HILTON AND THE HEBREWS.

Israel Satisfied with the Public Verdict.

WILL THE GRAND JEWNION PAY?

The Mosaic Press Sings a Canticle of Joy and Moderation.

Public attention was about equally divided yesterday between the two local sensations of the day—the Seligman-Hilton affair and the Tweed controversy. From careful inquiry the conclusion could not be avoided that the refusal to admit Mr. Joseph Seligman and his family to the Grand Union Hotel was losing its interest with the Israelites of this country, because of the prompt expression of the press throughout the land. The circumstance had not been twenty-four hours of age before it was known in every city of consequence throughout the United States. The fact that the parties to the misunderstanding occupied high positions in the mercantile world as well as in society caused thinking people at a distance to hesitate and to be slow in forming their judgment. In Northern cities, where the question of race, color and previous condition of servitude has been less frequently brought up than it has been south of Mason and Dixon's line since the reconstruction acts were passed, people were inclined to the belief that there must have been something besides the fact that Mr. Seligman was a Hebrew to warrant what they considered to be a very bold act on the part of Mr. Hilton. On the other hand, they argued that there must have been something besides a love of creed that could induce Mr. Seligman to write such a letter as he did to Mr. Hilton. They all in common deprecated the controversy. Advices from Southern cities, where influential Hebrews multiply the further South you go, show that there were two sentiments prevailing—one, that there was certainly some mistake in the reports that had reached them, and the other that such a mistake could not be countenanced in the face of Congressional acts that had been forced upon them and which they are obliged to observe.

JOCULARITY SUCCEEDS BITTERNESS.

Along Broad and Wall streets, and at many of the large business houses elsewhere, the same good-natured bandying was kept up during the morning and evening hours when men were coming and going to and from their business. The Gentile broker stood on the stoop of his office, and as the Hebrew banker passed jocosely inquired of him if he was going to summer at the "Grand Union," or whether he was buying long or short on Jerusalem. The best of good nature seemed to prevail everywhere in regard to this very disagreeable subject, but underneath this good nature there was plainly discernable to the careful observer a spirit of disapprobation for any differences of this sort. They seemed to be entirely out of joint with American institutions.

A PALMETTO HEBREW'S VIEW.

A prominent Israelite from South Carolina, a member of several of the charitable societies most popular throughout the United States and a man widely known for his liberal views, said last evening that he could not for a moment believe that any man who claimed to be a representative man, either in mercantile, political or other interests, could so far stultify himself as to adopt a course that if pursued would lead to a systematic ostracism.

NO PROSECUTION AHEAD.

Mr. Edward Lauterbach, counsel for Mr. Joseph Seligman, the banker, was found last evening at his residence, No. 21 East Fifty-seventh street. Mr. Lauterbach is evidently about forty years old, of medium stature and father slight figure, his complexion only just the edge of the swarthy, full beard and features quite removed from the usual Jewish type. He is a fluent and even graceful talker, and gave utterance to his thoughts on the Hilton-Seligman controversy in a natural and unrestrained manner. He said in effect that the question was practically closed. The exclusion of Mr. Seligman from the Grand Union Hotel had given rise to a great deal of public discussion, and naturally to a great deal of feeling on the part of the Hebrews. The action of Judge Hilton was an affront to the Hebrew race; but the question at issue had really been decided in their favor by a just minded public. The Hebrews felt that the question had really been fully stated, summed up and a conclusion reached. The public has speculated to a considerable degree upon the question as to whether Mr. Seligman would press his claims and rights upon the Grand Union Hotel as a public hotlery, under the provisions of the Civil Rights bill. Mr. Lauterbach knew of no intention on the part of Mr. Seligman or friends to press this question. Undoubtedly, he thought, there was ground for action. But such a course was unnecessary. Yet, he said, it was possible that Judge Hilton's action might result, for this season at least, in a larger patronage of his hotel than before. No one could tell; it was a matter of waiting. It might be that as Judge Hilton had, in the minds of some, established the fact that the Grand Union is the *hotel elegante*, there might be a flocking to it for a while. Of course the really solid American citizen would heed no such appeal as the one which has been made. Such a citizen has nothing in common with the spirit which led to Judge Hilton's decree; but the man or woman of sudden and uncertain wealth might be affected for a time.

WHAT THE HEBREW PAPERS SAY.

The Jewish press have very generally taken up the subject and discussed it thoroughly, and considerably different views have been expressed.

The *Jewish Messenger* casts oil upon the troubled waters in the following words:—"We have no sympathy with many suggestions that have been made in the newspapers, such as a mass meeting, an appeal to the civil rights bill, &c. If ladies and gentlemen, heretofore doing business with Mr. Hilton, either at Saratoga or at Stewart's New York stores, henceforth decline to have dealings with him, it is a perfectly natural burst of indignation, and will touch the man at his vulnerable point." The editor of the *Messenger* closes his article with wise advice:—"And let us preserve at this season that judicial calmness and balance which will entitle us to the confidence and respect of our neighbors. It is safe to appeal to the intelligence and sense of fairness of the community. At this stage Christians are more concerned than ourselves in condemning bigotry and proscription."

The *Hebrew Leader* says:—"As the individual expression of Judge Hilton's opinion the affair was not worthy the publicity given it. But it may be as well that it was noised about, inasmuch as it has brought out the unanimous and hearty protest of the press against any attempt to ostracize the people of any particular race or creed. The spirit of this Republic sets itself like flint against any such illiberality, and will punish it as it deserves. We are inclined to think that this will be the last exhibition of religious intolerance in American social life that we shall be compelled to chronicle."

The *Reformer and Jewish Times* is very indignant, and devotes nine columns of its issue to the subject. A communication from "H. H. M.," which speaks very harshly of Mr. Hilton, announces that the well known Jewish business firms of the Bernheimers, Einsteins, Kohns, Colemans and Neustadters have all withdrawn their patronage from Stewart's store. It was announced before that Fechheimer, Goodkind & Co., and Fechheimer, Frenhel & Co., two large clothing firms of the West, with headquarters in New York, have withdrawn their custom. In an editorial article in the *Reformer and Jewish Times* it is stated that although Mr. Hilton has claimed that he has received numerous letters commending his course, still he has not mentioned one name. The article concludes with the following advice:—"Our advice is, 'keep cool.' Public opinion brands such exhibitions as unworthy of the spirit by which our community is governed. It is only with that spirit we have to deal as a people; that spirit and the expression it finds is all we can desire as members of a free community; with Hilton we have nothing to do, the target is too small, too insignificant to waste ammunition about. His opinion of Mr. Seligman and that gentleman's opinion of Hilton, do not concern the public; Hilton's opinion of the Jews ought certainly concern nobody, and this ought to be the end of the matter."

THE CONTROVERSY AT THE GOLDEN GATE.

SAN FRANCISCO, June 21, 1877.

An evening paper of this city prints reports of interviews with a number of prominent Hebrews on the subject of the Seligman-Hilton controversy. A general sentiment of condemnation of Hilton's course is expressed in them, and the attacks upon Seligman's character and standing warmly resented.

THE CASTE CONTROVERSY.

Worcester *Gazette*:—"It was a great mistake."

Utica *Herald*:—"Proscription is hostile to American ideas."

Richmond *State*:—"We can feel only pity for such men as Hilton."

Hudson *Republican*:—"Judge Hilton has put his foot in it this time."

The Brooklyn *Union-Argus* says that Hilton has made a martyr of Seligman.

Fitchburg *Sentinel*:—"The Jews will not stand alone in resenting the offensive act."

Pittsburg *Dispatch*:—"As a rule there is no class of citizens less offensive than Jews."

New Haven *Register*:—"The blunder which Judge Hilton committed amounts to a crime."

The Fall River *Herald* quotes the HERALD'S opinion on the Hilton-Seligman difficulty as its own.

Fitchburg *Sentinel*:—"From our standpoint it looks as if Mr. Hilton had made a fool of himself."

Utica *Observer*:—"The American people are first, last and always the champions of fair play."

Detroit *Free Press*:—"As contemptible a bit of sectarianism as the country has ever witnessed."

Cleveland *Plain Dealer*:—"Such bigotry and prejudice belong to the Dark Ages. They are as much out of date as the thumbscrew and the rack."

Chicago *Tribune*:—"The Jews themselves are the strictest constructionists in religious matters."

Baltimore *Bee*:—"It is not in the power of Judge Hilton or any other man to stigmatize the race."

Baltimore *Bee*:—"Judge Hilton has done a thing which shocks the right sense of his countrymen."

New London *Telegram*:—"Judge Hilton probably realizes by this time that he made a great mistake."

Buffalo *Courier*:—"'Vulgar ostentation' and 'general obtrusiveness' are by no means confined to Israelites."

Utica *Observer*:—"Judge Hilton 'aims his blow at the Jews, but strikes every advocate of religious freedom.'"

The Newark *Advertiser* says of the Jews that, "Down at the bottom of their exclusion lies their own exclusiveness."

Hartford *Post*:—"There seems to be no question that the Union Hotel people have declared war to the Hilt—on Jews."

Paterson *Press*:—"The funniest part of the 'Seligman Jew' vs. Grand Union—Gentile case is the civil rights feature."

Wheeling *Standard*:—"The time has passed when such an act of bigotry will be countenanced by an intelligent public."

Pittsburg *Dispatch*:—"Such exhibitions as Hilton has made in this matter cannot fail to excite indignation and contempt."

Boston *Advertiser*:—"The dispute * * * has come to a crisis in which Judge Hilton is left at immense disadvantage."

Boston *Post*:—"Good society can easily enough take care of itself without the help of hotel keepers or their self-elected friends."

New Bedford *Standard*:—"We shouldn't think a Jew or any one else would want to go to a hotel where such snobbery prevails."

Elmira *Gazette*:—"The discrimination is an unjustifiable insult—an outrage upon a large, respectable and enlightened class of citizens."

Buffalo *Courier*:—"Such a unique survival of blended bigotry and snobbery cannot too soon engage the attention alike of satirists and naturalists."

Cincinnati *Star*:—"Judge Hilton has demonstrated his utter incapacity for the great responsibility his suddenly acquired wealth imposes upon him."

Buffalo *Advertiser*:—"There is no ground for prejudice against a race which in many respects are the most remarkable people on the face of the earth."

The Chicago *Tribune* says that any effort to revive the persecution of the Jews in this democratic country in any shape will be "a most lamentable failure."

Baltimore *Bee*:—"It proves against the Jews nothing; against Judge Hilton it simply proves that it is possible to be a great lawyer and a great fool as well."

Rochester *Democrat and Chronicle*:—"The refusal of that Saratoga hotel to entertain Jews is not only a great discredit, but is a violation of the Civil Rights law."

Granville (N. Y.) *Sentinel*:—"A whole race to be persecuted because of the manners of a part, we do not consider justice under our country's constitution."

Syracuse *Courier*:—"The insult to Mr. Seligman is enough to make us pause and inquire whether this is indeed free America and this really the nineteenth century."

New Bedford *Standard*:—"It is only contemptible bigotry or personal hatred that excludes a person of decent appearance and conduct because of race or religion."

Elmira *Gazette*:—"It is about time, we should say, that Congress looked beyond the poor negro to see if some further legislation is not required to insure the rights of a white man."

Rochester *Union and Advertiser*:—"The late A. T. Stewart was an Irish emigrant, from near Belfast, and came to this country as one of an oppressed nationality to seek his fortune."

Philadelphia *North American*:—"What business has Judge Hilton to fling stones at the Jews? An unworthy man is simply an unworthy man, be he Jew, Christian, Mussulman or pagan."

Fitchburg *Sentinel*:—"So long as 'the scrawl of a Jew on the back of a piece of paper is worth more than the royal word of three kings,' it will be in vain to try to limit him to two dollar hotels."

The Worcester *Press* says of the Jews that it is not probable that they would find another landlord in the country who would not be glad to receive them and entertain them to the full extent of their ability to pay.

Buffalo *Courier*:—"If Judge Hilton and Mrs. Stewart had a personal grudge against Mr. Seligman they made a big mistake when they undertook to wreak their small revenge on a people instead of on him as an individual."

Boston *Herald*:—"Such an act is in the highest degree reprehensible, and is so totally opposed to all the principles of equality and toleration upon which our institutions are based that it should be indignantly denounced."

Baltimore *American*:—"There are Jews and there are Gentiles whom decent people do not care to be thrown into contact with; but to commence and end with the Jews would be only a half-way correction of the nuisance."

Chicago *Tribune*:—"Certainly whatever social prejudice exists among Americans and Christians against the Israelites is traceable to the women, for there is not one man in a hundred who cherishes any feeling against any other man or woman on account of race or religion."

Washington *Star*:—"As we understand the words, we call a man a Jew because that defines his religious belief the same as when we speak of a Christian it denotes his supposed fealty to Christianity, without reference to his place of birth, be he American or foreigner."

Rutland *Globe*:—"There can be no doubt that a good many of the Jews who have patronized the Grand Union and other similar hotels are rather vulgar and offensive in their manners, but the principle of outlawing them as a race is rather a novel one, and not likely to be popular in this country."

Rochester *Union and Advertiser*:—"Every little while the newspapers announce 'another important decision.' The last is by 'Judge' Hilton, who presides over the bar of the Grand Union, at Saratoga, that a Hebrew is not a Jew and a Jew not a Hebrew; and that Mr. Seligman is heterodox and not orthodox in his faith."

Norwich *Bulletin*:—"Judge Hilton is partly right and partly wrong. He is to be praised for excluding objectionable people from the Grand Union; he is to be condemned for driving away a reputable and polished gentleman. His error lies in not overlooking race distinctions and refusing only such applicants as really meet his complaints."

Cincinnati *Times*:—"It is a singular fact that the man who, perhaps more than any other one capitalist, has been instrumental in the past ten years in contributing to sustain the financial credit of the government and of republican administrations, should be singled out for this gross insult by a democratic judge, hotel keeper and manager of dead men's estates."

Nashville *American*:—"It may be that the public have not rights that a snobbish Saratoga hotel is bound to respect, but we are to learn for the first time that an innkeeper in this country has any business to inquire into the religious opinions of his guest before permitting him to contract dyspepsia at his table, or a typhus fever under his miasmatic sheets, at the cost of a small fortune for the luxury."

Providence *Journal*:—"Judge Hilton makes the mistake of supposing that a great caravansery can be 'run,' to use his own expression and technical language, like a private house. There are advantages and disadvantages in living in an inn; but the proprietor of one who refuses accommodation to a man because he is a Jew or a Methodist is not likely to be overburdened with sensible guests."

Washington *Nation*:—"Despatches received here yesterday gravely hint that if the insult to Joseph Seligman could possibly be construed as an entering wedge to the proscription of the Jews in America the Rothschilds would withdraw from the Syndicate and oppose American credit in Europe. If they believe in an intended proscription they will be driven to the course that is suggested, for the Jews are as clannish as the ancient Scots. But there is no such intent on the part of the American people. The Secretary of the Treasury has denounced the course of Judge Hilton toward Mr. Seligman as unwarranted."

Portland *Press*:—"In reading of Judge Hilton's suddenly developed antipathy to the Hebrews one cannot help recalling the story of the man who met an Israelite in the streets of San Francisco and fell upon him and beat him. The Israelite turned upon his assailant, whom he had never seen before, and asked the reason of the assault. 'You are a Jew, ain't you?' queried the enraged bruiser. 'Yes.' 'And you Jews crucified Christ?' 'Holy Moses, that was eighteen hundred years ago,' exclaimed the astonished Israelite. 'No matter if 'twas; I've just heard of it,' replied the champion of Christianity, as he renewed the assault. Is it possible that Judge Hilton has just heard of the Crucifixion?"

Elmira *Advertiser*:—"Let us make common cause for our oppressed fellow citizen the Jew. It will be cheap. The Jew has plenty of money, and will bear all the expenses. And then the attorneys and the witnesses, and all the interested parties would, of course, be called to Saratoga during the trial, and would have Congress water and high life without cost. Alas! come to think of it, not a man of them all could so much as pick his teeth on the steps of the Grand Union, and so what would the effort avail? Snubbed in the very portals of heaven! and all for a Jew. Not much. The Jews must look out for themselves. Let us have local self-government and snobbery supreme."

THE PLYMOUTH PASTOR.

MR. BEECHER TELLS HIS FRIDAY NIGHT AUDIENCE HOW TO LIVE A CHRISTIAN LIFE.

Promptly at eight o'clock last evening Mr. and Mrs. Beecher made their appearance in the lecture room of Plymouth Church, he hale and hearty and of ruddy complexion, she pale, slender and sedate. The weather was delightfully cool and the lecture room was fully three-quarters filled with an audience of miscellaneous composition. Many, doubtless, came in the hope that Mr. Beecher would speak on the subject of Jew and Gentilism or on another subject which is at present attracting the attention of the community—that of Molly Maguirism. But such visitors were disappointed, for the latter subject was not touched upon in the remotest way, while the word Hebrew, though twice repeated, was not used in connection with the Hilton-Seligman affair.

LIVING A CHRISTIAN LIFE.

After the singing of one or two hymns and a prayer by Mr. Halliday Mr. Beecher glanced calmly about the room and in a clear though subdued voice began his evening's talk. "I think," said he, "that a great deal more might be attained in the living of a Christian life if men knew better their own dispositions. They are converted, some from being actual reprobates, and others, while in the conduct of a fairly moral life, to a higher religious life. They have a vague idea of their duties, but think if they are going to heaven they have got to live better, and to throw off many things and to take on many others; to join the church, &c. This is all very true, and in many respects important. But it is not everything. If I were going to describe a wagon I would not say that it is a thing made up of circles and of straight lines, and some iron and much more wood, for that would as well describe a churn, a wheelbarrow, or a great many other things. What we want is a definite idea of a man's duty when he becomes a Christian—then he is converted. First, then, we must restrain our passions, we must repent and turn from them, from selfishness, envy, jealousy and all evil. We must get rid of them, must live down all malign feeling. We must not talk evil of our neighbors, nor think evil of them, nor rejoice in their mishaps. Now, there are hundreds of members of the church, who, if you were to take all that out of them, would have nothing left. Their whole life is mean and despicable, filled with trifling and impertinences, and when they talk of the higher religious life it is an insult to God.

"The first step is to hate evil and turn from it, and the second to develop the Christian emotions. Having excluded the malign element we must introduce the benign or benevolent in its place. We must be patient, generous, fair minded, simple in all our transactions with our fellow men. Third, we must put into the avocation God has given us our ripest and greatest power. Our trade or profession, our social position, everything we have, is ours by God's appointment, and however humble it may be we must ennoble it; however high, we must live up to it. We must give to it all our energies, and see that it is perfumed, as it were, with truth in all nobleness. That is living according to God. As the apostle says, we must serve not with the eye or lips alone, but as unto the Lord. We must labor not in the hope of human praise, or wealth, or power, but merely because it is the will of our Saviour, and if our duties are repugnant and violate all our noblest aspirations the more do we glorify Him."

At the conclusion of Mr. Beecher's remarks Mr. Halliday confessed a few weaknesses, such as undue severity of temper, &c., and asked for counsel. Mr. Beecher said that he was himself severe against all severity in others, and was positive that sharpness of temper could be fully overcome. His brother George, who had inherited his father's quick temper and dyspepsia—that "many devils" which was cast out of some men in the old times, as Mr. Beecher believed—had finally overcome his asperity, and he was positive that every one could do likewise. Mr. Shearman asked a few questions, and Dr. Edward Beecher wanted to know whether the power of God is in anywise limited? Mr. Beecher explained that it is not; then, taking his hymn book in hand, looking at Mr. Shearman, said:—"I know, Thomas, that you want to ask some more questions, but you shan't do it."

AN ATTACK ON MR. BEECHER.

Science Hall, in Clinton place, near Broadway, was filled last evening with a large and motley assemblage, which gathered to hear Colonel John A. Cunningham, of South Carolina, deliver a lecture on "Henry Ward Beecher and his Recent Speech at Bath, Long Island." The lecture was delivered under the auspices of the Liberal Club, and consisted of an outpouring of vituperation and personal abuse that greatly amused the scandal-loving portion of his audience. Colonel Cunningham was, it appears, editor of the Charleston *News and Courier* during the rebellion and is a son-in-law of Governor Noble, of Georgia. He quarrelled with the words rebellion, slavery and aristocracy as applied to the South. There was no rebellion, slavery was a system of labor, and aristocracy, taken in its Greek sense, was something to be lauded. Mr. Beecher, he thought, aimed vainly at being Mohammed, Tom Jefferson, Christ, Brigham Young, Confucius, Washington, Leo X., Richelieu all in one. He was, in fact, a Yankee steeped in Hoosierism, which seemed, in the lecturer's idea, to make about the most objectionable sort of human being. Then Mr. Beecher had no proper standards of ideas. He wanted to revive war issues. That was his capital sin; for his other doings he was content to leave him to Plymouth Church. At the conclusion of the Colonel's lecture a lively debate ensued.

UPPER HUDSON REGATTA.

TROY, N. Y., June 22, 1877.

The regatta of the Upper Hudson Rowing Association opened this afternoon at two o'clock. Eight events came off. The Filleys, of Lansingburg, won the final heat in the pair-oared race by a foul. The Junior trial heat was won by a Cohoes sculler. The Wolvenhooks, of Greenbush, and the Watervliets, of West Troy, won the Senior scull trial heats. The four-oared trial heats were won by the Rensselaers, Polytechnic Institutes, Filleys and Wolvenhooks. The water was rough, but the wind was favorable. The best time made in the four-oared heats was by the Wolvenhooks, 8.46¼. The best time in the single scull races was 10:30. To-morrow, the final heats of the singles, doubles and fours will be rowed.

WALKING FIVE HUNDRED MILES.

COLUMBUS, Ind., June 22, 1877.

Will N. Lake, an amateur, to-day finished a walk of 500 miles in 500 consecutive hours. Average time, 13 minutes.

CROOKED WHISKEY.

VIGOROUS WORK BY REVENUE OFFICERS—THREE "MOONSHINERS" KILLED AND TWELVE CAPTURED.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE HERALD.]

NASHVILLE, Tenn., June 22, 1877.

A party of twenty-two revenue officers will return here to-morrow, having during the past seven days broken up fourteen wild cat distillery concerns and captured twelve "moonshiners." On the 15th inst., while moving up Dismal Hollow, forty-five illicit distillers sent word that if the officers did not surrender their prisoners they would attack them. The officers returned answer that if they did so they would kill the prisoners and then fight them to the bitter end. No attack was then made.

While the officers were destroying Sam Johnson's distillery they were attacked. Johnson was mortally wounded, dying four hours after, and fatal wounds were inflicted on two men named Morgan. They were subsequently attacked, one revenue officer having a finger shot off and his horse shot.

MYSTERIOUS MURDER.

AN OLD MAN SHOT ON HIS OWN HEARTSTONE BY A STRANGER.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE HERALD.]

SCRANTON, PA., June 22, 1877.

A dastardly murder has just been committed near Nicholson, a small town several miles north of this city, on the line of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad. The victim was Patrick Golden, upward of eighty years of age. He was seated with his wife in their house near the railroad tunnel when a masked man flung open the door and, without saying a word, raised a double barrelled gun which he carried to his shoulder and fired at Golden, wounding him in the side. The old man ran to an adjoining room, but was followed by the assassin who discharged the contents of the other barrel into Golden's neck, then turned and ran to the woods. The wounded man lingered in great agony for several hours and died in terrible torture. He was a quiet, harmless citizen, and by his industry had accumulated about $10,000 worth of property. As no attempt was made to rob him, the tragedy continues a mystery. He had no known enemies, and there are no prospects that the motives prompting the cold-blooded butchery will ever be brought to light.

A WISE PRINCE.

MAYOR PRINCE, OF BOSTON, URGED BY MRS. LIVERMORE AND OTHERS TO EXCLUDE WINE FROM THE PRESIDENT'S BANQUET—HIS HONOR SPEAKS HIS MIND FREELY, AND ADVOCATES MODERATION, RATHER THAN PROHIBITION.

BOSTON, June 22, 1877.

In consequence of a request for an interview with Mayor Prince, presented by Mrs. Mary A. Livermore and others, His Honor received a call this morning from that worthy lady, accompanied by Mrs. L. B. Barrett, Mrs. Henry McCoy and Mrs. E. M. H. Richards. The object of their visit was to urge upon the Mayor such action as would result in the exclusion of wines and liquors from the Presidential banquet next week. Mrs. Livermore was the spokeswoman of the occasion, and in stating the object of the visit, she said:—"Mr. Prince, we call on you this morning in the interests of the people of this Commonwealth and in behalf of the Women's Temperance Christian Union, an organization composed of 12,000 women of Massachusetts and largely representing the moral and Christian sentiment of the community. I have been delegated by my associates to present to you the following memorial, which, with your permission, I will read:—

THE WOMEN'S MEMORIAL.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Massachusetts we, the undersigned, were chosen a committee to wait upon you with the following petition:—

In behalf of the Christian women of the city and of the State, we ask you, respectfully, but earnestly, to direct that no intoxicating liquors shall be furnished at the expense of the city when the banquet is given by the city of Boston in honor of the President of the United States.

An occasion of this kind affords an opportunity for exerting an influence for good or evil such as is rarely offered. This banquet is to be given by the city of Boston in honor of the Chief Magistrate of the nation. Can he be honored by the observance of a custom which is closely linked with debauchery and disgrace, and which has led so many of our best citizens into shame and dishonor? How can we urge total abstinence upon the masses, to whom it is the only safeguard, if the city of Boston gives respectability to social drinking customs by sanctioning them on this august occasion?

Allow us, dear sir, respectfully to remind you that the authority given you to provide for the entertainment of distinguished visitors to our city carries with it great responsibility. The drinking customs of society will be strengthened or weakened as you refuse or grant them your official sanction on this occasion, and the virtue of our homes—the greatest interest of any city—will be helped or hindered by your decision in this matter.

RESPONSE OF THE MAYOR.

I merely would say at this moment in response, that while I agree with you ladies and those you represent in respect to the horrors of intemperance, and I do not believe there are any words in the English language sufficiently adequate to describe those horrors, I differ entirely with you and those you represent with reference to what you say in respect to total abstinence. In the first place it is the part of wisdom to regulate what you cannot eradicate. We have tried two prohibitory laws and found they have not succeeded in accomplishing their objects, and I may say in this connection that I myself thirty years ago, or nearly thirty years ago, was in the Legislature when the Maine Liquor law first came up, and voted for it for the purpose of trying it, and it proved an utter failure. I can understand how enthusiasts expect to make angels of men and women, when we are told we are somewhat lower than the angels, in their earnestness to effect good objects, and want very much indeed to prevent the people from drinking any intoxicating beverage. The motive is honorable to them, but in my humble judgment, and I say it respectfully, it shows utter ignorance with human nature and the laws that rule human conduct. We shall never have an era of total abstinence in my judgment.

MRS. LIVERMORE (interrupting)—We admit what you say in reference to the Prohibitory Liquor law.

Mayor PRINCE—If you will allow me to go on? It is not true that the great people of this Commonwealth, as urged here, are in favor of prohibitory legislation, as shown by the issue at the polls, and these prohibitory people seem to be "growing smaller by degrees and beautifully less."

Mrs. LIVERMORE—We are not advocating a prohibitory liquor law in this memorial.

Mayor PRINCE—But you say total abstinence.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—The inability to enforce the Prohibitory Liquor law arose from the absence of public sentiment behind it to compel its enforcement.

Mayor PRINCE—I differ from you there.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—Is not a law always enforced when there is a public sentiment behind it?

Mayor PRINCE—Yes.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—Then the reason this was not enforced is because there was not the necessary public sentiment behind it.

Mayor PRINCE—You cannot create that public sentiment.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—That is what we are trying to do.

Mayor PRINCE—And your motives are honorable and trustworthy. I have been thinking for thirty years how to manage this question.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—We have been thinking of it also for thirty years, as we are not young women.

Mayor PRINCE—I understand that. If you can satisfy me that the great desideratum can be accomplished you will find me on your side, as I think there is no language adequate to express the horrors of intemperance. You cannot accomplish your object because it is not right it should be accomplished. I believe in temperance in all things. I believe wine was made to be enjoyed by man, and the fact that he abuses this thing is no argument against its use.

Mrs. RICHARDS—Is it not moderation you mean?

Mayor PRINCE—Yes, most of our people do use, and moderately use, wine. Take all the wealthier classes of Boston, they use wine; are they drunkards?

Mrs. LIVERMORE—No, sir; but I think they are responsible for any actual drunkenness.

Mayor PRINCE—Hasn't there been a great change come over the community in regard to drinking? Formerly a party could be seen tipsy and not lose the esteem of his acquaintances, but now if a man is seen drunk his character is ruined.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—The fact that there has been this change is an argument for a greater change. While we are working among the lower classes throughout the State in our reform clubs, we are perpetually met by the objection from both men and women, "Why should we give up our whiskey any more than those persons of the higher society should not give up their wine?"

Mayor PRINCE—That is no argument.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—But they are on a lower plane, and we are very accustomed to copy the manners and customs of those above us. I believe the time will come when it is possible for those who wish to drink wine to say, "We take our stand on the basis of Christianity, which demands of us that for the sake of others we should forego the pleasures and delights which are innocent to us in themselves, but which are so injurious to others."

Mayor PRINCE—In my judgment the prohibitionists have set back the temperance movement by their action.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—We are in favor of total abstinence and are not allowed to say it is prohibition.

Mayor PRINCE—That is bringing metaphysics into this, which I did not expect. To go back to the point from which we diverged, in respect to the President's entertainment. The city of Boston desires that every honor should be paid to the President, because he is our President.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—We share in that feeling.

Mayor PRINCE—And I am determined that nothing shall be left undone which can contribute to that result. Now to give the President a dinner without giving him what is usual—

Mrs. LIVERMORE—He never drinks wine; he has never taken a drop of it in his life.

Mayor PRINCE—That may or may not be.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—That is the statement of his wife.

Mayor PRINCE—He is to be permitted to do just as he pleases, but there are other gentlemen who will be with him, members of his Cabinet and others, and they ought to receive what they have a right to expect to receive, and it is customary on such occasions to give wine, and I propose to give it, and I think it my duty to give it. I represent the citizens and my personal character is sunk in my official position, and whatever my constituents expect me to do on that occasion I shall do—whatever is fit and proper to be done. I may say in this connection that if I were to give a dinner in my own house I should give wine.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—That is a different affair and we could not interfere, but it is because you are acting in an official capacity and because the city has made you responsible.

Mayor PRINCE—Don't you agree with me in this proposition, that I ought to do what the citizens expect?

Mrs. LIVERMORE—Whom do you mean by citizens—men and women?

Mayor PRINCE—I mean people who live in the city of Boston; that is my notion.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—If you should do what the people in Boston, the men and women, require you to do, you would not give wine.

Mayor PRINCE—You make that assertion. What is the evidence that the people of Boston don't wish me to give wine? Satisfy me upon that point and then I may take a different view of it.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—That is our opinion.

Mayor PRINCE—What is it based on?

Mrs. LIVERMORE—We have attended the meetings that have been held during the winter.

Mayor PRINCE—The fact that wine is generally used in the city of Boston.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—By a small proportion of its citizens.

Mayor PRINCE—I beg your pardon. I think I am conversant with the habits of the people of Boston; I have lived here nearly sixty years of my life.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—But the majority have not the means to purchase wine.

Mayor PRINCE—You ladies are enthusiastic; I am glad to say it, because all orders are benefited by the enthusiasts. You would not accomplish anything if you didn't go into it with zeal and spirit; and if you don't get all you propose to get such enthusiasm will enable you to get half a loaf if you cannot get a whole loaf. You have done a great deal of good and will do more, but you will never accomplish total abstinence—never in the world; I don't think you ought to. I give you my opinion, I have five children and have wine on my table every day of my life.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—I hope you will never rue it.

Mayor PRINCE—But none of my children will drink it. I think, however, if I told them they could not drink it they would try to drink it.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—When 600 of the market people last year sat down to dinner, to the surprise of everybody, they adjured all intoxicating liquor, wine and everything else, and it was strictly a total abstinence festival.

Mayor PRINCE—I am invited to a great many entertainments and dinners, and am almost tired out by attending them, yet I have never seen one without wine.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—When the boot and shoe men were here three weeks ago they went down the harbor and wine was furnished freely all through the entertainment, and there are little stories circulated in reference to excessive drinking on that occasion.

Mayor PRINCE (emphatically)—I take this occasion to brand that statement as wholly untrue. I was present, I caused the entertainment to be given, and when the bills were sent in for the wine I was perfectly astonished to see what small an amount of wine was drank; and I take the occasion to say that there was not a man on board that boat that was in any way affected by the wine he had taken; and if any citizen or any voter doubts it he can call at the Auditor's office and see the bills for the wine. People say these sort of things in the excitement of partisan feeling, I suppose. While, as I said before, I have great regard and respect for these parties who are endeavoring to reform the world, although I have very little faith they will accomplish all they expect to accomplish, and until I am satisfied that the citizens of Boston do not want me to give wine I shall give it. Satisfy me of that and I shall be very glad not to give it, as I want to save all the money I can. Thanking you, ladies, for calling, and trusting I have not said anything in the excitement of the moment which can be construed as discourteous, I wish you good morning.

Mrs. LIVERMORE—We have nothing to complain of on the score of discourtesy, but are sorry you cannot see the matter in the light in which we view it. We stand on a moral platform.

Mayor PRINCE—That is the platform to stand on. Good morning, ladies.

LADIES—Good morning.

TWEED'S BLIGHTED PROSPECTS.

THE PUBLICATION OF THE CONFESSION HIS ONLY CHANCE OF LIBERTY—THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S ACTION.

There was a very strong feeling prevalent about town yesterday that Attorney General Fairchild should explain his conduct in relation to the so-called confession of Mr. Tweed at once; and on the other hand many contended that Mr. Townsend should not longer withhold the text of his client's confession from the public. A prominent democratic politician declared, with great emphasis:—"The old man's grand mistake has been in giving his confidence to irresponsible adventurers and withholding it from his real friends. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that if Mr. Tweed had spoken fully and freely long ago to the public through the press, exposing the rascalities of the Ring's satellites and throwing himself upon the mercy of the press and people, he would be free to-day. Instead of that he excited public antipathy by at first absolutely refusing to answer any questions tending to the discovery and punishment of the criminals. Later when he found himself incarcerated with little prospect of release he began to bargain, and attempted to barter his knowledge for freedom. That a man of his shrewdness and experience should allow himself to open these negociations as he did in such a round about way and through such a curious medium is the most astonishing thing in the world to his friends.

TWEED'S ONLY CHANCE FOR LIBERTY.

It is not too late yet for him to unburden himself now, and in my opinion that is his only chance for liberty. The document to which he has pinned all his hopes and the general tenor of which is indicated by M. Townsend's letter, has been copied as I understand, and that copy is now in the hands of an outside party. Probably it will be secured by fair means or foul, for publication very soon. Then Mr. Tweed's whole stock in trade in the barter for freedom will be stolen, public resentment will be excited against him for not making the facts known himself, and the result will be he will be left to spend the close of his life in prison, the object of universal execration. The old man played a bold part in refusing to convict his associates until he found they had abandoned him to his fate. He did a wise thing in determining to "give them away," and it now remains for him to rectify the error he made in carrying out his determination by confessing all he knows and throwing himself upon public sentiment which, after all, is far more generous than any official could afford to be.

The report which was circulated in the afternoon to the effect that the Attorney General would reply to Mr. Townsend's strictures by making a report of his actions with reference to the so-called confession to Governor Robinson, had the effect of suspending to some extent the general judgment. When it was stated that Mr. Fairchild would not in his report attempt to directly reply to any of the charges made by Mr. Townsend, the adherents of the "Boss" were quick to assert that the charges referred to are irrefutable.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL RIGHT.

A prominent lawyer who in the early days of the fracture of the Ring took a leading part in all the preliminary proceedings for driving the Ring thieves from office, and who has been engaged ever since more or less in the promotion of suits for or against the city, said to a HERALD reporter yesterday that he had read Mr. Tweed's statement, and that the publication of it would be the best vindication of the Attorney General. The bowl of the press, he said, against him was founded on an utter misconception of what Mr. Tweed had offered to prove. There was but a very small portion of the Tweed statement that had reference to corrupt legislation. The only checks that were payable to any legislator were about twelve, and these had been explained as checks paid by Tweed for money advanced to him as a matter of accommodation. There was in Tweed's statement a list of about two hundred and fifty, and those were to about one hundred different persons, some of these persons were dead, and many of the others showed on their face that they were likely to have been paid by Tweed for legitimate business purposes. There were charges made by Tweed that would be very damaging to politicians of both parties if they could be corroborated; but as far as had been ascertained it was only a very small minority of these charges that could be corroborated. He believed that it was capable of being shown that more than one of these parties had been approached by a person representing himself to be Tweed's agent with an offer of a compromise for certain considerations, and that certain checks had had a definite price put upon them. The lawyer concluded by saying that any public sympathy for Tweed was very much misplaced.

MR. FAIRCHILD'S STATEMENT.

ALBANY, N. Y., June 22, 1877.

Attorney General Fairchild will not have the statement concerning his action in the Tweed case ready to present to the Governor for several days. He left the city this afternoon for Casenovia, and it is understood he will, while absent, prepare the statement. It will be brief, and no part of it will be devoted to the letter made public by Mr. Townsend.

TAMMANY PATRIOTISM.

An address, signed by Grand Sachem Augustus Schell, Henry L. Clinton and others, has been issued to the members of the Tammany society. After calling upon the members to assemble at Tammany Hall on the Fourth of July to celebrate the nation's birthday the address goes on as follows:—"The abuses of the time make it especially necessary that we should, with more than usual fervor, revive the memories which give significance to that day. While our society, in common with millions of order loving and order observing citizens, subm