

LOUISIANA.

The State at Peace, but Showing the Results of Tyranny.

ARE REPUBLICANS SAFE?

Causes of Disorder and Order.

WHO ARE THE MURDERERS?

NEW ORLEANS, April 28, 1875.

A friend writes me from the North this question, "Are white and black Union men safe in this liberty and property in Louisiana? That is the question which we of the North want to have honestly and seriously answered."

I answer—First, the population of Louisiana is divided politically into republicans, called here radicals, and democrats, called here conservatives. They are all Union men. It is absurd and wicked to keep up the old war animosity by giving to the Southern republicans the special title "Union men."

The republican party in Louisiana contains a great many men who were bitter secessionists, not only during, but after the war. One of the most conspicuous republicans, who came before the Congressional Committee with complaints, and who was proved there and then by documentary evidence to be a rogue, Judge Myers, of Natchitoches, was a Breckenridge democrat before the war.

THE NORTHERN MEN AND NEGROES SAFE? What my correspondents, and no doubt many others, wish to know is whether Northern men and negroes are safe and can get security and justice in Louisiana; and to this I reply, unhesitatingly, "Yes." It is perfectly true, as I said in a previous letter, that between 1865 and 1868 there was a good deal of savage and brutal wrong inflicted on blacks; and in the same period, and probably for a year or two later, Northern men who came here to take possession of the State political, and who at once began a prodigious system of public plunder, were not always safe from the anger and resentment of the native whites.

AN UNLucky PARISH. This parish has become so notorious as the most unquiet in the State that I have taken some pains to ascertain the facts; because there, if anywhere, persecution of Northern men and negroes would be found. Now, then—First, an official report, properly authenticated, of the murders committed in this parish from 1868 to 1875 lies before me. They number forty-one, and of these there were whites murdered by whites, 13; colored murdered by colored, 15; whites by colored, 4; colored by whites, 2; whites by unknown, 3; colored by unknown, 1; colored by officials of justice in serving process, 3; Indian by a white man, 1. Now, somebody may object that the record is not correct, but to that the reply is that the parish has been almost continuously since 1868 under Republican officers, and that the Coroner is a Republican officer, and that the Coroner is a Republican officer, and that the Coroner is a Republican officer.

A PEACEFUL PARISH. I have taken Natchitoches as an example, because it has an especially evil reputation. Contrast with this a parish in which the republicans have given the people an honest and economical government, and where there has been no disturbance. There are but four or five honest returned parishes in the State. I happen to be well informed about one of these, Tensas, like Natchitoches, a cotton planting country, and with a large preponderance of negroes. There has never since 1868 been any disturbance in Tensas, nor any presence of intimidation. Here is the story since 1868—The republicans who came into it from the North happened to be honest and sensible men. Their leader was General Steele, now Assistant Attorney General of the State, and an able man. They per-

son, and, for that matter, every Northern State has a proportion of lawless and ruffianly persons. This class is not numerous, but is composed of idlers, drunkards and braves, who go armed; and when a community is excited they are ready to commit outrages, not only on blacks, but on whites, even on each other. I was touched by the remark of an elderly man from a remote parish. He said—"The State government and the courts and officers it gives us are a lamentation that we have to deal with these ruffianly young men ourselves. I have never since taken my life in my hands, and I regret the death of my wife. She was too cowardly or inefficient to do my duty. We have not had a murderer punished in our parish in five years, except one, and he was pardoned out of the Penitentiary. We live near the Texas line, and desperate men come and go easily. Instead of being abused as disorderly people deserve praise that we have kept as good order as we have, when the Governor has time and again appointed corrupt and inefficient officers, and when, in fact, society has had to be maintained against the abuses and inefficiency of the government by the private effort of the good citizens." This man spoke the truth in a solemn and undeniable fact, that the republican rulers of Louisiana have disorganized society, instead of protecting the good citizen. The only danger to the peace of Louisiana to-day lies in the corruption and inefficiency of her rulers, who call themselves republicans and have thus gained the countenance of the Northern republican party and the support of the federal administration. These men have committed a great crime against the State and against the country, the greatest crime which civilized men can commit; for their marble has struck a blow at the very foundations of society here; they have corrupted the public morals; they have degraded and debauched the negroes, whom they were sent to lead into the exercise of citizenship; and, surveying the story of their misrule, I am constrained to say that their plunder of the State, monstrous as it has been, is at least of their offences, because it is a graver crime to debauch and demoralize a State than to steal its treasure.

CHARLES NORDHOFF. CARRUTH QUILTS JOURNALISM. VALEDICTORY OF AN EDITOR WITH A BULLET IN HIS BRAIN. VINELAND, N. J., May 24, 1875. The following curious announcement is made in the Independent by Mr. Carruth, who was recently shot by Landis. The article is headed "Adios" (adieu); but no one will venture to assert that, notwithstanding the presence of lead so near the vital region, it is loaded with melancholy.

LOUISIANA MURDERS. In the North we have heard so much about murders that I was very glad to get hold of some of the statistics on this subject. The State government, which has almost entirely neglected to punish murderers—being too busy engaged in stealing—has, of course, no such official returns of crime as it ought to possess. I have seen about a dozen returns, chiefly made by county clerks and coroners, from only thirteen parishes, not counting Plaquemine, which I have before given. From 1868 to 1875 there have been in these thirteen parishes 313 murders. Of these ninety-three were of whites by whites, 143 were of colored by colored, twenty-eight were of whites by colored, thirty-two colored by whites, three colored by officials of justice, five colored by persons unknown, seven whites by unknown, five whites by mobs and five colored by mobs. The State has thirty-seven parishes. Most of the thirteen of which I have given returns have a population nearly equally divided between white and black, and I suspect the figures give more than an average number of murders.

COMMISSIONERS OF EMIGRATION. SECRET MEETING—A HOST OF DECAPITATED OFFICIALS. A secret meeting of the Commissioners of Emigration was held at Castle Garden yesterday afternoon. The circumstances of a private session to which representatives of the press had no admission was somewhat unusual. Mayor Wickham and Commissioners Forrest, Lynch, Schack, Starr and Quintard were present. It was determined to make twenty removals from Castle Garden and sixteen from Ward's Island. The salaries of several officials are also to be reduced, saving, it is said, \$107,000 from expenses of Ward's Island and \$13,900 from Castle Garden. It was also decided to continue both the Labor and Information bureaus after the 1st of July.

MUNICIPAL NOTES. It was a dull day at the City Hall yesterday, and, thanks to the rain, the Mayor in the forenoon had but few bothersome visitors, and those who did call in the afternoon had to go away without seeing him, as he was absent attending the meeting of the Commissioners of Emigration. Comptroller Green feels very sore, it is said, over the failure of his attempt to have the Croton Water bill passed by the Legislature, so as to give him the control of the work to be done under it, and that he would have gone to Albany on Saturday to urge Governor Rice to sign a bill that would have given him an unnecessary expense of money had he not received information beforehand that his visit would be of no avail.

THE ONLY SOURCE OF DISORDER. Do not exaggerate when I say that the only cause of disorder in the State lies in the corruption and inefficiency of the State and parish governments. The compromise is accepted by an overwhelming majority of the conservative party in good faith. The people hope for an improvement in the administration, and are willing to give the Governor and the other rulers a fair trial. Even Marshal Packard tells me the State is at peace. It has, as Packard tells

me, and, for that matter, every Northern State has a proportion of lawless and ruffianly persons. This class is not numerous, but is composed of idlers, drunkards and braves, who go armed; and when a community is excited they are ready to commit outrages, not only on blacks, but on whites, even on each other. I was touched by the remark of an elderly man from a remote parish. He said—"The State government and the courts and officers it gives us are a lamentation that we have to deal with these ruffianly young men ourselves. I have never since taken my life in my hands, and I regret the death of my wife. She was too cowardly or inefficient to do my duty. We have not had a murderer punished in our parish in five years, except one, and he was pardoned out of the Penitentiary. We live near the Texas line, and desperate men come and go easily. Instead of being abused as disorderly people deserve praise that we have kept as good order as we have, when the Governor has time and again appointed corrupt and inefficient officers, and when, in fact, society has had to be maintained against the abuses and inefficiency of the government by the private effort of the good citizens." This man spoke the truth in a solemn and undeniable fact, that the republican rulers of Louisiana have disorganized society, instead of protecting the good citizen. The only danger to the peace of Louisiana to-day lies in the corruption and inefficiency of her rulers, who call themselves republicans and have thus gained the countenance of the Northern republican party and the support of the federal administration. These men have committed a great crime against the State and against the country, the greatest crime which civilized men can commit; for their marble has struck a blow at the very foundations of society here; they have corrupted the public morals; they have degraded and debauched the negroes, whom they were sent to lead into the exercise of citizenship; and, surveying the story of their misrule, I am constrained to say that their plunder of the State, monstrous as it has been, is at least of their offences, because it is a graver crime to debauch and demoralize a State than to steal its treasure.

THE COURTS.

Acquittal of Policeman Williamson for Clubbing Campbell.

DIVORCE SUIT EXTRAORDINARY.

A Breach of Promise Case—Its Two Stories and One Moral.

CHARGE OF FORGING A DEED.

There was a lengthy argument yesterday before Judge Lawrence, in Supreme Court, Chambers, on the motion to amend the answer in the suit brought by John B. Green against the city, to recover \$52,000, alleged to be due for laying Croton mains. At the close of the argument Judge Lawrence took the papers.

In the Court of Oyer and Terminer yesterday, before Judge Brady, Charles Nelson, John Sheridan, James Nolan and Henry Sampson pleaded guilty to an attempt at burglary in the third degree. They were remanded for sentence.

The motion for a bill of particulars in the \$20,000 suit against William M. Tweed was to have been argued yesterday in Supreme Court, Chambers. On the case being called Judge Lawrence stated that he considered himself disqualified from hearing the motion on the ground of having been consulted as counsel in regard to the first Monday in June, when another Judge would hold the court.

JUSTIFIABLE POLICE CLUBBING.

There was a large attendance at the Court of Oyer and Terminer yesterday, Judge Brady being on the bench, which evinced great interest in the progress of the trial of Officer Charles W. Williamson, of the Twenty-seventh precinct, charged with having caused the death of James Campbell, on the 12th of April last, by striking him on the head with his club in his efforts to arrest him and take him to the station house. The prisoner, still wearing his police uniform, sat by his counsel, Mr. Wm. R. Howe, wearing the same look of confidence as to the final result as on the opening day of the trial.

The second day's proceedings opened by further witnesses being called. Mr. Howe to prove the reasonableness of the police action, called James W. Husted, ex-captain of the Assembly, who testified that he had known the prisoner since he was a mere boy; he always wore a good character and was a very respectable man. Captain Lawrence, of the Sixth precinct, testified that the prisoner was one of the best officers in his precinct.

James Williamson, the uncle of the prisoner, testified that Williamson's character was that of a very respectable man, who was a very good officer. William Birrell, who witnessed the fight, testified that before the prisoner struck the fatal blow he was talking to the man who was struck, and that he was endeavoring to gain a firm footing and he struck the man on the head with his club. He was here handed the club, and he illustrated the manner in which the blow could have been struck. He said that the blow struck Campbell as to the exact spot where he was hit.

The above closed the testimony, and Mr. Howe then made a bold and forcible address to the jury, in which he endeavored to establish the fact that the prisoner was justified in striking the fatal blow. He said that the prisoner was endeavoring to gain a firm footing and he struck the man on the head with his club. He was here handed the club, and he illustrated the manner in which the blow could have been struck. He said that the blow struck Campbell as to the exact spot where he was hit.

SINGULAR DIVORCE SUIT.

A divorce suit, presenting some rather singular features, came to trial yesterday in Supreme Court, Circuit, before Judge Barrett. George C. Searle charges his wife, Edwina Searle, with adultery with William C. Fingal, and on this ground sues for a divorce. The parties to the suit are still young, having been married but a few years and having one child. They lived with her father, Mr. Jones, at No. 43 Third street. The husband's story is very briefly told. Fingal, he says, engaged rooms at his father-in-law's, and after a sojourn of a few days seduced his wife. His suspicions having been previously aroused, he followed her to the rooms, and there, between his wife and Fingal, he took one Henry C. Fuller with him to the room one evening, and there, in the presence of the parties, he witnessed the act of adultery. This story is denied by Mrs. Searle, who alleges on the one hand that she never saw Fingal, and on the other that the result of a conspiracy concocted between her husband, Fuller and Fingal, who sought to get out of a divorce suit, a crowd speedily allied with the police, who, by the aid of a private investigator, with the intense zeal generally manifested in suits of this peculiarly interesting type. The man Fuller, he says, had a wife, and was engaged in employing the facts set forth in the husband's complaint as stated above. After him was called the witness, Fingal, who, as stated above, in the course of his testimony, his wife's experience in the world, although still a young man, has been known various other cognitions. In his direct testimony he stated that he was employed in operating the stores of the husband and Fuller. He was admitted to a lengthy and scathing cross-examination. The first witness gave a narrative of the facts, which he lived till after the war, when he started on his travels. After spending some time in Philadelphia, where all he did, he says, was to enjoy himself miserably, he came to this city, where, after stopping a short period at the New York Hotel, he took rooms at a boarding house in Bond street, and in this place he became acquainted with a lady, who was married. Her wife died shortly afterward, after which he carried on his life as usual. "After your wife's death did you ever live with any other woman as your wife?" asked the opposing counsel.

A BATCH OF BURGLARIES.

Captain Vanhook, of the Fifteenth precinct, yesterday referred to Superintendent Walling that on the night of the 21st inst. burglars effected an entrance by means of a ladder from the rear into the premises of George M. Miller, No. 35 Fifth avenue, and carried away silverware to the value of \$300. The police have no clue to the robbers.

BREACH OF PROMISE CASE.

The continued fickleness of human nature must continue to beget breach of promise suits. A somewhat singular case, illustrative of this doctrine, was brought to trial yesterday in the Superior Court, before Judge Speer. Miss Sarah Odine, a rather petite and prepossessing looking young lady, is the fair complainant, and James Collins, a man of muscular mould, and whose hair and whiskers have a decidedly rufous hue, is the party complained against. Collins is a baker, his place of business being on the corner of Fourth avenue and Twelfth street, and while he kneads dough, as is to be reasonably inferred from his bustling for \$5,000 damages, needs money. As usual in such cases, the parties are very contradictory. She asserts that after she began to patronize his bakery he began to call upon her at her sister's house, where she was boarding; that he continued such visits till he finally asked her to marry him; that she accepted, she offers as the happy day; that a day was fixed for the wedding; that the marriage was postponed till after the time first fixed, and that she wrote her loving letters, and that he wrote her promises and met and married another woman. His story is that she persuaded him, invited him to her home, and that all the love-making was on her side. "Explain yourself more fully," his counsel asked him, as he was telling his story from the witness stand. "She kept coming to my store and writing me letters."

THE COURTS.

Acquittal of Policeman Williamson for Clubbing Campbell.

DIVORCE SUIT EXTRAORDINARY.

A Breach of Promise Case—Its Two Stories and One Moral.

CHARGE OF FORGING A DEED.

There was a lengthy argument yesterday before Judge Lawrence, in Supreme Court, Chambers, on the motion to amend the answer in the suit brought by John B. Green against the city, to recover \$52,000, alleged to be due for laying Croton mains. At the close of the argument Judge Lawrence took the papers.

In the Court of Oyer and Terminer yesterday, before Judge Brady, Charles Nelson, John Sheridan, James Nolan and Henry Sampson pleaded guilty to an attempt at burglary in the third degree. They were remanded for sentence.

The motion for a bill of particulars in the \$20,000 suit against William M. Tweed was to have been argued yesterday in Supreme Court, Chambers. On the case being called Judge Lawrence stated that he considered himself disqualified from hearing the motion on the ground of having been consulted as counsel in regard to the first Monday in June, when another Judge would hold the court.

JUSTIFIABLE POLICE CLUBBING.

There was a large attendance at the Court of Oyer and Terminer yesterday, Judge Brady being on the bench, which evinced great interest in the progress of the trial of Officer Charles W. Williamson, of the Twenty-seventh precinct, charged with having caused the death of James Campbell, on the 12th of April last, by striking him on the head with his club in his efforts to arrest him and take him to the station house. The prisoner, still wearing his police uniform, sat by his counsel, Mr. Wm. R. Howe, wearing the same look of confidence as to the final result as on the opening day of the trial.

The second day's proceedings opened by further witnesses being called. Mr. Howe to prove the reasonableness of the police action, called James W. Husted, ex-captain of the Assembly, who testified that he had known the prisoner since he was a mere boy; he always wore a good character and was a very respectable man. Captain Lawrence, of the Sixth precinct, testified that the prisoner was one of the best officers in his precinct.

James Williamson, the uncle of the prisoner, testified that Williamson's character was that of a very respectable man, who was a very good officer. William Birrell, who witnessed the fight, testified that before the prisoner struck the fatal blow he was talking to the man who was struck, and that he was endeavoring to gain a firm footing and he struck the man on the head with his club. He was here handed the club, and he illustrated the manner in which the blow could have been struck. He said that the blow struck Campbell as to the exact spot where he was hit.

The above closed the testimony, and Mr. Howe then made a bold and forcible address to the jury, in which he endeavored to establish the fact that the prisoner was justified in striking the fatal blow. He said that the prisoner was endeavoring to gain a firm footing and he struck the man on the head with his club. He was here handed the club, and he illustrated the manner in which the blow could have been struck. He said that the blow struck Campbell as to the exact spot where he was hit.

SINGULAR DIVORCE SUIT.

A divorce suit, presenting some rather singular features, came to trial yesterday in Supreme Court, Circuit, before Judge Barrett. George C. Searle charges his wife, Edwina Searle, with adultery with William C. Fingal, and on this ground sues for a divorce. The parties to the suit are still young, having been married but a few years and having one child. They lived with her father, Mr. Jones, at No. 43 Third street. The husband's story is very briefly told. Fingal, he says, engaged rooms at his father-in-law's, and after a sojourn of a few days seduced his wife. His suspicions having been previously aroused, he followed her to the rooms, and there, between his wife and Fingal, he took one Henry C. Fuller with him to the room one evening, and there, in the presence of the parties, he witnessed the act of adultery. This story is denied by Mrs. Searle, who alleges on the one hand that she never saw Fingal, and on the other that the result of a conspiracy concocted between her husband, Fuller and Fingal, who sought to get out of a divorce suit, a crowd speedily allied with the police, who, by the aid of a private investigator, with the intense zeal generally manifested in suits of this peculiarly interesting type. The man Fuller, he says, had a wife, and was engaged in employing the facts set forth in the husband's complaint as stated above. After him was called the witness, Fingal, who, as stated above, in the course of his testimony, his wife's experience in the world, although still a young man, has been known various other cognitions. In his direct testimony he stated that he was employed in operating the stores of the husband and Fuller. He was admitted to a lengthy and scathing cross-examination. The first witness gave a narrative of the facts, which he lived till after the war, when he started on his travels. After spending some time in Philadelphia, where all he did, he says, was to enjoy himself miserably, he came to this city, where, after stopping a short period at the New York Hotel, he took rooms at a boarding house in Bond street, and in this place he became acquainted with a lady, who was married. Her wife died shortly afterward, after which he carried on his life as usual. "After your wife's death did you ever live with any other woman as your wife?" asked the opposing counsel.

A BATCH OF BURGLARIES.

Captain Vanhook, of the Fifteenth precinct, yesterday referred to Superintendent Walling that on the night of the 21st inst. burglars effected an entrance by means of a ladder from the rear into the premises of George M. Miller, No. 35 Fifth avenue, and carried away silverware to the value of \$300. The police have no clue to the robbers.

BREACH OF PROMISE CASE.

The continued fickleness of human nature must continue to beget breach of promise suits. A somewhat singular case, illustrative of this doctrine, was brought to trial yesterday in the Superior Court, before Judge Speer. Miss Sarah Odine, a rather petite and prepossessing looking young lady, is the fair complainant, and James Collins, a man of muscular mould, and whose hair and whiskers have a decidedly rufous hue, is the party complained against. Collins is a baker, his place of business being on the corner of Fourth avenue and Twelfth street, and while he kneads dough, as is to be reasonably inferred from his bustling for \$5,000 damages, needs money. As usual in such cases, the parties are very contradictory. She asserts that after she began to patronize his bakery he began to call upon her at her sister's house, where she was boarding; that he continued such visits till he finally asked her to marry him; that she accepted, she offers as the happy day; that a day was fixed for the wedding; that the marriage was postponed till after the time first fixed, and that she wrote her loving letters, and that he wrote her promises and met and married another woman. His story is that she persuaded him, invited him to her home, and that all the love-making was on her side. "Explain yourself more fully," his counsel asked him, as he was telling his story from the witness stand. "She kept coming to my store and writing me letters."

TOMBS POLICE COURT.

Before Judge Otterbourg. A CHARGE OF LIBEL. Antonio M. Sotelo, of the Free Lanes, entered bail yesterday. Mr. Rufus K. Andrews became his bondsman, in the sum of \$1,000, to answer a charge of libel made by Peter M. McGuire, of No. 57 Fifth avenue. Mr. Sotelo was arrested on the 22nd inst. by a constable brought to recover damages by the same party for the same alleged libel. An examination was set down to take place on the 29th inst. at the Tombs.

ESSEX MARKET POLICE COURT.

Before Judge Morgan. DEFAULTING TAILOR. Mr. William S. Patton, of the firm of W. G. Browning & Co., clothiers, of No. 346 Broadway, procured a charge of embezzlement against a Nathan Newell, employed by them to make up 100 coats, the materials being furnished him. The suit supplied was worth \$900. He failed to deliver the coats on the 12th inst. and he was admitted having pawned and professed his willingness to restore. Officer Johnson, of the Fairmount precinct, arrested Newell and Judge Morgan held him to \$1,000 bail to answer.

WASHINGTON PLACE POLICE COURT.

Before Judge R. Cox. YOUTHFUL BURGLARS. John Moore and Thomas McCaffrey alias John Coffey, two boys about fifteen years of age, were arraigned yesterday on a charge of burglary, preferred by Mrs. Margaret Gardner, of No. 553 West Thirty-second street. On the night of the 24th inst. the boys entered the premises of Mrs. Gardner and stole a quantity of clothing and other valuables, to the extent of \$90. They were seen by Mrs. Elizabeth Henry, who lives in the same building, and she called the police, who arrested them at the time mentioned. They were arraigned by Officer Murphy, of the Twentieth precinct, and committed by Judge Bixby in \$1,000 each to answer.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS. Part 1—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 2—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 3—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 4—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 5—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 6—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 7—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 8—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 9—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 10—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 11—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 12—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 13—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 14—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 15—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 16—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 17—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 18—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 19—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 20—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 21—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 22—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 23—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 24—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 25—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 26—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 27—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 28—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 29—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 30—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 31—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 32—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 33—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 34—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 35—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 36—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 37—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 38—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 39—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 40—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 41—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 42—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 43—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 44—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 45—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 46—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 47—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 48—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 49—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 50—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 51—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 52—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 53—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 54—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 55—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 56—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 57—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 58—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 59—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 60—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 61—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 62—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 63—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 64—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 65—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 66—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 67—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 68—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 69—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 70—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 71—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 72—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 73—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 74—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 75—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 76—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 77—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 78—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 79—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 80—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 81—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 82—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 83—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 84—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 85—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 86—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 87—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 88—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 89—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 90—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 91—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 92—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 93—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 94—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 95—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 96—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 97—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 98—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 99—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875. Part 100—Adjudged until Monday, June 1, 1875.

DECISIONS.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS. By Judge Lawrence. Smith vs. Hart.—This seems to me to be a reference case. Let an order be entered referring the same to D. C. McLaughlin, Esq., to be reported on or before the 1st of June. McLaughlin vs. Howe.—After the papers in this case were submitted counsel for some of the parties moved for an order that the parties be desired to present affidavits in opposition to the motion. I have waited for the presentation of the affidavits, but they have not been presented. The motion on Wednesday if opposing affidavits are not furnished by that day. The blanks in the thirteen blank of the release must be filled in with the proper data, &c., before the order can be granted. McLaughlin vs. Howe.—After the papers in this case were submitted counsel for some of the parties moved for an order that the parties be desired to present affidavits in opposition to the motion. I have waited for the presentation of the affidavits, but they have not been presented. The motion on Wednesday if opposing affidavits are not furnished by that day. The blanks in the thirteen blank of the release must be filled in with the proper data, &c., before the order can be granted.

DECISIONS.

By Judge Lawrence. Smith vs. Hart.—This seems to me to be a reference case. Let an order be entered referring the same to D. C. McLaughlin, Esq., to be reported on or before the 1st of June. McLaughlin vs. Howe.—After the papers in this case were submitted counsel for some of the parties moved for an order that the parties be desired to present affidavits in opposition to the motion. I have waited for the presentation of the affidavits, but they have not been presented. The motion on Wednesday if opposing affidavits are not furnished by that day. The blanks in the thirteen blank of the release must be filled in with the proper data, &c., before the order can be granted.

DECISIONS.

By Judge Lawrence. Smith vs. Hart.—This seems to me to be a reference case. Let an order be entered referring the same to D. C. McLaughlin, Esq., to be reported on or before the 1st of June. McLaughlin vs. Howe.—After the papers in this case were submitted counsel for some of the parties moved for an order that the parties be desired to present affidavits in opposition to the motion. I have waited for the presentation of the affidavits, but they have not been presented. The motion on Wednesday if opposing affidavits are not furnished by that day. The blanks in the thirteen blank of the release must be filled in with the proper data, &c., before the order can be granted.

DECISIONS.

By Judge Lawrence. Smith vs. Hart.—This seems to me to be a reference case. Let an order be entered referring the same to D. C. McLaughlin, Esq., to be reported on or before the 1st of June. McLaughlin vs. Howe.—After the papers in this case were submitted counsel for some of the parties moved for an order that the parties be desired to present affidavits in opposition to the motion. I have waited for the presentation of the affidavits, but they have not been presented. The motion on Wednesday if opposing affidavits are not furnished by that day. The blanks in the thirteen blank of the release must be filled in with the proper data, &c., before the order can be granted.

TOMBS POLICE COURT.

Before Judge Otterbourg. A CHARGE OF LIBEL. Antonio M. Sotelo, of the Free Lanes, entered bail yesterday. Mr. Rufus K. Andrews became his bondsman, in the sum of \$1,000, to answer a charge of libel made by Peter M. McGuire, of No. 57 Fifth avenue. Mr. Sotelo was arrested on the 22nd inst. by a constable brought to recover damages by the same party for the same alleged libel. An examination was set down to take place on the 29th inst. at the Tombs.

ESSEX MARKET POLICE COURT.

Before Judge Morgan. DEFAULTING TAILOR. Mr. William S. Patton, of the firm of W. G. Browning & Co., clothiers, of No. 346 Broadway, procured a charge of embezzlement against a Nathan Newell, employed by them to make up 100 coats, the materials being furnished him. The suit supplied was worth \$900. He failed to deliver the coats on the 12th inst. and he was admitted having pawned and professed his willingness to restore. Officer Johnson, of the Fairmount precinct, arrested Newell and Judge Morgan held him to \$1,000 bail to answer.

WASHINGTON PLACE POLICE COURT.

Before Judge R. Cox. YOUTHFUL BURGLARS. John Moore and Thomas McCaffrey alias John Coffey, two boys about fifteen years of age, were arraigned yesterday on a charge of burglary, preferred by Mrs. Margaret Gardner, of No. 553 West Thirty-second street. On the night of the 24th inst. the boys entered the premises of Mrs. Gardner and stole a quantity of clothing and other valuables, to the extent of \$90. They were seen by Mrs. Elizabeth Henry, who lives in the same building, and she called the police, who arrested them at the time mentioned. They were arraigned by Officer Murphy, of the Twentieth precinct, and committed by Judge Bixby in \$1,000 each to answer.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS. Part 1—Adjudged until Monday, June