

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT, PROPRIETOR.

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.

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

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

Letters and packages should be properly sealed. Rejected communications will not be returned.

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. 34

AMUSEMENTS TO-NIGHT.

- GERMANIA THEATRE. Fourteenth street.—DER GRUBBENSCHWUM, at 8 P. M.; close at 10 P. M.
NIBLO'S. Broadway.—TOM AND JERRY, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:45 P. M.
SAN FRANCISCO MINSTRELS. Broadway, corner of Twenty-ninth street.—NEGRO MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.; close at 10 P. M.
ROBINSON HALL. Sixteenth street.—MRS. CARL, at 8 P. M.; close at 10 P. M.
GLOBE THEATRE. Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:00 P. M.
WALLACK'S THEATRE. Broadway.—THE SHAGBIRRAUN, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:30 P. M.
BROOKLYN THEATRE. Washington street.—LITTLE EMILY, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:30 P. M.
ACADEMY OF DESIGN. Corner of Twenty-third street and Fourth avenue.—EXHIBITION OF WATER COLOR PAINTINGS. Open from 9 A. M. to 10 P. M.
WOOD'S MUSEUM. Broadway, corner of Thirtieth street.—WITCHES OF NEW YORK, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:45 P. M.
METROPOLITAN THEATRE. No. 508 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:30 P. M.
NEW YORK STADT THEATRE. Bowery.—EIN STAATSGEMEINEN, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:45 P. M.
OLYMPIA THEATRE. No. 624 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:45 P. M.
THEATRE COMIQUE. No. 514 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:45 P. M.
BROOKLYN PARK THEATRE. COLONEL SINN'S VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:45 P. M.
ROMAN HIPPODROME. Twenty-sixth street and Fourth avenue.—Afternoon and evening, at 2 and 5.
TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE. No. 20 Bowery.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:45 P. M.
FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE. Twenty-eighth street and Broadway.—WOMEN OF THE DAY, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:30 P. M.
ACADEMY OF MUSIC. Fourteenth street.—English Opera.—MIGNON, at 8 P. M., M. M. Kellough.
LYCEUM THEATRE. Fourth street.—AS TOD LIKE 17, at 8 P. M.; close at 10:45 P. M.
BRYANT'S OPERA HOUSE. West Twenty-third street, near Sixth avenue.—NEGRO MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.; close at 10 P. M. Dan Bryant.

TRIPLE SHEET.

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1875.

From our reports this morning the probabilities are that the weather to-day will be clearing, with rain or snow.

WALL STREET YESTERDAY.—Stocks were higher and dealings large. Money remains at two and three per cent on call loans. Foreign exchange is steady. Gold was feverish and advanced to 114.

THE REV. FATHER P. J. DEALY lectured last night before the Historical Society upon "The First Catholic Mission in New York," and his instructive discourse will be found in our columns.

THE SUICIDE OF THE EMPRESS OF CHINA is reported by cable, and if true shows an extraordinary devotion to her late husband. It is also said that a child of three years has been proclaimed Emperor, under the regency of the Empress Mother.

THE FRENCH ASSEMBLY yesterday passed M. Wallon's bill giving the President, without concurrence with the proposed Senate, power to dissolve the Assembly. The majority of two hundred and nine shows that the deadlock is broken, and that progress is to be expected now in the work of forming a constitutional government.

MR. F. W. SEWARD has already begun his services by presenting in the Assembly a bill providing for the paving of Fifth avenue. It is supported by a petition of many of our leading citizens and property-holders, and we hope it will have a rapid transit through both houses.

THE REVOLUTION IN VENEZUELA is not annihilated. It is as solid as ever. The interest in South American revolutions is increasing, as since New Orleans, Vicksburg and Harrisburg, not to forget Washington, we naturally look to South America to know what we may expect at home.

THE TINTINABULATION of the silver bells is once more a familiar sound, and our account of the sleighing in the Park and on the avenues will be found lively reading. This is a winter in which "it the red slayer thinks he slays" he is not mistaken. Mr. Emerson notwithstanding to the contrary.

THE COMMISSIONERS OF ACCOUNTS, under the directions of the Mayor, are engaged in an examination of the Finance Department. It is to be hoped that their investigation will be thorough. It is essential that they should carefully scrutinize all the facts connected with the issue, redemption and renewal of assessment bonds, the collection of assessments and arrears, the alterations of assessment rolls, and the use that has been made of the moneys received from such collections. It is also important that they should ascertain whether there have been any deficiencies in the annual tax collections, and, if so, how they have been met, and whether a deficit in the public treasury now exists.

A Tumultuous Day in the House—The Right of Debate and the Rights of the Minority.

Yesterday's session of the House of Representatives was the most contentious and exciting that has occurred since the opening of the Presidency of Andrew Johnson. It was indeed more remarkable than anything that occurred even on that memorable occasion; and we should have to go back to the passionate parliamentary tactics in the height of the Kansas-Nebraska struggle to find a parallel. The strenuous filibustering last week, which kept the House in continuous session for two successive nights and a great part of three consecutive days, without rest or sleep, was very resolute and determined, but at the same time exceedingly dull and business-like. Neither side lost its temper or its self-possession, and the incessant, wearying roll calls to take the yeas and nays on constantly repeated dilatory motions proceeded with a heavy monotony which roused no feeling, inflamed no passions, called forth no angry speeches, provoked no sharp thrusts or venomous retorts, and produced no dramatic effect. But the scenes yesterday exhibited a complete change of humor. Both sides were fiercely belligerent, and the reciprocation of invective accusations kept the House at a white heat and caused it to glow like a furnace. As compared with the sullen filibustering of last week, it was like the contrast between a heavy, lowering sky and the vivid play of forked lightning in a violent thunder storm.

The victory was at last won by the republicans, but whether it was worth so fierce a struggle time and events will show. The new rule was adopted, not merely by a bare majority, which would have sufficed to pass it, but by a majority of two-thirds, which proves a loss of opposition strength in the course of the struggle. The democrats were able to keep the House at a deadlock during the contest of last week because their opponents were unable to command a two-thirds majority. They lost that advantage in the struggle yesterday, but they might, perhaps, have retained it if the question before the House had not been varied. The contest, in its final shape, was not for a simple suspension of the rules, but for the adoption of a new rule, which does not leave the minority so absolutely helpless as it would have been if the republicans had won their victory on last week's battle ground. The new rule pays some respect to the rights of debate. While it inhibits more than one dilatory motion on any stage of a bill it does not permit any bill to be passed on the same day on which it is proposed, thus securing to the minority one day for debate, whereas by a simple suspension of the rules debate might have been cut off entirely and the opposition completely gagged by a mere majority vote. Another great difference in the two propositions lies in the fact that the new rule does not apply to bills making an appropriation of money or pledging the credit of the government. It does not fling the door wide open for the corrupt schemes of the lobby, as a mere suspension of the rules would have done. The effect of the new rule is to take out of the hands of the minority their power to block all progress and defeat all legislation by parliamentary filibustering. The new rule is, perhaps, a salutary change, and the democrats, at least, will have no reason to complain of it in the next House, when they will be a majority. The minority have their rights, but those rights have a limit. They have a right to be heard, but not a right to render the majority powerless. They have a right to prevent hasty, inconsiderate legislation, but not to prevent legislation altogether by blocking its wheels and keeping the House in a perpetual wrangle, with no other object than to nullify the will of the majority. No such scenes as our American filibustering are ever witnessed in the British House of Commons or any other legislative body in the world. It is the indefeasible right of the majority to control the action of the House. They are morally bound to allow the minority to express their views in debate, but that is a very different thing from giving the minority power to defeat the transaction of public business or to prevent the passage of any bills which they may dislike by interposing incessant dilatory motions and consuming the time of the House in endless calls for the yeas and nays.

The new rule is very unsatisfactory to General Butler, who desired to gag the minority and deprive them of all influence. Speaker Blaine came down from the chair and made a vigorous speech on the floor in opposition to the views of Butler. The sharp sparring between him and several democratic members in an earlier stage of the proceedings might have justified the suspicion that he was carried too far by the heat of party feeling, if he had not afterwards defined and vindicated his position by his speech on the floor. His railings during the long filibustering struggle last week were impartial and considerate, and if some of his language in the early part of the day yesterday was tinged with unusual acerbity he had a good deal of provocation from the filibustering democrats. But his speech against Butler was a full recognition of the right of the minority to be protected against sudden surprises and to have their arguments listened to. He favors no gag law such as Butler wished to fasten on the minority. But he also asserts, and justly asserts, the right of the majority to control the legislation of the House and to pass such bills as it may deliberately approve. The new rule, carefully guarded and restricted as it is, will be considered as unobjectionable by fair-minded men, and the democrats themselves will not undertake to change it when they come into power in the next House. In that House Mr. Blaine will be the leader of the minority, and he professes his willingness to be bound by the same rule then which is adopted by the majority now. He favors deliberate legislation and fair opportunities for debate; but a power to block the wheels of legislation and bring the business of the House to a perpetual deadlock is what no minority has a right to ask and no majority should be expected to assent to. We are glad this protracted contest is ended, and are not dissatisfied with the result. We approve of the action of Speaker Blaine in giving the

democrats the full advantage which they claimed for the discarded rule, and if the effect has been to expose the absurdity of the rule the democrats must blame themselves for pushing it to such an extreme as to necessitate its repeal. They will lose nothing by the passage of the Civil Rights bill, if it should pass; and if the republicans should pass more objectionable measures for reducing the South to a humiliating military vassalage the democrats will be furnished with new party measures and will be strengthened for a successful appeal to the people. But they will gain nothing by declaiming against the new rule or denouncing Speaker Blaine, who, bating some asperity of language under strong provocation, has borne himself with great fairness and prudence throughout these extraordinary proceedings.

A Sure Way to Obtain Rapid Transit.

The meeting held at the Chamber of Commerce the other day by the merchants and others in favor of rapid transit discussed, among other questions, the probable cost of that improvement. Some gentlemen thought it would cost three millions, others five millions and others again computed the figures at twelve millions. These calculations are important, but we would remind the public that the great question is what it will cost not to have rapid transit. Any sum, however large, expended in a practicable and adequate road, would be economy as compared with the extravagance of continued neglect. The present method of transit has cost the city of New York many millions of dollars already, and every year adds millions more, the loss increasing in more than arithmetical progression. Every day that the metropolis remains without sufficient means of transportation for its vast population makes its burden heavier. So when the cost of building a road is considered by our merchants let them remember the cost of not building one, and be inspired by the contrast to efforts even more determined than those they are now making.

Those prominent citizens who have grown up with New York, whose colossal fortunes are invested here, whose names are identified with the splendor of New York throughout the country, should have an especial interest in this view of the subject. Their wealth is depreciated and their reputations are lessened by the failure of the city to solve this problem of rapid transit. Their personal stake in the question is far greater than that of the ordinary citizen, who has not the power to remedy the evils by which he suffers. But the capitalists of the city not only largely feel and perceive the injury but possess the power to remove it. This constitutes a responsibility which they cannot evade and which we gladly believe they are willing to assume.

There is no doubt that twelve millions of dollars would be sufficient to revolutionize our present methods of transit—methods which contrast with our other achievements as barbarism does with civilization. The street cars, with their diseases and delays and nuisances, disgrace metropolitan New York, with her splendid streets, her pure water, her gas system, her magnificent Park and all her multitudinous achievements, as much as an African nose ring would disgrace the fair face of a Fifth avenue belle. There ought not to be the delay of a week in securing the pledge of twelve or fifteen millions to remove this blot from our American civilization and insure the reform which will begin a new career of prosperity for the city. There are twelve gentlemen who could give New York to-morrow the certainty of rapid transit. The pledge of one million of dollars each from such wealthy citizens as Messrs. Astor, Cooper, Stewart, Vanderbilt, Anderson, Belmont, Duncan, Lenox, Tilden, Goeltz, Brown and Taylor, would liberate our city from its chains, and make their names illustrious in its annals. Contributions so princely and yet so easily to be made from their imperial fortunes would fitly crown their careers and entitle them to gratitude so long as New York remains a city. There is no surer method of obtaining the sum required, and none which would be of greater value to both the receiver and the giver. And it is these gentlemen especially that we respectfully ask to remember, when they estimate the cost of rapid transit, what they have already lost for the want of it, and what they would lose in wealth, gratitude and national honor if they should now neglect the golden opportunity of their lives. They can be, if they choose, the regenerators of the American metropolis.

The Beecher Trial.

Mr. Tilton's testimony yesterday was exceedingly interesting. His story is one intrinsically sorrowful in any shape, but as a personal narrative it becomes absorbing. The principals in the case are like the great personages in a play; no one of them can eclipse the others. From one point of view Mr. Beecher is the central figure, from another it is Mr. Tilton, and probably in the profounder sense he is the real hero of the tragedy. Unquestionably this is the true position if his testimony is accepted, for he is at once the victim and the Nemesis. Mr. Beecher, on the theory of his innocence, is like an angel caught and tortured by malicious creatures, and on the supposition of his guilt, he appears more like the angel of ruin and desolation. From still another standpoint Mrs. Tilton seems the chief sufferer, whether she has wronged Mr. Beecher or is now wronging herself and Mr. Tilton. Yet none of these three friends nor standing "apart, like rocks that have been rent asunder," place Mr. Moulton in a secondary position. He is the ambitious Atlas who attempted to carry a world of scandal, but finding it too heavy, let it fall against his wish, and now stands among the fragments. The direct examination has brought out Mr. Tilton's story in nearly all its details, and those portions ruled out by the Court are known to the public by the statements published. It is a long trial, but the extreme importance which is attached to it is displayed in the increasing interest of the public, not merely in the climax of the tragedy, but in the development of the plot, scene by scene and act by act.

THE LITTLE EMMA SILVER MINE is now being worked in the Court of Common Pleas by Mr. Williams, who brought suit for an alleged libel in connection with that imaginary Bonanzas or Goinanza, for we have got the two fondas places confused. The decision of the Court upon the demurrer is published to-day.

Grant's Resignation—Its Value as a Precedent.

When General Grant came into public life as a politician and candidate for office he made the remarkable declaration that under no circumstances would he have a policy against the will of the people. This was understood as a protest against the irritating features of the administration of President Johnson. Mr. Johnson was in antagonism not so much to the will of the people as to the policy of the dominant party. We question now whether, if at any time during his term of office, there could have been an honest, accurate expression of popular will, free from the interference of federal and State patronage, party discipline, the military governments in the South and the corruption of the suffrage, as in Georgia and Pennsylvania, there would not have been a majority in favor of the much abused policy of a statesman who now, in a spirit of political justice, comes once again into public life, at a time when his successor and antagonist is departing from it. When General Grant meant that he would have no policy at variance with the will of the people his probable idea was that he would always be in accord with republican sentiment. But this was not his generally understood meaning at the time; his declaration rested upon higher grounds. If we could only bring him to accept and respect it now it would be a crowning act of his fame and a supreme benefit to the country.

General Grant's administration is unfortunate because of many of its precedents. Let him do away with the evil resulting from them and give us a new precedent by resignation. We especially refer to his executive misconception of the Presidential office when he entered upon its duties. The powers of the Presidency are prescribed by statute, and are largely colored by tradition and custom. It is a unique office, unlike any other in the world, with many attributes that are kingly and many responsibilities that could not exist in a royal system. Thus, custom has made it almost as absolute as a law that there shall be a cabinet, a representative, responsible body, composed of wise men, leaders of political movements, of ripe experience and purpose and skilled in representative government. There is no constitutional enactment giving the Cabinet a position like that assigned the President and Vice President; but it has an existence, and is as much a part of the government as any of the great departments recognized by the constitution.

No President has admitted his obligation to remove a Cabinet officer at the dictation of a party or of Congress. Presidents have protected their secretaries against such opposition. But whenever it has been seen that the party supporting the administration has been really bent upon a change in the Cabinet the President always found a way of yielding. Lincoln found it when he sent his Secretary of War to Russia; Buchanan found it when he summoned Stanton and Dix into his councils; Jackson found it when he threw out the secretaries whom he believed to be under the influence of Calhoun, and named men more congenial and acquiescent. So that the tradition of the Cabinet responsibility to the party and to the country has become a principle as fixed as if it were in our constitution.

President Grant is the first Executive who has scorned this precedent. From that beginning we have had all our misfortunes. His administration, with its violation of vested rights, its ignoring of the will of the people, its wounding of the national pride, its apathy, callousness, and obstinate indifference to the higher purposes of government, springs as naturally from the President's course in founding his Cabinet as the oak tree springs from the acorn. The President honestly believed that his acceptance of the Presidential office was like a transfer from one command to another, that the Cabinet was his staff, that the republican party composed his battalions, and that his will was to be as absolute as when it erected the batteries at Vicksburg or planned the flanking movements in the Wilderness. Consequently the administration has been drifting further and further from the haven of true republicanism into the fatal and alluring seas of anarchy and Caesarism.

The country has put its seal of condemnation upon the administration. The question therefore arises whether the President cannot be induced to accept this verdict in a personal sense. When he delivered his second inaugural address he took pains to felicitate the country and himself upon the fact that the extraordinary vote which re-elected him was a personal vindication against calumny. If he was sincere in this construction of the electoral votes of 1872 let him apply the principle to the votes of 1874. If he accepted the Presidential office the second time because it represented the condemnation of personal slanders, let him resign the same office, now that the country has declared him, with all his accumulated mistakes, unworthy of future confidence. There is every logical reason why he should resign. We do not see how he could decline it without belying the noblest words and best deeds of his whole career. Its value as a precedent cannot be overestimated. Many wise and grave men fear the effect of General Grant's further administration upon the country unless we can turn the ship of State back from its present course into the one laid down in the charts of our fathers. The surest way to effect this will be to respect the will of the people. He will then show that a republican form of government is really republican in the highest sense—namely, that it respects the people's voice so much that it cannot hold power under any shadow of false pretences. It will bring back the gross and overlaid office of the Presidency to the jurisdiction of public opinion. It will strengthen Congress, a body which for the last ten years has become weaker and weaker before these encroachments. It will give new life to the spirit of democracy. It will show the world that in America it is not possible by any combination of machinery, in the way of universal suffrage or a plebiscite, for a President to become virtually master and king.

These are moral advantages that will inure from the resignation of President Grant. We base them on his own avowal that under no circumstances would he hold power against the will of the people. If he is a sincerely

honest man he will redeem that pledge, and in doing so make a precedent that will strengthen republican institutions, do away with much of the evil that has sprung from his own policy, add a new benefit to the country and a new lustre to his fame.

End of the Deadlock on the Civil Rights Bill.

The extraordinary contest over the Civil Rights bill, on which a week's time has been squandered in parliamentary filibustering and trials of physical endurance, has resulted in such a change of the rules as will preclude such tussles during the remainder of the session. In estimating this remarkable legislative battle we must not overlook the motives of the combatants on each side. Neither party cares a straw for the Civil Rights bill on its merits. If the republicans had thought it wise and desirable they could easily have passed it at the last session, when it came from the Senate. It lay several months on the table of the House, but was not taken up because it was understood that the President would kill it by a veto if it should pass. Had the elections of the year been favorable to the republicans it would not have been heard of again. But overwhelming defeat of their party, and the new complications arising out of the military dispersion of the Louisiana Legislature, have forced the administration to a change of base. The republicans have determined to revive the negro issue and fight the next political battle on that question. The Civil Rights bill is merely a symbol of this policy. It is hoped that it will reunite the negro vote of the South, on which the democratic party were beginning to make inroads, and that it will arouse the decaying zeal of Northern republicans in behalf of negro rights. By setting the outrage mill in operation and flooding the republican press mill with highly colored accounts of White League murders the republican leaders think they may reinvigorate their party.

The filibustering opposition of the democrats proceeding also from mere political calculation. They would gain more than they would lose by the passage of the Civil Rights bill, but they think it necessary to demonstrate to the Southern whites that they mean to stand by them and strenuously fight their battles. The Civil Rights bill will strengthen the democratic party in the South if passed in spite of democratic opposition in Congress. The negroes are too poor to ride in palace cars, attend fashionable theatres and pay for accommodations in first class hotels. Legislation may bestow on them the empty right, but it cannot put money in their pockets to be spent in luxuries above their condition. A civil rights bill might secure to negroes the legal right to bury their dead in Greenwood Cemetery, but it cannot compel the proprietors to sell them lots at a lower price than to white citizens, and people who are fastidious in such matters would have a complete guarantee against negro intrusion in the impecuniosity which places Greenwood lots beyond the reach of negro purchasers. The mere passage of a law conferring upon negroes rights of which they can make no practical use is of little consequence one way or the other. So far as it had any operation it would be for the advantage of the democratic party by shutting up one of the mills for the manufacture of outrages. The reason why hotel keepers and the managers of theatres refuse admission to negroes is the fear of offending their white patrons. But if the law allowed them no liberty their white patrons could not take offence at what was done under compulsion, and political mischief makers would have no motive to supply presuming negroes with money to test a claim which was no longer resisted. The poverty of the negroes would then put the question to sleep and save everybody from annoyance except in rare cases. It is only admission to schools that could occasion disturbance; but if equally good separate schools were provided for both races negro children would generally prefer the colored schools, where they would avoid the jeers and contempt of white schoolmates, which no law could suppress or prevent. The passage of a civil rights bill would close up one source of agitation, and it is for the interest of the democratic party that the negro agitation should die out. We cannot see that the question is worth the vehement struggle and long deadlock of the last week.

The Story of a Mysterious Book.

Nearly half a century since the adventurous American, who is always on his travels, happened to be in London; and while he was there some patriotic Briton gave to the world a more or less accurate account of the life of His Sacred Majesty George IV. Rather, he would have given it to the world, but the ruthless censorship intervened, and he only succeeded in giving it to the few lucky fellows who got an early copy each, or to the man of enterprise who always secures suppressed volumes and smuggled whiskey. Our American was perhaps one of the men of enterprise, for the American abroad has the faculty of seizing rare opportunities. At least one plate of the Vendome Column is now in San Francisco, and was taken out of Paris at a time when the police were in hot pursuit of those treasures, of which, indeed, they recovered all but three or four. But the account of George IV. was more scrupulous than the common run of such things. In those days there were very fierce political passions in the land, and the quasi-republican system that the chartists demanded in 1838 was fermenting and was held to be greatly favored in men's minds by a salutary exposition of the vices of royalty. So the dish was peppered to please the excited palate of the people, and the author could not always be squeamish as to his authorities. It was perhaps because of the brilliancy of his talent that the Chamberlain asserted a well-timed authority. But our American brought his volume home and kept it, conceiving that he had a treasure which would pay interest on the purchase money, and, perhaps, picturing in his mind a perfect panorama of the effects he would some day produce. He waited well—though this is not commonly the forte of our countrymen. At last the "Greville Memoirs" came. In a few short weeks the editor of those memoirs made a fortune—out of what? Why, out of the same sort of material—as our traveller probably saw it—out of a scandalous story about a number of persons of much less consequence than George IV. So it naturally occurred

that perhaps there was by this time a fortune in that volume also. And then came a device to prepare the public mind; to stretch us on the very tenter hooks of curiosity. From this point the acute reader perceives the true story of that erst mysterious volume. Our adventurous traveller put forth this well constructed advertisement:—

23,000 REVELATIONS—A BOOK—Any person having in his possession a certain book, printed in London by T. Jackson, Newgate street, in 1830, with the name of M. Lindell, Paternoster row, on the title page as publisher, against the publication of which the Lord Chancellor issued an injunction, it containing certain statements regarding a member of the Royal Family, will receive the above reward in gold by bringing the book to Mr. G. Gouborne, No. 55 Duke street, London, or to R. H. Brown, No. 569 Broadway, New York, United States. Only one copy is known to be in the United States.

Here is something to tickle the fancy of the gourmands of scandal. Only imagine what dreadful things there must be to make it worth five thousand dollars to any one to suppress these revelations; and consider also the fidelity with which the sleuthhounds of an effete monarchy have hunted the thing down when they have got to the point that there is only one copy in this great Republic which they contemptuously propose to wipe out with five thousand dollars! Cheap Republic they must think it. In the fancy of the adroit projector the rôle of the people was to start from this natural indignation at the attempt to deprive a free people of these moorland revelations. Just as the tools of foreign tyranny were about to consume the mystery in fire some rich publishing house was to step in and with reckless extravagance offer ten or fifteen thousand dollars and give the great disclosures to the public at a dollar a volume, to the extent of fifty thousand volumes, if possible. But some of the joints of this game have apparently fallen out by the way and the pieces do not go together well. Our adventurous traveller has evidently overreached himself. He has certainly attracted attention—a great point, and has contrived his scheme well; but he is not ready with his book, and in the meantime books near enough alike to it to answer every purpose will swarm on the market and reap the harvest of curiosity prepared by his skill. Another of the errors of genius.

WHERE ARE THE THOOTS?—The scene in the Pennsylvania Legislature may be considered disgraceful to that State, but is it not even more disgraceful to the general government? Here was just the situation in which it was bound, by its own precedents, to use the military to preserve order. General Grant turned a sheriff out of his office at Vicksburg by the army. He sent Steinberger with a condemned howitzer in a war vessel of the United States to the Samoan Islands. He sent the troops to expel four members from the Louisiana Assembly. Now, here was a case in which the Sergeant-at-Arms could not expel one man and in which the Legislature of Pennsylvania was resolved into a mob. The President claims the right to disperse mobs and remove the danger of bloodshed, and should consistently order a regiment to Harrisburg. Why does he not do it? Is it possible that a mob of democrats and a mob of republicans deserve different treatment at his hands?

A SUIT AGAINST THE CITY for salaries of certain officers was determined in their favor yesterday. Mr. Green was ordered to pay over twenty-seven thousand dollars, including interest, so that all the city treasury gains by his dispute of a fair claim is a loss. That is all that has been gained by Mr. Green anyhow.

PERSONAL INTELLIGENCE.

- Mr. Asa Packer, of Pennsylvania, is residing at the St. Nicholas Hotel.
Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, of Boston, is registered at the Westminster Hotel.
An edition of "Moliere" in English, translated by Henry Van Lann, is on the tapis.
State Senator Nathaniel Wheeler, of Connecticut, is staying at the Fifth Avenue Hotel.
Don Carlos has a Count Garowski on his staff who hates liberalism, which is but natural.
Wong Chinfoo, an educated Chinese gentleman, is among the latest arrivals at the St. Nicholas Hotel.
Mr. John H. Gear, Speaker of the Iowa House of Representatives, is sojourning at the St. Nicholas Hotel.
Assistant Attorney General E. C. Brainerd arrived from Washington yesterday at the Grand Central Hotel.
Colonel Thomas A. Scott, President of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, has apartments at the Windsor Hotel.
Lyons sent to this country in 1874 \$12,000,000 worth of her fabrics, principally in silks, velvets, ribbons and gloves.
Mr. John King, Jr., First Vice President of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, has arrived at the Fifth Avenue Hotel.
Mr. H. B. Harbut, Vice President of the Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati and Indianapolis Railroad Company, is stopping at the Windsor Hotel.
Yesterday J. P. Robeson, brother of G. M. Robeson, Secretary of the Navy, received a commission appointing him to the position of Assistant Collector of Customs for Camden, N. J.
While the Duke of Edinburgh was waiting for the starting of a train at Paddington terminus his dressing case was mysteriously carried off. Evidently the rogue thought he had another case of jewelry.
The Americans residing at the Hotel Chauvin, Nice, gave a ball in January at which were present Admirals Taylor, Case and Scott, of the United States Navy; also the officers of the Franklin and Congress.
The next Consistory will be held at the Vatican in March. On that occasion nine new cardinals will be appointed, including Archbishop Manning. Another sherdan for Baltimore or St. Louis or some other.
General Sheridan and party left New Orleans yesterday for Vicksburg. It is understood that they will not return to New Orleans. The headquarters of the Department of the Missouri will be re-established at Chicago.
The testimonial fund to be presented to Mr. and Mrs. S. C. Hall, whose "golden wedding" was celebrated recently, is now nearly £2,000. Mr. Tennyson, Lord Houghton and Professor Longfellow are members of the Testimonial Committee.
At a meeting of the League of St. Sebastian, the object of which is the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope, Mr. Owen Lewis, M. P., said his only feeling for Mr. Gladstone was one of "contemptuous pity" for the "degradation into which so great a man had fallen." No one yet knows how Gladstone feels about this.
Once on a time the Pope spoke of four English ex-Ministers—"One," said the Pope, "I like and understand;" "one like, but do not understand;" "one I understand, but do not like;" "one I neither understand nor like." Who the fourth was the Pope charitably forgot; but the second was Gladstone, whom His Holiness by this time, perhaps, understands better than he likes.
In Barcelona is an artist, Zuloaga by name, who takes a steel plate, incrusts it with gold and silver, and with his hammer works out a box such as those of the unique Canto period, now so much sought after. Alton-o-Xie, it is stated, has ordered of this artist a surtout d'habille, decorated with the arms of Spain and of England, when His Majesty means to present to the mess at the Woolwich Artillery School as a souvenir of his sojourn with his late comrades.