EN CHINE, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.
Tony Pastor's Opera House, No. 39 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.
New York Stadt Theatre, Bowery.—DER VERGESSNER, at 8 P. M.
Olympic Theatre, No. 524 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.
Booth's Theatre, corner of Twenty-third street and sixth avenue.—LITTLE EMMA, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.
Theatre Comique, No. 514 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.
Hooley's Opera House, Brooklyn.—GLORIA MINSTRELS.
Roman Hippodrome, Twenty-sixth street and Fourth avenue.—Afternoon and evening, at 2 and 8.
Fifth Avenue Theatre, Twenty-eighth street and Broadway.—MERCHANT OF VENICE, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.
Bryant's Opera House, West Twenty-third street, near Sixth avenue.—NEGRO MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10 P. M.
Germania Theatre, Fourteenth street.—MAIN LEOPOLD, at 8 P. M.
Niblo's Broadway.—UNCLE TOM'S CABIN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.
Brooklyn Theatre, Washington street.—THE COLLEEN BAWN, at 8 P. M.
M. W. J. Florence.

TRIPLE SHEET.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1875.

From our reports this morning the probabilities are that the weather to-day will be clear and decidedly cold.

WALL STREET YESTERDAY.—Stocks were fluctuating and irregular. Gold remains firm at 112 1/2 a 112 3/4. Foreign exchange was strong. Money on call was abundantly offered at 2 1/2 a 3 per cent.

THE CARLISTS are said to have sustained several severe defeats in the North of Spain. The army officers have no longer any need to temporize with the adherents of the Pretender, and we would not be much surprised if they should at last discover a means of putting an end to the Carlist insurrection.

CHARITY.—An effort is being made to bring about such an organization of the various city charities giving outdoor relief as may enable the societies to promptly aid deserving persons, and, at the same time, afford protection against imposition. It is important that the necessary organization should be perfected with the least possible delay, as we are already in the midst of winter, with everything pointing to a season of distress and suffering for the unemployed poor.

WE WONDER WHY IT is that the Fourth Avenue Railroad Company cannot afford to place a little straw in their street cars for the comfort of their passengers. Straw is not a very expensive article; its absence from the Fourth Avenue cars cannot therefore be accounted for on the score of economy. We must conclude that the directors of the road are indifferent to the comfort of the public. We have some hopes that a day may come when great corporations, upon whom the public have conferred large privileges, may be compelled to give some return for their valuable franchises. At present they look on the public much as miners look on a placer—as something to be exploited for their own sole benefit.

THE CHURCH QUESTION IN ENGLAND.—Rev. John Henry Newman, D.D., the venerable and we may perhaps say the illustrious Catholic writer of England, whose genius as an author ranks him with the most gifted of living men, has contributed to the literature of the Gladstone-Manning controversy. The substance of his letter is sent to us by cable from London. Dr. Newman denies the assertion that he ever contemplated joining the Old Catholic Dollinger party—which, by the way, no one at all familiar with Dr. Newman's opinions would be inclined to believe. Dr. Newman also replies to the construction placed by Mr. Gladstone upon the Papeal doctrine of infallibility, and strengthens it by a quotation from the opinions of the First Napoleon, as recorded by the historian Alison.

President Grant's Message of Apology.

We lay before our readers this morning the Message of the President in reply to the inquiry of the Senate. It is an ingenious and able document, bearing marks of extreme care in its preparation. It is a very different Message from the one which the public expected in view of the strong indorsement sent to General Sheridan by the Secretary of War, in which it was stated that the President and "all of us," meaning the whole Cabinet, heartily approved of all that was done on the 4th of January by the federal troops stationed at New Orleans. Instead of defending and justifying those proceedings the President makes an elaborate apology, wherein he shifts the blame, so far as blame can be imputed, upon Governor Kellogg. This is a different Message from the one first prepared, and which intelligent observers in Washington and elsewhere believed would have been sent to Congress if two or three leading members of the Cabinet had not protested and supported their protest by a determination to resign if their views were overruled. The President could not afford a Cabinet explosion in such a crisis as the present, and least of all could he have afforded the indignant retirement of the particular members who have the strongest hold on public confidence—Messrs. Fish and Bristow.

This Message is quite a different document from the one originally prepared, which would have led to the immediate resignation of the few members of the Cabinet to whom the country concedes the title of statesmen. We are glad that President Grant has been constrained to recast the Message, abandon his first positions and exchange a tone of defiance for one of apology. If the Message as first drafted was in the spirit of Secretary Belknap's unqualified indorsement by "all of us," if it undertook to parry democratic criticism by recalling the action of President Pierce in dispersing the Topeka Legislature in Kansas, it is fortunate for General Grant that he was restrained from offering such untenable arguments. President Pierce's action in that case is not precedent as a precedent, because Kansas was not at that time a State, but a Territory, and Territorial governments, being the mere creatures of the federal authority, permit a degree of interference which is not permissible in the government of a State. The public indignation aroused on that occasion precludes the republican party and a republican President from pleading that precedent in justification; for, if indignation was well founded when only a Territorial Legislature was interfered with, it has an infinitely stronger justification when the federal army undertakes to control the Legislature of a State in the Union. The federal government has supreme authority over the Territories, but it has no shadow of right to determine the validity of a State Legislature. The Message, as finally revised, is not a defence, but an apology, and we will fairly restate the positions on which his apology is made to rest.

First, the President pleads total ignorance of, and, therefore, denies specific responsibility for, the military proceedings of January 4. "I did not know," he says, "that any such thing was anticipated, and no orders or suggestions were ever given to any military officer in that State prior to the occurrence." If he thought it safe to assume responsibility for those proceedings there would be no necessity for this kind of hedging. The refractory members of his Cabinet have evidently convinced him that he must wash his hands of any direct responsibility for proceeding in such flagrant violation of law.

Secondly, the President explicitly shifts the responsibility to the shoulders of Governor Kellogg, and is constrained to express his doubts of the legality of Kellogg's action. "Whether it was wrong," the President says, "for the Governor, at the request of a majority of the members returned as elected to the House, to defeat these lawless and revolutionary proceedings is perhaps a debatable question." The President thereby admits that it is not clear that Kellogg had any right to interpose. But if he had no such right it logically follows that the federal army could not be lawfully used to enforce his unwarranted assumption of authority.

Thirdly, President Grant has been constrained by the dissenting members of his Cabinet to concede and indorse all the positions of law on which the opposition rests. He says, among other things of the same purport, that "each branch of a legislative assembly is the judge of the election and qualifications of its own members," and he admits that even the Governor has no right to interfere unless a riotous and tumultuous mob prevents the regular action of the Legislature, when, he thinks, "it might become the duty of the State Executive to interpose, if requested by a majority of the members elect." The President hereby virtually abandons his defence of Kellogg by admitting that it is a "debatable question" whether Kellogg had a right to interfere in any case, and that, if he had, nothing could justify him but the request of "a majority of the members elect." It is a fact admitting of no question that the fifty-two members who signed the application to Kellogg were less than a majority, and, if this be conceded, Kellogg was wrong by the President's own admissions.

Fourthly, the President has been compelled to admit and declare that "any military interference by the officers and troops of the United States with the organization of a State Legislature or any of its proceedings is repugnant to our ideas of government." The President goes on to say, "I can conceive of no case not involving rebellion or insurrection where such interference by the authority of the general government ought to be permitted or can be justified." There was neither rebellion nor insurrection in Louisiana on the 4th of January, and consequently there was no justification, by the President's own admissions, for federal interference with the Legislature of the State.

Fifthly, the President exonerates his friend, General Sheridan, from all responsibility for the proceedings of January 4. He asserts that Sheridan did not assume command until nine o'clock in the evening of the day on which the five sitting members were dragged from their places; but this effort to shield Sheridan is an implied confession that the acts in which it is deemed important to know that he had no complicity are indefensible. If they were right it would

be absurd for the President to disclaim responsibility for himself by asserting that he knew nothing of them until he saw the newspapers the next morning, and to disclaim all responsibility for Sheridan on the ground that he was not in command until several hours after the military interference.

Sixthly, the President's apology for the officers of the army is a virtual admission that they mistook their duty. "The army," he says, "is not composed of lawyers, capable of judging, at a moment's notice, of just how far they can go in the maintenance of law and order." If this means anything it is a confession that the officers of the army overstepped the limits of legal authority. It would be irrelevant to plead their ignorance of law as an excuse for their action if the President believes they have done nothing which the law condemns.

It is clear that President Grant has retreated from the position he assumed when he sanctioned Secretary Belknap's "all of us" despatch, and the country is to be congratulated on his adoption of more sober and defensible opinions. Whether the change be due to the protests of certain members of his Cabinet or to the widespread expressions of public indignation it is fortunate for the President that he has reconsidered his first determination and been induced to change his mistaken policy. He falls back upon alleged wrongs and outrages alleged to have been perpetrated against the negro voters of Louisiana. It would, perhaps, be unkind to deprive him of this refuge or this subterfuge; but if it be true that Mr. Foster, of the Congressional committee which conducted its investigation at New Orleans, had a long interview with the President on Saturday evening and attempted to disabuse him of his false impressions, there is no good excuse for those parts of the Message which charge the Louisiana conservatives with every kind of atrocities. But even the President does not maintain that these alleged atrocities are a justification for military interference with a State Legislature. He tries to clear himself on the ground that he knew nothing of the transactions until the next day; he tries to clear Sheridan on the ground that he did not assume command until several hours after the interference with the Legislature had taken place; he apologizes for the army on the ground of its ignorance of law, and he attempts to shift the whole responsibility to the shoulders of Governor Kellogg, whose right to interfere he admits to be "debatable." We rejoice that the President has felt constrained to publicly wash his hands, in the face of the country, of this unwarrantable transaction.

It is but simple justice to the President to concede the truth of his statement that he has repeatedly asked Congress to direct his action in this unfortunate Louisiana case and relieve him of a painful responsibility. "I have heretofore urged the case of Louisiana upon the attention of Congress," the President says, "and I cannot but think that its inaction has produced great evil; and he closes the Message by earnestly asking "that such action be taken by Congress as to leave my duties perfectly clear in dealing with the affairs of Louisiana." We hope that Congress will at last comply with this perfectly reasonable request.

The Enforcement Act.

The President, in his apologetic Message to the Senate, does not pretend that the employment of federal troops in Louisiana, on the occasion which has created so much excitement, is justified by the Enforcement act, but only by the law for protecting the government of a State from subversion by domestic violence. The advisers who assisted him in the preparation of his Message had a clear perception of the weak point in his case, and have exerted their ingenuity to support it. The only apology for permitting federal troops to be employed in Louisiana at all is found in the President's favorable response to Governor Kellogg's application in September. When that insurrection was suppressed the authority of the President was exhausted, and he could not employ the army in Louisiana again without a new application from the State authorities. The Message parries this point by contending that the September insurrection was never suppressed, and has continued up to the present time. "It cannot be claimed," says the President, "that the insurgents have surrendered to the State authorities the arms belonging to the State, so that they have in any sense disarmed. On the contrary, it is known that the same armed organizations that existed on the 14th of September, in opposition to the recognized State government, still retain their organization, equipments and commanders, and can be called out at any hour to resist the State government." It is clear from this language of the Message that the President justifies the continued use of federal troops to sustain the Kellogg government only on the ground of the September application under the old law of 1795, which he tries to make applicable by asserting that the September insurrection has never been suppressed. There is a provision in the Enforcement law passed in 1871 which needs but little stretching to make it cover almost any kind of military interference in a State by federal authority, but we are glad that the President has not pleaded this law in justification of anything beyond his stationing troops in various parts of the State to prevent intimidation in the election. But the Enforcement act is susceptible of a construction which would justify any amount of interference in a State, and this feature of it ought to be repealed as subversive of liberty.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.—The statement of the condition of our school system made by the Chairman of the new Board of Education may be accepted as satisfactory. There was an increase, a slight one, it is true, in the school attendance last year, and as the new truancy laws go into operation at once we may look for a decided improvement in this direction during the year. Mr. Neilson in his address touched upon the important question of the elimination of merely ornamental studies from the primary course of instruction. There is a general complaint that too much is expected of the children and that not enough attention is paid to laying the foundations of knowledge solidly. If the present high pressure system is found to lead to superficiality the sooner it is abandoned the better. This question will, we are certain, receive the careful attention

of the gentlemen of the Board, and if changes be found desirable they will be carried out with intelligence and firmness.

The Management of the City Finances.

Mr. William E. Warren, who has had many years' experience as Deputy City Comptroller under Mr. Hawes and Mr. Brennan, calls attention to the fact that we have now in the Sinking Fund a surplus over and above the amount of indebtedness chargeable to that fund. He asks why not pay off at once and cancel that portion of the debt, or so much of it as the holders may be willing to surrender, and apply the residue of the amount in purchasing and withdrawing any other city stocks or bonds? And he suggests that if any legislation is required in this matter the Common Council should ask for it.

The authority to use the money accumulated in the Sinking Fund in such a manner as will most effectually benefit the city and relieve the taxpayers is fully given by law. Section 102 of the charter of 1873 provides as follows: "It shall be lawful for the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund of the city of New York in their discretion, and they are hereby empowered in such discretion, to cancel any portion of the indebtedness of the said city held by them which is by law redeemable from the Sinking Fund, and to sell any stocks and bonds which they may hold that are not payable from said fund, and with the proceeds of such sale of stocks and bonds to buy any other stocks and bonds which are payable from said stocks." The wisdom of Mr. Warren's suggestion will be conceded. The amount of city debt redeemable from the Sinking Fund is a trifle under twenty-three million dollars. The total sum in the Sinking Fund on December 31 last is said to have been between twenty-six and twenty-seven million dollars, thus showing that there has accumulated in the Sinking Fund more than three millions and a half of money over and above the whole amount of debt redeemable from that fund. We are asked every year to raise a large sum by taxation for interest on the city's stocks and bonds held by the Sinking Fund. We believe the Comptroller has never condescended to explain how much the gross amount of interest required is, and what sum is set off by the receipts of the Sinking Fund for the payment of interest on the city debt. This whole interest question is among the mysteries of the Finance Department demanding investigation. But why should we pay any interest at all on twenty-three million dollars of debt when we have the means of paying the debt at once and of stopping the interest? The Sinking Fund holds probably two-thirds of the bonds and stock redeemable by itself. Why should they not be wiped out and taken from the city debt? Why should not the surplus then left be used to purchase such bonds of the same character as their holders might be willing to sell, in order that they also might be cancelled? Why should not the three millions and a half excess over and above the whole debt payable from the Sinking Fund be in like manner used to buy up and cancel other interest bearing bonds?

The answer to all these questions is, because we have a narrow-minded, incompetent person at the head of the Finance Department, who occupies his time in paltry intrigues and in impertinent and illegal interference with the patronage of other departments of the city government instead of studying the broad interests of the taxpayers and of the city. A competent and clear-headed financier would rid the city at once of its Sinking Fund debt, thus saving more than one million and a half dollars in interest every year. He would then seek to turn all the streams of income into the general fund, and to husband and increase the city revenues from all sources, in order to lighten every year the heavy burden of taxation. Such a financial policy would lift a mountain's weight from the groaning real estate interests and would make land in New York a desirable investment once again. But Comptroller Green is a charlatan, who wraps himself up in his own impudence and ignorance, and follows his own whims and vagaries, holding himself responsible to no authority. With a proper person at the head of the city finances we should soon find our debt decreasing and our taxation lightened.

What Next—And Next?

President Grant having virtually conceded in his Message that the late military interference with the Louisiana Legislature has no legal justification, apologizing for it on the ground that soldiers are not lawyers, and that neither he nor General Sheridan was then in immediate direction of the federal troops, the question arises as to what steps should be taken to undo the wrong. If De Trobriand, who was ignorant of the law, blindly put himself under the direction of Kellogg, whose authority to interfere is "debatable," and doubtless untenable, and a Legislature was upset and dispersed by that illegal interference, what is the proper method of redress? If the federal army had not exceeded their authority the organization under Speaker Wiltz would have been maintained and the House have remained in control of the conservatives. Whether that state of things ought to be restored or some other method of reparation adopted is a question which we submit to public consideration, not caring to discuss it or assume any position upon it at this stage of the controversy. If it be admitted that the army had no right to interfere, it would seem to follow that things should be restored to the state in which they existed at the time of the interference. But it may be maintained, on the other hand, that the army has no more right to intervene to redress its wrongs than it originally had to intervene to commit them.

Tweed.

There has been an ingenious argument before the General Term of the Supreme Court on the question of the release of Tweed. Mr. Field made an able speech and presented his case with consummate ability. But there is one point he overlooked, and this is the proffer to the city treasury of the money which Tweed and his associates stole from it. We learn from Mayor Wickham's letter to Corporation Counsel Delafield Smith that some time ago a proposition was made to the city to pay three millions of dollars as an indemnity from further prosecution. Now, why does not Mr. Field come

into Court with a check for three millions of dollars on account, and then trust to the generous sense of the American people for mercy to his client? This would go far toward strengthening his case. Mr. Tweed is the one person in this State who should understand that mercy to him will come after justice, and that justice means complete restitution and confession. It is intimated that Tweed has squandered a large part of his fortune on his lawyers. We do not know how true this statement may be, but if it is a fact it somewhat changes the aspect of the case. Of course, if he has not got the money he cannot pay it back. The statement of this fact would not be without value in determining public opinion.

Are the Enforcement Acts Constitutional?

The laws of Congress, commonly called Enforcement acts, give to the officers of the federal government authority to arrest, try and punish citizens for offences or crimes of which, until those acts were passed, only the local or State authorities were supposed to have cognizance—such as breaches of the peace and injuries of different kinds to individuals, contrary to the local laws of the State where the offence was charged.

Under these acts of Congress federal marshals and their subordinates in some of the Southern States act as a federal police, and with the power to summon to their aid federal troops and to bring those whom they choose to arrest for trial into federal courts. Under these same acts of Congress the President's interference in elections has taken place, and he appears to have held himself justified or perhaps bound to interpose the federal arm on all occasions when his partisans demanded it of him.

These acts were adopted by Congress with the purpose of "enforcing" the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth constitutional amendments. At the time of their adoption the country was in disorder, the majority in Congress was not inclined to pay very strict regard to constitutional limitations, and the country, alarmed and irritated at the disorders in the Southern States, was ready to support any measures of repression, no matter how harsh or of what doubtful constitutionality. President Grant spoke the people's mind when he said, "Let us have peace," and it was generally believed that it needed the strong arm of the federal government to preserve peace.

Nevertheless, persons who had not lost their self-possession, and among them many of the ablest lawyers of the country, believed these acts to be unconstitutional, and this not only because they violated the general principles of the constitution, but because, as was held, they were not authorized or justified by the terms of the very amendments they were intended to carry into effect. Nor can any one who carefully reads these amendments continue in doubt on the question. The thirteenth amendment simply prohibits slavery, and its effect is to make void any State law which should attempt to re-establish this condition. The fourteenth amendment (so far as it concerns this law) declares all persons born or naturalized in the United States to be citizens, not only of the United States, but of the State in which they live, and forbids any State to abridge the privileges or immunities of any of its citizens, or to deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, or deny to any person equal protection of the laws. The fifteenth amendment forbids the United States and the States to deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race, color or previous condition.

All three of the amendments deal only with States, refer only and clearly to State laws, and to the acts of State authorities under State laws, and do not provide or authorize, in any way, that the federal power shall interfere—otherwise than it was previously allowed to interfere to assert its own rights—in the local affairs of the States. The spirit of these amendments is consonant with the general spirit of the constitution in this particular; and they do not pretend to increase the scope of the power or authority of the federal government in the least. Their adoption did not, therefore, in any way change the form or nature of our government; but left it precisely where it was before, except that these amendments made the States powerless to re-establish slavery, or to deny equal rights, civil and political, to all their people.

We make these statements with the more confidence because of a recent decision of Mr. Justice Bradley, of the Supreme Court, given in the Grant parish case, in the Louisiana Circuit Court. In this case four citizens of Louisiana were indicted under the Enforcement act, charged with having feloniously banded together to intimidate certain persons of African descent, to deprive them of certain constitutional rights specified, the right to peaceably assemble, to bear arms, to be protected in life, liberty, &c., to vote, &c. The persons charged with these offences were brought, not before a State court, but directly before the United States Court, being arrested by United States officers. There was no pretence that the State laws denied or deprived them of any of the specified rights.

Mr. Justice Bradley, in his opinion on a motion to arrest judgment, very elaborately discusses the terms of the amendment and of the Enforcement act, and concludes that the act is unconstitutional, that the amendment gives no such power to Congress as is assumed in passing the law, and that, practically, the Enforcement act is null and void. Here is his language:—"If these views are correct there can be no constitutional legislation of Congress for directly enforcing the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, by original proceedings in the Courts of the United States, where the only constitutional guarantee of such privileges and immunities is that no State shall pass any law to abridge them, and where the State has passed no law adverse to them, but, on the contrary, has passed laws to sustain and enforce them." The case has been carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, where it will come up for a hearing early in March. If that Court should decide, as one of its members, Mr. Justice Bradley, has already decided, that the Enforcement act is unconstitutional, a great step will be taken toward the pacification of the Southern States; for almost the whole of the federal interference in those States has been under this act, and it

must, if this is pronounced unconstitutional, at once cease.

There is here a hope of peace and good government, even under the administration of President Grant, for he will be compelled, in that event, to take his heavy hand from the States and restore them to self-government, as the federal constitution provides.

Cuba.

From Havana we learn the important news that the insurgents are moving steadily westward. Spanish accounts admit that a force of a thousand men have forced their way across the trocha which was erected to confine the insurgents to the Central and Eastern departments, and are now on the way to join their comrades in the Cinco Villas district. We are informed that they will be followed and annihilated, but as the Spaniards have been engaged killing the Cuban insurgents—on paper—for the last six years, we may be pardoned if we do not accord implicit faith to the assurances of the authorities. It is evident that the Cubans are resolved to begin their long contemplated campaign against the sugar estates of the Western Department. We may expect news of burning plantations and wholesale destruction of property unless the Spaniards succeed in driving the insurgents once more across the trocha or completely dispersing them. It is to be regretted that the war for independence should involve the destruction of so much valuable property; but as the Spanish party did not hesitate to destroy the property of the Cubans they have no right to complain of the retaliatory measures which may be adopted against them. If the insurgents succeed in passing through the Cinco Villas and falling on the rich plantations of the Western Department we may expect a renewal of the scenes of the St. Domingo revolt.

PERSONAL INTELLIGENCE.

- Mr. Amasa Sprague, of Providence, is registered at the Hoffman House.
Rev. Dr. N. K. Loring, of Boston, is residing at the Westminster Hotel.
Ada Gray has been playing "Camille" with some success at New Orleans.
A recent dinner of physicians in France they were very jolly and toasted—disease!
Paris complains that there were not buyers enough in the shops at Christmas time.
Muriel's picture was saved by the newspapers, which spread abroad the news of the robbery.
Ex-Governor Theodore P. Randolph, of New Jersey, has apartments at the New York Hotel.
Mr. W. Brandt Storer, Russian Vice Consul at Boston, is sojourning at the Westminster Hotel.
Mrs. Rousby continues to draw good houses at the Lyceum. She has settled down into a popular favorite.
Mr. Robert E. Carr, President of the Kansas Pacific Railway Company, has arrived at the Hoffman House.
"Undine" was produced at Ford's Opera House with a magnificence never before equalled on the Washington stage.
Mr. Dion Boucicault has been suffering from severe indisposition for some days; but, with his usual courage, refuses to give up.
It appears, then, by Beecher's letter of May 31, 1873, that the great pastor did "step down and out," so far as personally lay in his power.
Mr. Isaac Hincley, President of the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad Company, yesterday arrived at the St. Nicolas Hotel.
If the Republicans had not Grant for their shoulders in the Louisiana row they might have made a fight for us; but, fortunately for the democrats, he "sticks."
It is proposed in England to soothe the kicking disposition of the British husband by the cat-nine-tails, which was found so effective against garrulous.
"Lon esters," nearly all editors and artists, assembled at a Paris restaurant to try the meat of the monarch of beasts—the steaks were sent from Africa, but were not greatly liked.
Mr. Girardin appears to be the first public man in Paris to discover that the proceedings of the government against the Bonapartists committee would practically deprive the people of the right to organize themselves in political parties.
At Trevous, in France, a farmer's boy killed two young owls in a nest near the house, and the old owl watched around for several nights, till on the fifth night an old male owl struck the same boy in the face and put one of his talons in the boy's left eye.
The negro melodies of the South find fitting interpreters in Colletier's Georgian Minstrels, now performing at Hooley's Opera House, Brooklyn. These singers are real negroes, and their songs and their humor are genuine, and come of the black man's intellect.
There was a tremendous flourish of trumpets over Sardou's tragedy "La Haine," and it was a great success; but on the twenty-fifth night the receipts were insufficient to pay the expenses of the house and it was withdrawn, to be succeeded by "Orpheus aux Enfers."
The report put into circulation that Mr. James W. Morrissey, the popular treasurer of the Fifth Avenue Theatre, was about to sever his connection with that house is without foundation. Mr. Morrissey, after a short vacation, has resumed his duty with characteristic energy.
Charicari recently had a conversation with a physician on the effects of the Paris siege, which the latter especially regretted because it had killed off in a short time thousands of feeble persons, who would have otherwise lingered through years, to the great profit of the doctors.
Some of the Boston papers are discussing the advisability of American audiences learning to hiss in the theatre. The revival of hissing is recommended. Every one interested in the progress of dramatic art will approve of the recommendation. It is only in free America that the public can be bullied by managers out of their right to express their feelings of dissent.
December 19, in the evening, a young woman had a quarrel with a man—apparently a love quarrel—in a room on the third floor of a house in the Boulevard Moutonmontant. Made furious by the quarrel she threw open the window and jumped out. There was a hard wind blowing at the time and this, making a balloon of her skirts, sustained her weight so far as to let her gently down into the deep snow, and she called a cab and drove away.
In Japan public expenses are being reduced in various ways. The Mikado and members of the Imperial family have renounced part of their incomes. Numerous employes have requested a reduction of their salaries, and even scholars in the national academies have petitioned that the amount allowed for their education be temporarily reduced. As the Japanese have a great fancy for taking Western ideas they will eventually get over notions of this sort.
One day, during the conflict between Bismarck and the Chamber in 1864, Herr Hilmerding, the actor, was present at the debates. One of the members was violently attacking the Minister, who was sitting in a small room adjoining, reserved for the members of the Cabinet. Suddenly Bismarck had opened the door, and, putting on his head, observed in a contemptuous tone:—"The honorable gentleman need not speak so loud; we can hear him quite well in here." On the following evening Hilmerding was in the theatre, and laughed heartily at some satirical verses which were sung by Herr Hilmerding apropos of the incident of the previous day. When the curtain fell the audience loudly applauded, upon which Herr Hilmerding, putting out his head, exclaimed:—"Don't make such a noise, gentlemen; we can hear you quite well in here." This, of course, brought down the house, and Bismarck was so delighted that he sent for Herr Hilmerding to congratulate him.