WIDOW OLIVER'S SUIT.

An Exciting Day in Judge Cartter's Court.

MR. OLIVER ON THE WITNESS STAND.

A Grass Widower's Efforts in the Reform Line.

SKETCH OF THE PLAINTIFF'S CAREER.

The Old Story of a Woman's Wrongs and Abandonment.

ARDENT DESIRE TO EXPOSE A BLACKMAILER.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE HERALD.]

WASHINGTON, March 21, 1879.

For some reason—possibly because of the continued absence of Mr. Cameron or because it was believed Widow Oliver had nothing more to tell of her sad courtship—the trial in the Circuit Court to-day drew a rather smaller crowd. At the opening of the court there was hardly more than one-half the number of spectators of previous days. As the day wore on the room gradually filled and at times was uncomfortably crowded. General Butler came to his task smiling cheerfully and wearing a more brilliant nosegay than he displayed yesterday.

A MYSTERIOUS LADY.

One of the incidents of the day was the entrance into court of an elegantly dressed lady, who made her way down the passage and took a seat in the rear of defendant's counsel. She was strikingly tall and had a superabundance of color in or on her cheeks. She wore a large fur hat and her dress and skirt were of blue velvet. All eyes turned toward her, and it was soon whispered around that she was Annie Davis; but it was afterward learned that it was not the mischievous telltale, but a lady from Chicago. She looked around the room, and finding Mrs. Oliver, sat steadily watching the witness for some time. Becoming satisfied with her scrutiny she at length drew a piece of paper from her pocket and began writing. Her arrival and mysterious manner disconcerted the crowd and led to various speculations as to her business. At intervals a number of other women came in and occupied seats near her. Following behind this party came a number of members of Congress, who arranged themselves near the Judges' bench. There were in the audience several gray haired or bald headed old fellows, whose presence was severely commented upon.

THE MAN OLIVER.

The proposition to swear the man Oliver on his *voir dire* made quite a sensation. Said the Court:—

"If you insist on that we will dismiss the case right here." The demand was instantly withdrawn and Oliver went on with his testimony. During the recital of his story Mrs. Oliver looked the spruce old sexagenarian squarely in the face. This seemed to make him nervous and his hands appeared to be a great trouble to him. He referred to a memorandum, and from it gave his testimony, which caused an unfavorable impression.

A lively tilt occurred when counsel for defence asked witness to allow them to look at his memorandum book. Witness replied that the records in it were made a long time ago and he did not mean to give it up. The Court sustained him and said he could obtain a portion of the record from Tommie's tombstone; that was good enough authority. Counsel for plaintiff made another demand and witness replied:—

"I have had this book many years, and I intend to keep it."

Mr. Peters said he did not understand witness, to which the latter replied, "I am very sorry." (Laughter.) General Butler, finding that the Court would not compel the witness to show the book, said, "Give him the fullest limit; he will do no hurt." Witness continued his testimony, and while referring to his relation with Mrs. Oliver some person in the rear of the seats said, loud enough to be heard at the other end:—

"Did you kiss her three times?"

This produced much laughter. Oliver continued and said:—

"I say in the presence of the Court and fear of God that I never introduced her as my wife. I passed the daughter off as my daughter.

"Living as you did is often done?" is it not, asked one of the counsel, to which Gen. Butler replied:—

"It is, but differently here as the man comes to see the woman."

"One thing is sure," said Oliver, "I never married her; that is plain talk, ain't it? (Laughter.) I lived in pretty good style—had two servants and a good cook; they called me Colonel, although I had no right to the title."

Judge Cartter remarked:—"That is all right, you are from Kentucky." (Roars of laughter.)

Mr. Peters requested witness to speak louder, as his hearing was bad. "So is mine," responded witness.

"I am sorry," said Peters.

"So am I," replied Oliver. (Laughter.)

Witness claimed that he was a professor in an academy. Mr. Peters inquired if he was professor of reformation, to which Oliver replied, "If I was I would like to teach you." In referring to his daughter he expressed great love for her, but none for the mother, and remarked that "A bad cow could have a good calf." This was appreciated by the audience, which again burst out in loud laughter.

PROCEEDINGS IN COURT.

When the Court adjourned last evening the point under discussion was the objection made by General Butler to the admission of the two letters presented by Mrs. Oliver and purporting to have been written by Mr. Cameron. The defence base their objection upon the ground that they are forgeries, and no proof had been offered to show that Mr. Cameron wrote them. This morning the testimony of Mrs. Oliver was read on that point. She testified that she knew his handwriting and that these letters were written by him.

The Court ruled that this was sufficient prima facie evidence to permit the letters to go to the jury. The defence excepted to the ruling.

The Court—Have the Bible and papers promised to be furnished this morning been brought in?

General Butler (examining the book)—Pardon me, these are not the papers. She (Mrs. Oliver) said on the stand that she had a stipulation with counsel. Now I want to see this agreement with Peters and Darneille. I want to know what this joint stock company is, and will know it if there is power enough in the law to get it. She said that she had a copy of the agreement (so she ought) between herself and her counsel. Now I want it produced. Let her take the stand again and we will see about it.

Mr. Peters—I suppose we have a copy of it somewhere.

General Butler—That won't do. A copy might have been made since this night. I want her copy.

Mr. Peters—I think that my reputation stands as high as any man's, and I will not have any such aspersions thrown upon my character.

The Court—There has been a good deal said during the trial that might have been omitted; but amid it all there is no need of a display of temper between counsel. Justice can be dispensed in a calm and peaceful way. She certainly did testify that she had a copy of the stipulation while on the stand yesterday. The paper is collateral to the issue or the Court would know what to do. It is germane to the issue, but not the body of it. It ought to be produced or a copy of it.

Mr. Peters—Mr. Darneille has a copy of it, or the original, and will bring it in. He had not bothered his head about it.

General Butler—Yes, Mr. Darneille is conveniently absent this morning.

The Court—There is no occasion for feeling, except contempt and indignation—I mean all around the whole case.

While waiting to get the reporter's notes as to Mrs. Oliver's evidence the two letters admitted in testimony were read to the jury. The plaintiff's counsel announced that here they rested their case in chief.

Mr. Darneille entered the Chamber with a copy of the contract.

General Butler—Let it be verified before being admitted I want the plaintiff.

THE CONTRACT WITH COUNSEL.

Mrs. Oliver here took the stand. She did tell them yesterday that she had a copy of a written contract, by which counsel was to have one-third of the amount received, but could not find it. She put it in a package with other papers, she thought, but when search was made for it she could not find it. She could not furnish the expenses of the suit; she had paid $11, and that was all she could stand.

Mr. Darneille—Her counsel has received nothing; let that be distinctly understood.

Witness, resuming—She handed the money to Mr. Peters' son or Mr. Darneille and took the receipt; the contract was made before she entered this suit; they wanted the contract; she went to their office alone; Mr. Maddox was not there with her; neither was William P. Wood; a Mr. Marshall was there and witnessed the signing of the receipt; she only signed one paper, and that was to give the counsel one-third of the amount recovered.

The paper was then read, and is as follows:—

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 17, 1877.

I have to-day employed Messrs. George and John F. Peters and Benjamin J. Darneille, attorneys-at-law, to bring and prosecute a suit for me against Simon Cameron for breach of promise of marriage to me, and now agree to give said George and John F. Peters for this service a fee equal to one-sixth part of what may be recovered by said suit, and to said Darneille a like sum for his fee.

Witness the following signature and seal, the date and year aforesaid. [Seal.] MARY S. OLIVER.

Attest—WILFRID MARSHALL.

MEMORANDUM.—If the within mentioned case should be settled by compromise then the fees of the within named attorneys are to be the same as mentioned within.

MAY 1, 1877. MARY S. OLIVER.

The following is the receipt:—

Received, this seventh day of February, 1877, eleven dollars of Mrs. Oliver by J. Darneille, to be applied to the suit of Mrs. Oliver against Mr. Cameron.

Mr. Darneille—At the time the receipt was made Mr. Peters and myself, it appears, were absent from the office.

General Butler—To save time I wish to put in all the letters that we have proved upon. I do not wish to take the time in reading them. If considered in they can be referred to in argument.

Mr. Darneille objected.

The Court—That settles it; it cannot be done.

MOTION TO DISMISS.

General Butler—I will have printed copies made of them for the benefit of all parties.

General Butler said that the suit could not be maintained, and asked that it be withdrawn from the jury; that no matter what the Kentucky law may be, to all intents and purposes she was a married woman. She had put her marriage in two ways. She had for five years lived with Mr. Oliver and held herself out as his wife. They had from that cohabitation three children. One had been laid in the cemetery and over it was placed a stone bearing the inscription, "Tommie, son of Thomas and Mary Oliver." If cohabitation ever proved marriage then it had been done in this case. She also expressly swore that the marriage ceremony between her and Mr. Oliver was performed by his bookkeeper. He might have been a Justice of the Peace, for there was nothing to show he was not. It frequently occurred in Massachusetts that business men were magistrates, and it might be the same way in Kentucky. Taking this state of things into consideration, was she not estopped from saying that she was not married? It cannot be denied that she was passing as a widow. She told Mr. Cameron that she had not heard from Mr. Oliver for many years, but admitted on the stand writing to him down to within six months of this trial; also, she stated that she did not know whether he was living or not.

The Court—You claim that cohabitation is marriage for all intents and purposes?

General Butler—There was never a case for a jury where there was only one witness and that witness swearing all one way.

The Court—Don't she swear two ways?

General Butler—If she does then you ought to throw her out.

The Court—No, I will reserve my decision for the present upon the legitimacy of the marriage and the effect of it upon a contracting party.

MR. OLIVER SWORN.

General Butler—Call Thomas M. Oliver.

Mr. Oliver came forward.

General Butler—Let him be sworn.

Mr. Darneille—Hold on, I object. I want him sworn first on his *voir dire* to see to his competency.

The Court—Well, if you make that objection, I will dispose of this case very quickly. This purports to be the living husband of the plaintiff, and if you object upon this ground I will settle this case very promptly.

Mr. Darneille—I do not wish to be captious about this matter and withdraw my objection.

Mr. Oliver was then sworn and examined by General Butler. He said that his name was Thomas Marshall Oliver; in the year 1850, in New Orleans and Raleigh, N. C., he was doing business as a merchant tailor and clothier; in the spring of 1850 he went to New York to buy goods; he met the plaintiff (Mrs. Oliver) at Osborn's masonic regalia establishment, in that city, working, he visited that city again in the fall of the year; he went to the store, inquired for her and found out that she had left there; he visited New York again in the spring of 1851; while in the city that time, in company with other persons, he visited an assignation house; while waiting in the parlor the plaintiff came in; he passed the night with her; she gave him a history of herself, where she came from and who she was; she told him that she came from Ireland to this country in company with her father, in 1848; they landed at Quebec, but not getting along well there they went to Montreal and next to New York, where he met her; she told him that she had been seduced while employed at Osborn's by a man named Johnnie Platt, under a promise of marriage; that she had a child by him, which was born alive but afterward died; this occurred between the first time he met her and the meeting at the assignation house; her name then was Mary Ann McCaffrey; she never said anything about the Duke of Armand, Butler family or other distinguished people; he met her in New York a number of times and passed several nights with her.

THE JOURNEY SOUTH.

In the year 1851 he made arrangements for her to go with him South; he was in search of vest and coat makers and told her that if she would go with him to Raleigh, N. C., he would give her employment and never expose her past life; she agreed to the arrangement, and he took her with him to North Carolina; she said that she never had been that far South before; the witness' mother's name was Alice Price Oliver; she did not travel with them from New York to Raleigh, and never heard of the woman until he brought her to North Carolina; the plaintiff was never with the Stuart family; he believed that she called herself Cooper sometimes; in 1851 he went to New York three times, and on one of these journeys he took her back to New York with him; she had been with him then only two or three months; when he got her back to that city he left her there; he never stopped with her at Petersburg, Va., and did not know any family there by the name of Stuart; he had nothing improper to do with the woman while she was in North Carolina; on January 8, 1852, he left Raleigh for Louisville, Ky., to set up a merchant tailoring establishment and clothing house; in 1852 he again met the plaintiff in New York and sent her to Louisville with his nephew, James W. Gaskins; his mother remained in North Carolina until 1853; when he met the plaintiff in 1851 she said that her age was nineteen and she was not educated; he directed his nephew to board her where he (the nephew) was stopping, at the house of Mrs. Biggert, a public boarding house; he directed the foreman of his shop to give her vests to make and it was done; he went to Louisville in May or June and found her at Mrs. Biggert's; he suggested that her education was imperfect, and if she would go to school he would send her and pay for it; she consented; as she claimed to be a Catholic, he sent her to a convent at Portland, Ky.; she seemed to be restless and wanted to return to Louisville, and finally did so; then he sent her to a Methodist school in Bloomsfield, Nelson county, Ky., kept by Rev. Mr. Brown; it was then for the first time that she took the name of Cooper; she remained there one session, about five months, and then came back to Louisville, and he boarded her with a widow lady; up to that time there had been no improper relations between them; up to that time he was trying to reform her, but reformation seemed impossible.

WITNESS' RELATIONS TO THE PLAINTIFF.

His mother was not in Louisville at that time, and had nothing to do with sending her to school; it was after she returned from Bloomsfield that he commenced living with her; that was in August, 1854; his mother was in Louisville at that time; he rented a house in Walnut street for her, and until June 1, 1860, they lived together in different places, at which time he left her; on June 5, 1860, he married his present wife; he never lived with the plaintiff in his mother's house while in Louisville; his mother had nothing to do with her, but she knew witness' connection with the woman; he had a girl by her named "Tommie;" she was born May 22, 1855, and died March 9, 1856; she was buried in a cemetery at Louisville; the plaintiff put up the head stone, and on it was the inscription, "Tommie, daughter of T. M. and M. E. Oliver."

There was no S in the plaintiff's name at that time; he had another child by her now living; she was born March 12, 1857; he never said she was his wife, but she went by the name of Mrs. Oliver; when he first met her he was a grass widower, and was up to 1859, when he was divorced; that was his second wife; she was in Newbern, N. C., and named Frances Maria Stuart, and that was where the plaintiff got the name of Stuart, and, strange to say, his wife's father's name was Charles Stuart; he never heard of her calling herself Stuart until he came to this city; he lived with the plaintiff until June, 1860, when he quit her, and never lived with her since, but had seen her frequently; she had been writing to him constantly since 1860 up to two weeks ago; he could not make a move that the plaintiff did not know about almost as soon as himself, no matter where he went; when he got to his destination he was very apt to find a letter from her awaiting him; she had written to every member of his family; when he quit her he claimed the child and had made several attempts to get her, but failed; in October, 1866, he was living in Cincinnati, Ohio, and received a letter from her; (he never kept any of her letters because they were not fit for anybody to read), saying that if he would come to Louisville and take her and the child's clothes out of pawn she would give him the child; in October, 1866, he made a legal attempt to get the child and the court decided against him; the letter to him was written after the legal proceedings commenced; he went to Louisville, found her and the child and they were both as poor as they could be; she had no valuable jewels or clothing then to carry on a lawsuit with; she must have acquired them since; he took the clothing out of pawn, but after she got it she would not let him have the child; whenever she drew upon him for the child she always got it; he received a letter from her in the latter part of 1860 from New Orleans; appeals for aid for the child were very frequent, and he honored them until he found she was deceiving him; he never died in Richmond, as his presence showed; he never sent a dollar to her after 1866; he obtained possession of the child April 1, 1867.

DISPOSITION OF THE CHILD.

He recived a letter stating that the mother had abandoned the child at the convent in Portland avenue, Louisville, Ky.; he went there, took her away and put her with the Sisters of Notre Dame at Reading, Ohio; she was there from 1867 to 1874; Mr. Clements, of Louisville, drew a contract by which he was to have possession of the child, it was signed by the plaintiff and himself; it bound him to clothe, educate and bring up the child as one of the first families in the State; after this was done the plaintiff tried to get up a mob to take the child away, and in 1874 for safety he sent her to the convent in Rittenhouse square, Philadelphia; he has kept the daughter out of her mother's way ever since, and she is now married and respected, and he did not intend that the plaintiff should ever know where she was living; as late as 1874 the plaintiff was corresponding with the partner of witness to find out where her daughter was.

NO CEREMONY OF MARRIAGE.

No ceremony of marriage was ever performed between him and the plaintiff by his bookkeeper; he received a letter from her in 1878 requesting that when he answered it that he would direct the letter to the care of Judge Marshall in this city; instead of writing to her he wrote to Judge Marshall on September 26, 1878, giving that gentleman her whole history; he had missed their old family Bible from the house sometime since, and they wondered what had become of it; if it was taken away it must have been stolen. (The Bible that the plaintiff had brought into court was here exhibited). He had seen that book before; it was the family Bible of his family, kept by his mother when she was living; his mother died at Newport, Ky., January 17, 1866; the Bible had been in their family for more than a century.

The plaintiff went to Montreal once while she was living with him, and brought back her father, sister and an old nurse, that she said had been in their family for many years, named Bridget O'Brien; the plaintiff had another sister besides the one that visited her, and she was in a convent at Montreal; her father was a plain, unassuming man, looking nothing like a retired general or a duke; he did not know whether he could write or not.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

The witness was then cross-examined by Mr. Peters.

He now resides at Millerville, Ky., with his nephew; his first marriage was with Mary Ann Newbourgh; it took place at Winchester, Va.; he could not remember the date, but it was previous to 1833; that wife was dead and buried before 1850; he married his second wife in 1835 or 1836 at Newbern, N. C.; her name was Frances Mary Stuart; he separated from her in 1842, and was divorced from her in 1859; he lived separate and apart from her for eight years in Raleigh, N. C.; he brought the suit for divorce; he took out a license on June 5, 1866, at Lexington, Ky., and there married his present wife; he made no provision for the maintenance of the plaintiff when he got married, neither did he tell her of his intention to marry, because he did not think it was any of her business; he had denied publicly and repeatedly to several persons before he left the plaintiff that she was ever his wife, and at no time did he call her Mrs. Oliver or allow her to be called by that name with his consent; he never told her father at the time he was visiting at their house that his daughter was the mistress of witness, neither did he tell him that she was his wife; he did not believe that he was solvent or that a judgment against him could be collected in the State of Kentucky.

The cross-examination was continued for an hour longer, but nothing new was elicited.

ANIMUS OF THE WITNESS.

On the redirect examination by General Butler the witness stated that he believed that in coming here he could show that the plaintiff was a blackmailer; that his testimony would mitigate damages if not destroy them altogether. She had annoyed and tormented his family for years, and if he could prevent any innocent person from becoming her victim he intended to do it. He had not been promised anything for coming here and testifying, and did not expect anything beyond his expenses. If he did not receive these he had sufficient money to pay his way back home.

This closed the testimony of the witness, and the further hearing of the case was postponed until Monday next.

FOUND GUILTY.

A VERDICT OF MURDER IN THE SECOND DEGREE RETURNED AGAINST JOHN SMITH FOR THE KILLING OF HENRY MADDEN.

Renewed interest was taken yesterday in the trial of John Smith, the Hollander, who was proprietor of the den known as "The Sailor's Return," No. 13 Oliver street, and who was charged with the murder of Henry Madden, an English seaman, on the night of January 23. The Court of General Sessions was again densely crowded. The prisoner, who is about thirty years old, at first wept bitterly, but toward the close of the proceedings became more composed and consulted repeatedly with his counsel, Messrs. Howe and Hummel and Colonel Spencer, during the day. There were also in attendance several of the unfortunate female inmates of Smith's establishment, whose levity was strangely out of keeping with the grave surroundings. As the proceedings drew to an end the crowd of spectators became very dense and the result was awaited by them with no little curiosity and by the prisoner with no little alarm. Mr. William F. Howe commenced his summing up for the defence shortly after Judge Cowing took his seat on the bench. Counsel said it was admitted that Smith fired the fatal shot, but urged that the shooting was done in self-defence. He earnestly submitted that the prisoner had done his utmost, in a peaceable manner to eject Madden and his boisterous shipmates (Green and Keating) from his premises. In doing this, having already been maltreated by them, he drew a revolver more for the purpose of frightening them than anything else. Counsel scouted the idea that the prisoner had gone into the yard and fired through a window into the barroom where Madden was standing. The evidence, he contended, showed that the shooting had taken place in the barroom, where Madden seized the muzzle of the gun. Aware of the fact that the sailors had possession of his revolver, and fearing that his life was in danger, Smith pulled the trigger—an act fully justifiable in view of the situation. Mr. Howe's address occupied over two hours. Shortly after two o'clock Assistant District Attorney Herring replied for the prosecution, and, although laboring under the disadvantage of a painful sore throat, occupied the interested attention of the jury for over an hour. With great deliberation and earnestness he argued, from all the testimony in the case, that the shooting, so far from being justifiable or excusable, was murder, as charged in the indictment. Indeed, he insisted that the jury could come to no other conclusion than that the prisoner was guilty of a wilful, premeditated, wicked crime. All the surrounding facts, he submitted, pointed clearly and unmistakably to the prisoner's guilt; his first attempt at shooting; his return to his room for his breech-loader, and the murder of the deceased from the outside window, whither he had retreated after being refused admittance to the barroom by his wife, who tried to avert the crime.

THE JUDGE'S CHARGE.

Judge Cowing then charged the jury, lucidly explaining the law regarding the different grades of murder and manslaughter. He referred to the important points in the evidence elicited on both sides during the trial. It was, he said, the duty of every man when attacked to endeavor to escape from his assailants and to use every means in his power to avoid coming in collision with hostile parties. Unless the jury came to the conclusion that the prisoner was in imminent danger of his life or serious bodily harm, and was unable to escape from the attacking party, they could not find the shooting justifiable. Should they find that the prisoner fired the fatal shot with premeditated design to kill, they could, of course, bring in a verdict of guilty. But if they found upon all the evidence that he was fully justified in believing his life in danger it would be their duty to acquit.

The jury retired shortly before four o'clock, and an hour later returned to court for instructions. They again retired, and at eleven o'clock found the prisoner guilty of murder in the second degree. On motion of Mr. Howe Judge Cowing remanded the prisoner for sentence pending the hearing of the motion for a new trial. The Court has no discretionary power in the matter of sentence, the penalty being imprisonment for life in the State Prison.

RECOMMENDED TO MERCY.

The trial of Michael Reilly, who was charged with killing his wife at their home, No. 15 Sullivan street, South Brooklyn, was concluded yesterday. The jury returned a verdict of manslaughter in the fourth degree and recommended the prisoner to the mercy of the Court. The prisoner was remanded to jail to await sentence.

POLICY COMPLICATIONS.

THE RECENT RAIDS IN JERSEY AND THE TALE THAT HANGS THEREBY.

Horace Farrier, a brother of ex-Assemblyman George H. Farrier, a short time ago, it is said, succeeded ex-Senator Noah D. Taylor as backer of a number of policy shops in Jersey City. The majority of the places in Jersey City and Hoboken were, it is alleged, backed by a man named Costigan. District Attorney A. T. McGill was notified a few days ago by ex-Policeman William Eaton, who is night watchman at the Jersey City Post Office, of the large number of policy places in the city. The Prosecutor took him before Judge Tusife, of the Court of General Sessions, where he made about thirty complaints. Prosecutor McGill found on looking over the complaints that none of Farrier's alleged places were complained of, and he accordingly had warrants issued for two places said to be under the latter's management. On Monday seventeen arrests were made, all the prisoners being required to give bail in the sum of $1,000. At the time of the arraignment only two were bailed, Joseph Hill and Charles Foster, and W. W. Farrier became their bondsmen. Costigan hearing that complaint had been made against him, on Wednesday surrendered himself to Sheriff Toffey and gave bail for trial. After regaining his liberty he lodged information with the District Attorney about Farrier, and the last of the places was closed yesterday, there being four arrests made. The prisoners were Joseph B. Weltch, Thomas Greene, John Freligh and Walter Lamb. Lamb, or "Gillie," as he is familiarly called, is a brother of one of the wealthiest residents in the city, and is said to be the oldest policy dealer in the country, having, as the story goes, carried slips from this city to Philadelphia on horseback before the days of telegraphy. All the prisoners were bailed.

COSTIGAN COMPLAINS.

Costigan alleges that the raids were the result of a "job" put up by Farrier to clean out and scare away the New York dealers, so that he could have a monopoly of the business in Hudson county, or so that no shop could be run in Jersey City which did not play its "slips" into him. Ex-Officer Eaton says that he was actuated by only moral motives by making the complaints. Costigan and his men allege that he was hired to do it by Farrier for $150. The trial of the accused will take place at the opening of the April term, and the developments promised are said to be of a highly interesting character.

THE STATE CAPITAL.

What Senator Murphy Will Say to Comptroller Olcott.

EXCISE LAWS FOR GOTHAM.

Amended Text of the Hudson River Tunnelling Scheme.

MORE SALARY REFORM.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE HERALD.]

ALBANY, March 21, 1879.

Senator Thomas Murphy states that he will prepare a letter in reply to that of Comptroller Olcott cutting down his bill for services as appraiser in connection with the Manhattan Life Insurance property. He says the amount to be charged for his work was left entirely to the officers of the company. Three of them, including the President, sat down, made the estimate and drew up the bill which he signed. He did not present the bill until after the report on the company was issued, so that there could be no appearance of coercion. The work would ordinarily, he says, have required several months to perform, but by using two pairs of horses and rushing through at full speed he finished it in six weeks. The amount allowed by Mr. Olcott, he says, would not pay his carriage bills, and he declares he will not accept such a paltry sum. He will bring the most experienced real estate dealers in New York to swear that the valuation of the 228 pieces of property is worth more than the sum to which his bill is reduced. Lawyers here tell the Senator that there is no appeal from the Comptroller's decision, and that the latter, if he chose, might have allowed $1 only. Precisely what steps he will take to secure his pay he has not yet decided; but he has the assurance of an officer of the company that if he brings suit for the full amount the company will not defend it, as they are perfectly willing to pay. Superintendent Smyth says that Governor Robinson's son and private secretary saw Mr. Olcott in relation to the bill several months ago, and that he then agreed to pay it. Mr. Smyth, however, claims that he then predicted that Mr. Olcott would keep the bill several months, and then write a letter to the newspapers about it on account of Senator Murphy's friendship for him (Mr. Smyth). The refusal of the Comptroller to pay the bill puts into "a bad box" a relative of Senator Murphy, to whom the claim was assigned in payment of a debt.

BRINGING FORWARD THE EXCISE BILLS.

The preliminary skirmish on excise legislation came off in the Assembly this morning. One decisive feat has been accomplished so far—the taking out of the Committee on Internal Affairs of all the measures introduced at the present session which aim to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors in certain cities of this State. A majority of the committee last night concluded to report favorably an excise bill drawn up in accordance with the views of that body. It contains a provision effectually repealing the hotel clause, which seems to be the principal objection of the liquor interest in New York city to the present muddled condition of affairs. This report was handed in to-day a few minutes after the reading of the journal. Mr. R. Strahan next made an adroit speech, in which he suggested that all the excise measures should be brought out of the committee room and placed before the whole House for discussion. His remarks were courteous in the extreme to the Committee on Internal Affairs and had a good effect. The result followed in the prompt passage of Mr. Strahan's resolution, although by a close vote—47 to 42. We may now expect some hot discussions and energetic wirepulling when all these important bills come up in Committee of the Whole. The following is the list embraced in Mr. Strahan's resolutions:—

Assembly bill 108, introduced by Mr. Stephenson, entitled, "An act to suppress intemperance, pauperism and crime and to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors, wines, ale and beer in the cities of the State of New York."

Assembly bill 109, introduced by Mr. Strahan, entitled, "An act to regulate the sale of strong or spirituous liquors, wines, ale and beer in the city of New York."

Assembly bill 110, introduced by Mr. Langbein, entitled "An act to suppress intemperance and to regulate the sale of liquors, wines, ale and beer in the cities of the State of New York."

Assembly bill 112, introduced by Mr. Ogden, entitled "An act further to amend Chapter 175 of the Laws of 1870, entitled 'An act to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors.'"

Assembly bill not printed, introduced by Mr. Varnum, entitled "An act to suppress intemperance in the city of New York."

DR. HAYES' TUNNEL BILL.

The important bill introduced by Mr. Hayes some time since (the points of which were published in the HERALD) providing for the construction of a tunnel across the Hudson River, from Jersey City to New York, has been materially amended and will be considered next week. It is intended by certain capitalists behind this measure to go to work immediately after the passage of the bill and complete the work so that cars of the Pennsylvania, Erie, New Jersey Central and other roads can be run across to New York under water, thereby saving great delay in transporting passengers and freight by steamboats. An immense depot is also to be located in the lower part of the city. It is contended that such an arrangement will redound materially to the commercial advantage of the metropolis and to the convenience of millions of passengers. It will be seen that the objectionable features alluded to in the HERALD editorial criticism have been entirely stricken out. The following is the full text of this bill as now agreed upon in the Committee on Cities:—

An act to provide for excavating, tunneling and bridging for transportation purposes within villages and cities of the State.

SECTION 1.—Whenever, according to the route and plans adopted by any railroad company heretofore or hereafter formed under chapter 140 of the Laws of 1850, entitled "An act to authorize the formation of railroad corporations and to regulate the same," and all acts supplementary thereto, for the building of its railroad, it shall be necessary or proper to build said road or any part of the same under ground, or to tunnel or bridge any river or waters, it shall be lawful for said company to enter upon and acquire title to such lands under water, and uplands, owned and unemployed by the State, as shall seem necessary to be taken for purposes herein mentioned, and they shall have the power to construct, erect and secure the necessary foundations and other structures which may be required for the operating of or connecting one railway with another and for maintaining the same, and purchase or acquire in the manner now provided by law such land or rights or easements in land along their said route upon, over or beneath the surface thereof, as may be necessary for the building of their said road; provided, however, that where said road runs underneath the ground at such depth as to enable said company to tunnel the same such tunnel shall be so built and at all times kept in such condition as to make the surface of the ground above the same, and in the neighborhood thereof, firm and safe for buildings and other erections thereon, and, as soon as can be done, such surface shall be restored to its former condition, except so far as may be actually required for ventilation of the tunnel beneath the same, or access thereto; and provided further, that in the event of the building of such railroad or any part thereof being construed to fall within the provisions of section 18 of article 3 of the constitution, whenever such road or any part of the same is intended to be built within the limits of any city or incorporated village of this State, and to run by means of a tunnel underneath any of the streets, roads or public places thereof, the said company before building the same underneath any of said streets, roads or public places, shall obtain the consent of the owners of one-half in value of the property on the line and the assent of the proper authorities having control of said streets, roads or public places; or, in case such consent cannot be obtained, the General Term of the Supreme Court in the district in which such city or village is, may upon application, appoint three commissioners, who shall determine, after a hearing of all parties interested, whether such railroad ought to be allowed to be built underneath said streets, roads and public places, or any of them, and in what manner the same may be so built with the least damage to the surface and to the use of the surface by the public, and the determination by said commissioners, confirmed by the Court, may be taken in lieu of the consent of the property owners.

SEC. 3.—All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 4.—This act shall take effect immediately.

and provided further that when any railroad company constructs under this act their railway under any part of or within the limits of any city or incorporated village of this State it shall be lawful for any other railroad, built under the provisions and limitations of this act, to connect therewith at such points or places as they may elect, and all such railroad companies constructed under this act shall be subject to all the provisions of an act, entitled "An act to authorize the formation of railroad companies and to regulate the same," passed April 2, 1850, and all acts supplementary thereto. And, further, at such point or points, place or places, where such connections shall be made by connecting roads, the railroad companies owning such roads shall build at their joint expense for their joint use such passenger and freight depots and other accommodations for handling passengers and freight as may be required for the convenience of the public.

SEC. 2.—Any such railroad company the greater part of whose roadbed according to its said route and plan is to be below the surface of the ground, and whose road does not exceed three miles in length, may at any time after its said route shall have been adopted, and the map thereof shall have been filed as required by law, merge and consolidate its capital stock, franchises and property with the capital stock, franchises and property of any other railroad company organized under the laws of this or any other State in the manner now provided by law for the consolidation of railroad companies whenever the railroads of said companies so to be consolidated may together form a continuous line of railroad, provided such consolidation shall not prevent all connecting railroads from having equal rights of transit.

WHERE WAS THE NEGRO?

The Railroad Committee to-day reported adversely Mr. Madigan's bill compelling one-horse street railroad companies to employ conductors as well as drivers. The report was adopted without any opposition.

PATENT MEDICINE IMPOSTORS.

Mr. Dougherty has introduced a bill which aims to protect the public from patent medicine impostors. It provides for the appointment of a commission of five by the Governor to examine all patent medicines and prevent the sale of any materials of an injurious character. These commissioners must be physicians and chemists.

FEMALE SUFFRAGE.

The gallantry of the Legislature was exhibited today in the report of the Assembly Judiciary Committee requesting Congress to submit to the Legislatures of the several States an amendment to the constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of citizens of the United States on account of sex.

MONEY FOR THE SOLDIERS' HOME.

The bill making an appropriation for the New York Soldiers and Sailors' Home at Bath, Steuben county, was considered in Committee of the Whole. Mr. Brundage moved to make the item for improving the grounds, $16,000 instead of $10,000. Messrs. Langbein, Varnum and Trowbridge sustained this motion. Mr. Fish thought it best to leave the change to the Senate after a further hearing. Mr. Brooks said if the legislation here was to be based upon sympathy for the old soldier then this amendment and all others like it would be adopted, but members here have a duty to perform. They are here to protect the Treasury from extravagant or wrong expenditures. He referred to the origin of this home and the promises made that if the State would relieve it from its embarrassments it would never become a tax on the State. He thought the Ways and Means Committee had been liberal in the amount it had put in the bill. Mr. Sloan expressed similar views, and said that the Ways and Means Committee had carefully examined the necessities of this case and had reported the bill under a full understanding, and yet the House is appealed to on the ground of patriotism to increase the appropriation. He claimed to have as much patriotism and as much sympathy for the veteran soldiers as any man, but he wanted common sense mixed with such sentiments. Mr. Brundage then withdrew his motion, saying that he would bring it before the Senate committee when the bill reached that body. The bill was ordered to a third reading.

SMYTH'S OLD PARTNER FAILS.

Mr. Walker, the former partner of Superintendent of Insurance Smyth in the brewing business here, failed to-day. There is a rumor that his insolvency was caused by bad commercial paper given him by the present Superintendent of Insurance. There seems to be no foundation for the report.

MEASURES IN THE SENATE.

The bill providing that fire insurance companies must pay to policy-holders the full amount named in their policies when property is destroyed instead of replacing the loss as at present practised, passed the Senate to-day.

The special "Reform Committee" of the Senate reported two bills. The first is in relation to the salaries of legislative employés, and does not differ essentially in its provisions from the Assembly Reform bill introduced by Mr. Skinner, and passed by the lower House. The second bill is in relation to the salaries of State officers and other State employés, and is similar to the Glidden bill in the Assembly, though not making such sweeping reductions. The salaries of the officers named below are fixed as follows:—Comptroller, $5,000; Secretary of State, $4,000; Attorney General, $5,000; State Treasurer, $4,000; Superintendent of Bank Department, $5,000; Superintendent of Insurance Department, $5,000; Auditor, $4,000; Superintendent of Public Instruction, $4,000; Engineer and Surveyor, $4,000; Superintendent of State Prisons, $5,000, and for travelling expenses, $500; Superintendent of Public Works, $5,000; Superintendent of the New Capitol, $5,000; Canal Appraisers, $3,000; State Commissioners in Lunacy, $3,000; Superintendent of Elmira Reformatory, $3,500; Superintendent of Binghamton Asylum, $2,000; Secretary of Public Charities, $3,000; Assistant Secretary, $1,500; Superintendent Utica Asylum, $4,000; Superintendent of the Willard Asylum, $4,000; Superintendent of the Hudson River Hospital, $2,500; Superintendent of the Middletown Asylum, $3,000; Clerk Court of Appeals, $4,000; Reporter Court of Appeals, $4,000; Governor's Private Secretary, $3,000; Deputy Comptroller, $3,500; Deputy Insurance Superintendent, $3,000; Deputy Attorney General, $4,000; Deputy Secretary of State, $2,500; Deputy Treasurer, $2,500; Assistant Adjutant General, $2,000; Deputy Superintendent Public Instruction, $2,500; Deputy Engineer and Surveyor, $2,500; Deputy Superintendent of Bank Department, $2,500; Secretary Board of Regents, $2,500; Deputy Auditor, $2,500; chief clerk Appraisers, $2,500; Assistant Superintendents Public Works, each, $2,500; agents and wardens at Sing Sing, Clinton and Auburn, $3,000; Director Natural History Museum, $2,500; State Assessors, each, $2,500; Superintendent Adirondack Survey, $2,500 and travelling expenses as approved by the Comptroller; Auditor's chief clerk, $2,700; State Librarian, $2,000; Assistant Secretary Regents University, $2,000; Governor's military secretary, $2,000; Commissioners Quarantine each, $2,000; Inspector Gas Metres, $1,500; Shore Inspectors, $1,500; physicians at Auburn, Clinton and Sing Sing, $1,500; chaplains, $1,200; Superintendent State Hall, $1,000; Superintendent State Cabinet, $1,000; Superintendent Old Capitol, $1,000. All chief officers are directed to reduce the pay of their employés to the minimum, and to report to the Legislature the names, terms of service and amount paid such employés.

A NEW DEPARTURE.

GERMAN REPUBLICANS CALL UPON THE LEGISLATURE TO TAX CHURCH PROPERTY.

At the monthly meeting of the German Republican Central Committee held at the Steuben House last evening, every Assembly district in the city being fully represented and ex-Judge Dittenhoefer presiding, Mr. Beyerley, of the Second district, offered the following preamble and resolution:—

Whereas in a republic in which equal rights are guaranteed to all, the duties and obligations to the government should be borne by all alike; and whereas a discrimination is made in favor of religious congregations, which escape taxation and thus unjustly increase the burdens of the citizens; and whereas this favor is abused in the erection of extravagant and untaxed edifices; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of New York be requested in the revision of the tax laws to provide for the taxation of church property.

The moment the resolution had been read a dozen members arose, anxious to address the Chair. Mr. Knobloch said:—"In so far as the adoption of this resolution will injure the future prospects of the republican party I move that the preambles and resolution be laid on the table."

The CHAIRMAN—Does anybody second the motion?

No one in the crowded meeting room seconding the resolution Mr. Knobloch sat down.

Mr. REININGER—Mr. Chairman, I do not see how a single German republican can make a motion to lay such a resolution on the table. Pity it is that at this late hour in the existence of the republican party we should only begin to discuss this important question. German republicans ought to be and shall be the pioneers in this movement. Other States have done it and we must follow. Church property must be taxed, whatever time-serving politicians or bigoted legislators may say to the contrary. I call for the unanimous adoption of these resolutions.

NO LONGER A CRIME.

Ex-Judge Dittenhoeter, having vacated the chair, said:—"Six or eight years ago I handed in resolutions of a similar purport to the State Convention in Utica. I was then told, as we have been told here this evening, that such a movement was high treason to the republican party. Experience has since taught me, however, that I was right then and am right now. I have been a republican from conviction since 1856, and from conviction only I have remained a republican. But our battle is not yet finished. The victory is not all ours yet. We must go on and emancipate ourselves and the masses from the burdens which the uncalled for favors bestowed upon corporations and religious societies have thrown on our shoulders. It is no longer treason to speak in this manner. Four years after I introduced resolutions like these in Utica General Grant, in a message to Congress, recommended an amendment to the constitution calling for the separation of all schools from church establishments and the taxation of church property. When once a republican President makes such a declaration it is no longer treason for us to talk in this manner. As German republicans it is our duty to demand the taxation not only of churches, but of railroad companies, telegraph companies and all other corporations. I am convinced that at the very outset of such a movement the burdens now borne by the people will be reduced at least one-half."

The vote was then taken amid great enthusiasm, every man, with one exception, rising and voting aye. Mr. Knobloch voted no. The meeting soon after adjourned.

ANTI-TAMMANY.

A meeting of the Committee on Contested Seats, of the Anti-Tammany organization, was held last night at Irving Hall. Among those present were ex-Senator Hugh H. Moore, who presided; James E. Morrison, Mayor Cooper's private secretary; Maurice J. Powers, Thomas Costigan, George H. Purser, Frank A. Ransom, T. J. Gibbons, Nelson J. Waterbury, John J. Fitzgerald, William Arrowsmith and others. The trouble in the Seventh Assembly district, between Messrs. Purser, Ransom and Fitzgerald on the one side and Messrs. Arrowsmith and Gibbons on the other was taken up. Both parties claimed to represent the true democracy in the district. Affidavits on both sides were submitted to the committee last evening.

"FINANCE OF THE FUTURE."

MR. E. MOODY BOYNTON, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE GREENBACK CENTRAL CLUB OF THIS CITY.

Thirty gentlemen and one lady, constituting the Greenback Central Club of this city, met in a small parlor at the Sturtevant House last evening to hear Mr. E. Moody Boynton, of Massachusetts, read a paper on the "Finance of the Future." Richard Schell occupied the chair, and Peter Cooper, J. C. Zachos, G. W. de Cunha and W. A. Carsey, leading members of the greenback party, were among those present. The paper was very lengthy, occupying, together with a running commentatary by the author over three hours in the delivery. Portions of it were received with great favor by the hearers. He considered that the use of a metalic basis for the circulating medium to be not only useless but pernicious in its effects. Patented paper, inks, engraving and powerful presses, he said, are a far better protection than any coinage can be against the arts of the counterfeiter; while scarcity of coin, uncertainty of mining and the exportable nature of the material render it unsuitable for the safest unfluctuating national money. If the money of this country were divided Americans would possess about $14 *per capita*. This sum is used to transfer all values by its rapid circulation. Dealers are therefore obliged to issue notes which are not currency, and debt and inflation of credit increase one hundred fold where current money is wanting. This is the source of all panics. The increase of commodity has outrun the tools of transfer. France is the best illustration of a country escaping panic for fifty years, because possessed of greater monetary tools than any other nation. She possesses an average of $57 to each of her citizens.

EXPANSION AND CONTRACTION.

Expansion is life; contraction is death. Capital is but fossilized life, accumulated labor product. A fourfold production does not indicate the need of a contraction of American currency. The money monger, dealing in selected credits, finds the purchasing power of his money greatly increased, the man of energy, the holder of real estate, the employer of labor suffers, but upon the million toilers and their helpless wives and children fall the burdens of hopeless idiocy which permits the panics that have agonized our country every year since 1860. So jealous were the creditor classes of the United States of the issue of eighteen millions remaining of the reserve of the greenbacks in the spring of 1874, that they did not hesitate to threaten revolution if this thing was to be permitted to go on. It did not matter that all the New York bankers a few months previously demanded of the President the issue of this very reserve and that $26,000,000 of it had been issued.

The lecturer then reviewed the histories of the famous banks of Venice and Amsterdam, and argued therefrom that the specie basis gives no real security. He summed up as follows:—

"Applying the statistics of the past decade to the supposed present population of the United States, the various classes of the employed and productive embrace more than fifteen millions of individuals. A depression of twenty-two per cent is equivalent to the loss of nearly two thousand millions of days' work annually, or as many dollars, of intrinsic values, of that labor product which alone forms the wealth of nations and the gold of commerce. I have not taken into account the loss of machinery production, or the almost limitless power of expansion of coal, iron, cotton, woollen and wooden industries, in which we should surpass all other nations, because God has given us more of these rich endowments than the world possesses elsewhere. Sixty-one per cent of the iron furnaces were idle in March, 1868, which may be taken as a fair average of the past six years. The addition of this gigantic wealth, with the expansion of the real estate they would have supported, with the advent on our shores of millions of productive Europeans, would have nearly doubled the values of the forty billions we possessed in 1872, but for the awful crime of national suicide which we are examining. To stop production is to invite revolution and national bankruptcy alike, and as production alone is wealth, and none can ever have too much wealth if exchange be free, there is no madness greater than the contraction of the tool, money that, in all the ages experience has proved, oppresses the king on his throne and the beggar in his hovel by its all-pervading, crushing force."

TALMAGE ON THE SAINTS.

AMERICAN POLITICS, ST. PATRICK AND SAINTS IN GENERAL DISCOURSED ON IN THE TABERNACLE.

In the Brooklyn Tabernacle last evening Mr. Talmage devoted his discourse to American politics, St. Patrick and veneration of saints in general. After speaking of the abuses that exist in both political parties in this country he said:—It is not a healthful sign when one party predominates over another. But we have this consolation, that after a century of quaking and political agitation the government of the United States stands to-day on a firmer basis than ever. We must rely on the ballot box for our moral and financial condition. We must stop this cant about disunion, a solid North and a solid South. We must raise the granite wall of our great republican fabric till its roof covers all nationalities and till despotism is completely crowded out. It is the custom with many Americans to deride American institutions, especially the ballot box; but I say that there is no nation where intelligence, industry and good morals have more freedom. The longer I live the more I love America. Travel where I may here I live, and let us hope here may I die; for, after all, the thought is forced upon me, after all my travels, there is no country like ours; with its gigantic mountains, its vast rivers, its immense plains and its broad expanse of territory. No wonder that Columbus when he landed on our soil fell down and kissed it. We can wish no better for our children than for ourselves, and let us hope we may ever prove true to this country, the dearest land to us. Eternal God, be Thou the defence, the guardian and the protector of this nation!

PANEGYRIC OF ST. PATRICK.

Since last we met Irishmen have assembled in churches and at banquets to honor the memory of St. Patrick, the Irish apostle. Now, let me say that if St. Patrick did half the good that is attributed to him all the churches may well feel proud of such a man. Talk as you will, and say this is superstition, but we all have saints to bless us, like St. Mary, St. John, St. David, St. Catharine and many others. I pity from my heart the man who does not feel the holy loving influence of some dear saint at one time or another. There are men here listening to me who have been kept upright by the influence of just such holy beings. Think of the dear good mother or good aunt who has passed into the blessed world, and say, if you can you never feel her influence. You cannot do wrong but she chides you; you cannot do right but she blesses you. And here let me say that the Protestants have as many saints as the Catholics, and they revere them. They call on them as fervently, in such endearing, imploring terms as "St. David, my father; St. Catharine, my mother." There is no family here but has an aunt gone to heaven to be a saint. You call the children by her name; she is, when in this world, consulted when the bride's toilet is to be arranged, when the dearest hopes of the family circle are to be gratified.

Mr. Talmage drew a vivid picture of the closing scenes of such a life, when the household is gathered together around the dying bed and when at last St. Mary passes away from an enchanted sick bed to the "house of many mansions." He closed by saying:—"St. Patrick has been a patron saint for more than thirteen hundred years; but the humblest Christian man may become, like him, a saint. Anything well done is done forever. May the ages to come long keep their memories green. They that instruct others to righteousness shall shine like stars through all eternity."

THE DUMPING NUISANCE.

HOW THE SEEDS OF AN EPIDEMIC ARE CAST WIDESPREAD THROUGH THE EAST RIVER DISTRICTS—ACTION BY THE BOARD OF HEALTH NEEDED.

Through a large heap of manure, which reeked with unpleasant exhalations, a HERALD reporter wound his way last night. The atmosphere at the foot of East Thirty-ninth street was laden with a hundred diseases, and children from the neighborhood were basking in its baleful influences. In the rear of Peck's wood yard certain parties have started a depot for the storage of manure. All the disagreeable odors that nose is heir to arise in this delectable neighborhood, and are wafted far and wide. The locality in question is impregnated with all the seeds of epidemic disease. The March sun shines on litters of dirt, of which the Street Cleaning Department takes no heed. A few Hibernians in the vicinity of the Thirty-ninth street dump told the reporter that this constant aggregation of the city's filth in their neighborhood represented to them a source of income. The haggard faces of their suffering wives and the waxen hue and glassy eyes of their poor children showed unmistakably the interest that this income demanded.

Adjoining the Thirty-ninth street manufactory of poisons, a row of tenement houses rear their fourth and fifth stories into view. Last evening the effects of the dumping ground at the foot of Thirty-ninth street were visible in a sanitary point of view. The reporter went up flight after flight of stairs, and at each landing there was revealed such a Doré picture of woe that the eye grew dim at the contemplation of such misery.

"Why do your children have such pallid faces?" asked the reporter of a red haired, stalwart Irishman in Thirty-ninth street.

"Why? And you ask me after smelling the cause? Because the city government is a fraud that will allow such a nuisance to poison our families. A heap of manure within a block of us. Only think what the effect will be when the weather becomes warmer."

"Why don't you complain to the proper authorities?"

The chorus replied, for at this time the neighborhood was aroused, "The proper authorities? Who are they? Policemen who club us at a moment's notice or agents of the Board of Health, who meet us on the sidewalk and ask us foolish questions? Why, my dear sir, I have complained over and over again, or at least my wife has done so, she does all the writing for me, and yet there is no redress."

BANKER AND TRAMP.

[From the Pittsburg Evening Dispatch, March 19.]

Henry Englehart, a German, about fifty-five years of age, was found dead in bed yesterday morning at No. 297 Penn avenue, in the building occupied by F. Zeleny & Brother, bakers.

There is a painful romance connected with Englehart's history. In early life he was in good circumstances, and held the responsible position of cashier in a bank in Dresden, Germany. Reverses came, and in the decline of life the broken spirited man sought the New World in hope of bettering his condition. It seems that he could not find employment for which he was fitted, and about a year since tramped all the way from Philadelphia to this city in search of work. Here he fell in with Zeleny Brothers, and since then has been engaged in peddling cakes, which he carried around in a basket. Englehart's wife is dead, but he leaves two children in Saxony.