A. No, sir; I do not know how; I never had one.

Q. "This we agreed to, provided the Board of Public Works would re-award the contract in our name, so that we might be the contractors instead of sub-contractors, or, in other words, that the pay for the work should come direct to us. Kirtland did not know that the Board of Works would be willing to do this, and, therefore, we came back to Newark about as wise as when we went away." Now, did not you represent to those gentlemen that you had a contract and did not know whether or not you would have it changed so as to put it in their name! A. No, sir.

"Some time later, between March and July, we received several letters from Reed, stating that everything was settled—to come on and sign contract. Not having received any official notice of the award from the Board of Public Works, we paid no attention to Reed's letters." You say you went to Newark! A. Yes, sir.

Q. About this business! A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did Mr. Reed go with you! A. No, sir.

Q. You went alone! A. He furnished me the money to go.

Q. You went to Newark with this contract for 25,000 yards! A. No, sir, I did not; I did not make any such statement.

Q. "At last Reed came to Newark with a letter purporting to be written by the clerk of the Board of Public Works, setting forth that a certain job or jobs, as stated in the agreement which was published yesterday, had been awarded to us, and that the contract awaited our signature." You did not carry such a letter there! A. No, sir; I did not know of any such thing as such a letter.

Q. Then it must have been Mr. Reed who carried this letter, as he went there alone. A. I do not know how many times Reed went there at all.

Q. Who prepared this contract read to you by Mr. Wilson the other day in relation to your interest!

The Witness. That agreement!

Q. Yes! A. I do not know.

Q. You did not prepare it! A. No, sir.

Q. You are certain of that! A. Yes, sir.

Q. "Mr. O'Conner then went to Washington, saw Kirtland and Reed, signed the agreement with them which had been prepared by Kirtland."

The Witness. I never prepared it. I never prepared it. I do not remember of reading that document at all.

Q. "But failed in either seeing or signing any contract for any kind of work, and returned home the same day. Some time afterward Kirtland came to Newark to have us sign the contract to another party."

The Witness. That is false. There was no contract made that I know of then, or any award, "as we refused to have anything to do with him or it," saying he would pay us 20 cents per square yard out of it.

Q. Did you not carry a contract there for some other party asking them to sign it so as to appear as the contractor! A. No, sir.

Q. Then that whole statement is false! A. If you are trying to prove that statement in the paper false I will say that it is false.

The Chairman. I am trying to get at the fact if I can: I do not know whether I can or not; I think it is rather doubtful.

"We refused to sign a contract, or an assignment of it, for the reason that we did not think we would still be liable for the performance of the work. And further, that neither then or since has we done any work in the city of Washington, nor received nor paid any money for any interest done in the said city.

"THOMAS O'CONNER.
"BERNARD C. SHANLEY."

Q. Now, you say that statement is not true? A. I do not know anything about it.

Q. You never asked them to sign a contract in which they had no interest, offering them 20 cents per yard, if they would sign it and become, nominally, contractors! A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever propose to introduce O'Connor & Stanley to any person or persons, in this city, who would be able to secure them the contract! A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know anybody in the New York custom-house who had anything to do with contracts in the city of Washington! A. No, sir.

Q. This letter is signed by O'Connor & Shanley, I might say to you, Mr. Kirtland. A. I do not know who it is signed by.

Q. These statements are all false! A. What I have stated are false are.

By Mr. Christy: Q. Do you know Samuel Strong, who formerly resided in New York! A. I know him by reputation in this District; that is all.

Q. Were you ever in his employ! A. No, sir.

Q. In any capacity! A. No, sir.

Q. What amount of money did you bring to this city which you were going to use! A. I could not state that fact.

Q. I am now speaking of your second visit to Washington! A. From what time!

Q. During the time you had certain conversations with gentlemen here which have been detailed by you, when you left the city by way of Alexandria. What amount of money did you bring with you! A. I do not know what time you refer to; when I went to Chicago to see the notes!

Q. No; long since. I refer now to the time immediately prior to your being subpœnaed. How much did you bring to this city then! A. I do not know.

Q. How much did you receive in this city! A. Ten dollars.

Q. Was that all you received! A. I think so. Ten dollars is all that I can account for, at any rate.

Q. I desire to have you approximate, as near as you can, the amount you brought to the city when you came here. A. I cannot approximate to it. I was a long time in New York. I do not know what I spent. I do not know what I took with me when I left home.

Q. Before coming here you were for some time in New York! A. I was some time in the city of New York.

Q. You had considerable expense there; then you came here, and all you received was $10! A. Yes, sir; that is all I can account for now.

Q. There is this expression in a letter of which I presume this is a true copy, on page 1500 of the published testimony. It is a letter that you addressed to Mr. Wilcox on April 15, 1874, from the city of York: "I presume I shall be compelled to put in an appearance before the committee, but some one will be sorry." I desire you to state to whom you refer in that expression. A. I have already stated that. I refer you to my testimony.

Q. That may be true, but I desire to ask further, and to have a categorical answer, a reasonable answer—not an evasive one.

The Witness. That answer, then, is not satisfactory!

Mr. Christy. What answer was it! A. I say I referred to my wife particularly.

Mr. Christy. Now I say to the committee that an answer as absurd as that is, as is apparent from the context of the letter, is not an answer to the question; and I desire that the witness be compelled to answer. It is very clear that that is simply an evasive answer. He is as much under the contempt of this committee as if he refused to give an answer at all. I want to put the question squarely to the witness so that he may reply. If he stands mute, he is in contempt, and he is also if he give an absurd answer.

The Witness. I have no other answer to make to that.

Mr. Christy. It is evidently not ingenious, that answer; it is absurd.

The Chairman. Is that the only answer that you take exceptions to! [Laughter.]

Mr. Christy. We have not progressed beyond this yet. I desire the committee to require this witness to give an answer to that question; the answer which he gives not being a categorical answer.

Mr. Jewett. You desire the committee to compel this witness to tell the truth.

Mr. Christy. I do, or at least make a statement that is reasonable or probable.

The Witness. I ask the committee to protect me against this man. I don't want to tell a lie here. I have answered that question.

Mr. Christy. I make the question direct, that it is not an answer.

Mr. Jewett. In my mind if we enter upon that discussion it will take us a long time to get through.

The Chairman. I don't think the committee can now judge of the absurdity or otherwise of that answer. I don't think we can compel him to give another answer. He says distinctly that he referred to himself and his wife.

Mr. Wilson. That is a categorical answer as I understand it.

Mr. Christy. Not as you look at the context.

Mr. Stewart. That is argument.

Mr. Wilson. The answer, however, you will observe, is a direct answer to the question; that is the answer that he has given to the committee two or three times.

The Chairman. Have you any other question, Mr. Christy.

Mr. Christy. No, sir. This not being answered, in my judgment.

The Chairman. You are discharged Mr. Kirtland.

TESTIMONY OF FRANK A. LYNCH.

Frank A. Lynch sworn.

By the Chairman: Q. Are you familiar with the pipe! A. Yes, sir. I have been in the business over seven years.

Q. And the prices! A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you engaged in that business in 1871, '72, '73! A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you furnish the Board of Public Works with any pipe! A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know Mr. Wilson! A. Very well acquainted with him.

Q. Do you know the prices of pipe in Philadelphia! A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you noticed the testimony of Mr. Wilson as to the prices paid for pipe in this city! A. I read it over casually.

Q. Did you sell any pipe in this city! A. A great deal of it.

Q. To private parties! A. Yes, sir.

Q. How were your prices, compared with the schedule of prices that we have had before us! A. In some instances it ranged above and in some below it. We had no set prices in Washington for pipe. Some parties got better terms than others.

Q. How far below the prices in the schedule of prices did you sell pipe in this city! A. I should say in some instances as low as 15 per cent.; that is, from the card prices.

Q. Have you sold any at any price above the card price! A. No, sir.

By Mr. Mattingly: Q. Do you belong to that association that was referred to by Mr. Wilson! A. Yes, sir.

Q. You had a dispensation as to this District! A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Wilson: Q. To whom did you sell in this city! A. Mr. Thomas Evans, Henry Langston, George W. Goodall, and a number of others.

Q. Were they dealers in pipe! A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you sell to them to be delivered to the Board of Public Works! A. Not that we were aware of.

Q. Did you have an agent in this city! A. No, sir.

Q. Did you sell any to Mr. Wall! A. We sold one bill to him.

Q. How much! A. Twenty-five dollars, I think—in that neighborhood. A small bill.

By Mr. Hubbell: Q. Did you notice the price as covered by this card, page 1123! Will you just examine those prices and see whether these are above or below the ruling rates for pipe! A. There were no ruling rates here. Some parties gave more discount than others.

Q. How is that as to the amount of discount! A. I should say this was near the maximum; near the highest rate of discount. Near the highest rate of discount, but it is not the highest that we have offered.

By Mr. Stewart: Q. Did you sell cheaper than this! A. Yes, sir, that is, from—up to 12-inch. I do not know that we ever sold anything larger than 12-inch cheaper than that.

Q. To private individuals, or to the trade? A. To the traders.

Q. Do you make any difference when you sell to private individuals or those buying to sell again! A. We did not allow private individuals any discount at all. We sell at card prices. The discount is for the trade exclusively.

Q. You discount to the trade but not to individuals! You sell to the retail, but private parties at the trade prices! A. Yes, sir.

By Mr Merrick: Q. Did you furnish Mr. Evans a memorandum of prices at which you would furnish pipe to him on behalf of the firm of Lincoln & Black! A. I recollect writing a letter to him, quoting prices.

Q. When was that! A. The letter I have copied is in the year 1869.

Q. Did you furnish him any list of prices after that! A. I did, verbally.

By Mr. Mattingly: Q. Were the prices increased after 1869! A. I think they were about the same; that is the verbal prices I gave him; there was one year the prices were fixed; we could not depart from.

Q. When did your association fix the prices? A. The convention was in session in December, 1870; it was some time in January, 1871, before they went into effect.

Q. Did you furnish him a list of prices corresponding with that on page 1123! A. I think that is the copy of the list of prices I furnished him in 1869.

Q. You say that the same rate of prices continued up to 1871! A. Well, I don't think they made any different quotations.

Q. You didn't make any different quotations to him in 1871 from that! A. I think I did after some time in the early part. I think I was here in Washington in January, 1871, before the prices had gone into effect, and the association was established, and I endeavored to get his trade for that year before the association——

Q. And then you represented to him this same price as the prices furnished to him! A. I think I offered to him at 40 per cent. discount from card prices, delivered in Washington.

Q. Did you offer him at this rate of prices there? A. I think there is 40 per cent. I think that is in that neighborhood.

Q. Look at that and see if you offered him pipe in 1871 at the rate of prices which he has given there as the rate of prices furnished to him by you! A. On twelve-inch pipe this is not quite 40 per cent.

Q. You reiterated to him in 1871 the price you had in 1869! A. The card prices differed in 1871 from 1869; we sold it at $2.50 and 80 cents a foot in 1871.

Q. Your new prices went into operation in 1871! A. I think about the middle of January, 1871.

Q. In that year you reiterated to him your offer to sell to him at the same prices as you did in 1869! A. I came down here to Washington and endeavored to secure a trade, for the whole of that year, among our customers, at our old prices.

Q. And this bill of prices corresponds with that A. Very nearly.

By Mr. Stanton: Q. And that was before the new prices went into effect! A. Before it was binding on the members of the association.

Q. And after that you communicated to Mr. Evans the increase of prices, in these subsequent dealings with him! A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the summer of 1871, in June, 1871, you did not furnish him any such list as that! A. No, sir; I do not think I could. I would have been breaking faith with the association, if I had offered him that in the summer of 1871.

Q. What was the prices for fifteen and eighteen-inch pipe! A. One dollar and twenty-five cents for fifteen, and $1.00 for eighteen.

Q. Have you acquainted yourself with the prices paid by the Board of Public Works for pipe! A. No, sir.

By Mr. Merrick: Q. You cannot give the date at which you gave him that bill of prices! A. I know it was in 1869 that the bill was written for that purpose. I think it was in the month of June, 1869.

By Mr. Christy: Q. Do you know one William M. Wilson! A. I am very well acquainted with him.

Q. Do you know of his applying to the association for a dispensation for a certain term, to allow the various associations engaged in this trade to sell at whatever prices they chose to! A. I think it emanated from him. I know there was a great deal of talk about foreign pipe manufacturers selling here cheaper than we could afford to sell at.

Q. When was that application made! A. I think it must have been made the latter part of 1871—December, I think.

Q. So that, by that dispensation, the rate which the pipe could be furnished and sold here would have resulted in a very largely reduced price, and is not! A. Yes, sir.

The committee adjourned to 10 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, May 7, 1874.

THE DEATH OF DUELING IN MISSISSIPPI.

[From the New Orleans Picayune, April 26.]

A correspondent of the *Picayune* having called upon Governor Ames, asked what course would be taken.

Governor Ames. I am determined to put an end to the business. When Colonel Rhett killed Judge Cooley, though a strong pressure was brought to bear against me, I thought that I would not interfere, believing as the harm was done it might be a preventive for the future. In short, if a man grossly insulted another and was killed, I had an idea that the people would be rather chary of how they did such things in the future, and therefore took no step in the matter. The people of Louisiana, however, did not seem to appreciate this act at all, and lo and behold! the very next difficulty they had among themselves they came over here and fought. I grew a little angry, but as no one was hurt I took no action again. But when the difficulty took place between Phillips and Bienvenu, and the latter was killed, I determined to put a stop to this bloody work at once, and telegraphed to arrest all persons fighting duels in this State, and to prosecute them to the full extent of the law.

Now, as for me to ask Isaik to injure, here comes along a whole crowd of people to engage in another affair. They are fully equipped. They bring wine, cigars and eatables, and then go coolly to work to try and kill each other, with newspaper correspondents to chronicle events. Fortunately, no one is badly hurt; but the whole crowd is arrested and looked up. Now, I propose to have them all indicted and punished, as an example. I am going not only to find true bills against them, but also against the participants in the others; and if I cannot get them in this State, I will issue requisitions and have them brought here and tried. They need not think, because it is the custom in Louisiana, that it is or is going to be the custom in this State. If I can't get witnesses against them I will have some one of the number to turn State's evidence, and will convict them on that. If they all refuse to testify, then I can, under the laws of this State, send them to jail until one does.

THE *Iron Age* publishes a decision recently rendered in the United States Circuit Court for the Northern district of New York, in a case involving the question as to what a patent will and will not cover, which is of unusual importance to patentees and inventors, inasmuch as a knowledge of the principles laid down will tend to prevent much waste of time and money in futile applications or useless suits for infringement. The gist of the decision is as follows: A claim to a result is not, *per se*, patentable; neither can a claim be sustained which covers every mode or means by which certain advantages can be secured in an invention. The mere location of an old apparatus upon a machine is not patentable.

If new devices are required in order to adopt an old apparatus to a new position on a machine, and the change produces a new and beneficial result, then the change is patentable in connection with the new devices; not the result, but the means of producing it, or, if such a change brings into existence a new combination of devices productive of a new and useful result, the new combination is patentable. The patent will not be infringed in either case by a like change in the location of the apparatus unless the new devices which adapt it to its new position are also used in one case, and unless all the material elements of the newly developed combination are employed in the other. In changing the location of an apparatus upon a machine it seems not to be patentable to adopt such mechanical changes to render it practicable as mere judgment dictates or the necessity of the case demands. These are points which all inventors and patentees would do well to remember.

THE NATIONAL DISGRACE.

PROPOSITION TO FINISH WASHINGTON MONUMENT.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SUBJECT—WHAT THE COST WILL BE—VIEWS OF A UNITED STATES ENGINEER—THE ORIGINAL PLAN TO BE MODIFIED.

During the last session of Congress a resolution was introduced by Hon. N. P. Chipman, Delegate in Congress from the District, for the appointment of a special committee of thirteen to inquire into the practicability of completing the Washington National Monument. In accordance with the provisions of the resolution, General Chipman, who was appointed chairman, on May 1, submitted the report, which contains a general *resume* of the entire subject, the material points of which are given herewith. The report is accompanied by the report of Lieutenant Marshall, United States engineer corps, (who was detailed by General Humphreys to make a critical examination of the structure) and other interesting facts. After giving an historical review of the subject, the report says:

The doubt which has been expressed as to the stability of the proposed monument led the committee to address the Secretary of War a letter, asking that officer to cause an examination to be made into the foundation of the monument by a competent officer of engineers, and to report whether the shaft could safely be completed according to the original plan, and at what cost; and also to report the cost of constructing the shaft at a less height if deemed expedient.

Lieutenant Marshall, an accomplished and competent officer of engineers, was detailed for that purpose, and his report, hereto appended, shows the ability and the thoroughness with which he has gone into the subject.

The margin of safety in constructing the shaft to the height originally designed is found to be so small that your committee reluctantly feel compelled to recommend that it would be unwise to construct the monument to that height.

It is believed, however, that the shaft completed to the height recommended by Lieutenant Marshall would possess as good, if not better proportions, and would be equally satisfactory to the American people and would stand for ages. The design for a terrace for the base your committee believe to be more appropriate and more harmonious with the style of architecture adopted in the monument than the original pantheon, which excited so much criticism of late years, and at the same time is comparatively inexpensive.

Your committee know of no structures, except six, on the face of the globe which will exceed it in height, namely: The dome of St. Peter's cathedral at Rome, 437 feet; spire at Landshut, Germany, 465 feet; the tower of the cathedral at Strasburgh, 468 feet; St. Stevens, at Vienna, 441 feet; pyramid at Chephereu, 454 feet; and the great pyramid of Egypt, 480 feet; while no simple shaft or obelisk known to your committee is within 200 feet of its proposed height. Whatever might be said from an artistic standpoint in favor of some other style of monument, your committee think it now too late to discuss that question.

Tens of thousands of our fellow-citizens have contributed toward this monument, and have in that expressed their approval of erecting a simple, plain, but massive and stately shaft, and now that this shaft is partially completed, it would seem almost sacrilegious to tear it down and substitute some other form of monument, or to convert the present unfinished shaft into a pedestal upon which to erect an effigy of Washington, as has been suggested by some. The difference in the height between the modified and original plan would hardly be perceptible to the ordinary beholder, while the difference in the cost is such as it is believed would make its completion by Congress entirely practicable at this time; the total cost being, as estimated by Lieutenant Marshall—for obelisk, $345,145.17; for terrace, $65,540.75; total, $310,685.92.

Your committee have considered carefully as to what should be done in order to secure the completion of the monument by the approaching centennial.

They find that the Monument Society has made every possible reasonable effort to secure subscriptions, but its efforts have failed, and its board of officers and members report that they have no hope of being able to succeed.

The members of the society show commendable patriotism, even to the point of yielding up their organization, with which some of them have been connected for many years. But your committee are unwilling to recommend the total disbandment of an association which has already done so much, and indeed has done all that has thus far been accomplished by the American people toward erecting a suitable monument to the memory of Washington.

It is found, however, that by a resolution of Congress, heretofore mentioned in this report, reservation number three, containing about thirty acres, was deeded to this association, and a deed made of the land, afterward confirmed by the charter act of 1859.

If the United States are to undertake the completion of the shaft by appropriations through Congress, your committee deem it but just to the people that this conveyance of so important a reservation should be canceled, and the title again vested in the United States.

This your committee believe it is entirely competent for Congress to do—

First. Because the charter act confirming the deed is repealable by its terms.

Second. Because the deed was made in trust, which trust, by the confession of the society, cannot be longer carried out; besides the members of the society have by formal vote expressed a willingness to surrender their organization. But in taking this action your committee recommend that the society continue its existence until the completion and final dedication of the monument upon the 4th of July, 1876, the appropriate ceremonies for which might very properly be conducted by said society. This your committee believe would be but a just recognition of an association which has faithfully collected and disbursed a large sum of money in the construction of this monument as the trustees of citizens in all parts of the Union.

It is estimated by Lieutenant Marshall that it will require five hundred and thirty-seven working days to complete the monument to the height proposed by him.

Assuming that the work may begin by the 4th of July, 1874, it will be seen that there is no time to spare between that and the approaching Centennial.

Your committee believe that Congress could do no one act which would meet with more favorable response from a large majority of people, or make any expenditure which they would more cheerfully pay, than to provide an appropriation sufficient to complete this monument.

The first century of our history, which is now drawing to a close, has been to us one of prosperity, unparalleled in the history of nations.

In the midst of our blessings we may not forget the struggles of those men of revolutionary times, who made this prosperity possible.

The common consent of mankind has made George Washington the central figure of this wonderful republic. We have been taught to look upon him as embodying those mental and moral characteristics which are typical of a free people, and it will be a sad day to this republic when this idol of the American heart is broken.

No one can doubt that the spectacle presented at the National Capitol to-day by the unfinished monument to the memory of that man whose history is the history of a nation's birth, has tended to deaden patriotic feeling and diminish that grateful affection in which Washington was once cherished, and in which he should ever be held by the American people.

The principles of free government can neither be appreciated nor preserved without cherishing with something like religious fervor the memory of the men who are conspicuous from time to time in defending those principles.

Feeling assured that any reasonable effort made by Congress at this time to redeem the plighted faith of the nation in regard to this monument will meet the hearty approval of those we claim to represent; and that they will hail with joy the removal of that reproach to our national gratitude which this unfinished shaft daily utters, your committee report the accompanying joint resolution, and recommend its passage.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the duty of Congress to provide, by a sufficient appropriation, for the completion of the unfinished Washington monument at Washington city by the 4th of July, 1876, the one hundredth anniversary of American independence.

A DETERMINED WIDOW.

Many years ago, during a severe winter, a Mr. Loomis, of Pawlet, Vt., after a long sickness, died, leaving a widow and two children in straightened circumstances. Under the pressure of want, the worn-out mother made application to the overseer of the poor for temporary assistance. The cold-hearted official, however, not only refused, but made her application a pretext for seizing her property and throwing the family upon the town. The bereaved woman felt the indignity keenly, and vowed that the town should, from henceforth, be obliged to maintain her as a pauper for fifty years; and although she has since that time had many offers of a comfortable home from her children and others, she still remembers her vow, and notwithstanding she is now ninety-eight years of age, she bids fair to complete her half century as a town charge, forty-eight years having already passed.

ENGLISH INFLUENCE ON FRENCH HABITS.

[From Paris Correspondence New York Times.]

It was just after the Crimean war that the French began to give their attention to racing, at a moment when an extremely cordial *entente* existed between France and England. The nation was then in excellent humor. The Queen had just distributed fifty thousand Victoria medals to the heroes who had fought beside the red coats in the East; affairs had prospered; financial operations were opening up in every direction; vast improvements were in progress throughout the country; the lands were being reclaimed to agriculture; the French love for military glory had been satisfied, and a young Prince had been born as if to give a promise of serenity in the future. An excellent commercial treaty was concluded with England, and the nations were on the best of terms.

The French were suddenly seized with a sort of Anglophobia, and manly sports became the rage. Gentlemen's fashions came from England, and those who could afford it had their clothes made in London. Poole became as famous upon the boulevards as Worth is in another line. English words in abundance were incorporated into the conversations of the day. A railway car became a "wagon," and a cane a "stick." English names were given to dogs and horses. The young dandies affected rough English suits for walking, thick soled brogans, and never went out without a "stick" in their hands, and accompanied by the ugliest looking bull pup it was possible to find. The men with horses felt bound to find a diminutive "tiger," whom they put into big boots, under a big hat, and covered with buttons.

Young men took to tea and pale ale, Stilton cheese and Worcester sauce, and followed the supposed English custom of eating their beef only slightly warmed on the outside. Half-and-half was ordered in English quite as pure as that ordinarily employed in London for ordering this beverage. And as time wore on they adopted English dickeys and cravats, Oxford ties and dogskin gloves, carried an umbrella in all weather, plastered their hair in middle or screwed a single glass in one eye. British coolness and phlegm became a study, and all of "milor Anglais" reported eccentricities were taken as real traits of the Britannic character and copied with more or less success. To be as English as possible was then regarded as the thing for a young man who was a member of the "high life," (another imported term) or who wished to appear to be.

Oftentimes this mania was very amusing, for French ideas of English habits and customs were frequently—as Rochefort was accustomed to say when he told that a Cabinet minister showed an ignorance of anything—were frequently "ex-ces-sir-e-ly droll." Perhaps I can best illustrate their general character by a recent experience. When going to Chilselhurst, the other day, I was with a young gentleman of the highest education and culture, and as sensible a young fellow as I know, and one who is sure to make his mark in the world. I saw but one thing to criticise in him, and that was his undue awe for the Prince, who was our traveling companion. And when Monsieur insisted upon taking pot-luck with us in London, his enthusiasm knew no bounds. But this is one of the results of the social training a lad has in Europe, even in this country of *egalite.*

The next morning I suggested that all should take tea, instead of coffee, as in Paris. "Oh! no," cried my friend at once; "while here I am going to follow English customs strictly," and with an air of great satisfaction: "I shall take a glass of gin and bitters over the counter." He did so, in fact, swallowing the nasty stuff without a grimace, and smacking his lips as if he liked it. He was under the profound conviction that every good Englishman went out to the nearest bar every morning of his life and took a glass of gin and bitters *sur le zinc.* He had read this in some novel, probably in one by Paul De Koch, who, never having been in England, naturally knew all about the manners and customs of the people. As this young gentleman seemed so proud of his knowledge, I concluded to let him enjoy it, feeling sure, however, that the gin taken on an empty stomach would convince him of his error a great deal quicker than I could do it by argument.

THE SACRED SPRING.

REPORTED CURE OF A CANCER BY WATER FROM THE FOUNTAIN OF LOURDES.

[Dubuque Times.]

Mary Waldron, of this county, a young woman of twenty-six or seven years of age, who formerly was a domestic in the service of Bishop Hennessey, then with Father Ryan, but for the last three years an inmate of the county asylum, where she has been helpless with cancer of the stomach, furnishes the most recent evidence of the wonderful curative qualities of the water of the famous Spring of the Lourdes that has come to our notice. She has been afflicted with the cancer about eight years. Three years ago she became so nearly helpless that she was taken to the county house. At times she would be taken with sinking spells, from which it seemed as if she could not survive, the cancer from month to month growing more malignant in its character.

Being of a religious turn of mind, she has spent the time since the cancer fastened upon her in preparing for that end which seemed inevitable. She had read and thought much of the curative waters of the sacred spring or fountain of Lourdes, in France, and when the recent miraculous cure of the young lady afflicted with curvature of the spine, in Franklin county, was reported, she became also impressed with the faith that it could also cure her, and accordingly her friends sent for some of the water a few weeks since, and she drank a small portion, and also applied it externally to the cancer. For a moment or two after she was noticed to turn pale, and it was thought she would faint. In a few moments she recovered, stood upright, and said she felt as if the cancer were loosing its hold upon her. At the time she took the water she was bed-ridden.

An hour after she was on her feet, and the next day she came down to the city, stopping at the residence of Mr. Hugh Treanor, and at other places where she was acquainted, and walked the distance of several blocks. She has applied the water on one or two occasions since with the same remarkable effect, from which there is no relapse, and the cancer gives every evidence of soon disappearing entirely. These facts were given to us yesterday afternoon at too late an hour for our reporter to visit the asylum and inquire into the full particulars so desirable in this connection; but what we have here given is from a trustworthy source. In this connection it may be well to reproduce the following tradition regarding the origin of this sacred spring, which appeared in these columns a few weeks since:

The small town of Lourdes is situated near the base of the Pyrenees, in the province of Talbes, in France. Near the town, and on the banks of the Gare, is the "Grotto of Marsalleane," from which flows "The Sacred Spring, or the Fountain of the Virgin Mother." On the 11th day of February, 1858, a little peasant girl (the daughter of a poor miller,) named Bernodette Loudirons, went with some companions to pick up wood for fuel along the banks of the stream. Approaching the grotto, the child, who was behind her companions, saw standing in the grotto the apparition of the Mother of God, surrounded with a halo of light. She then stood for a short time, and vanished. Other visits occurred, in each of which the "Virgin" appeared to the child, and on one occasion spoke, commanding that a chapel be erected to her memory on the site of the grotto.

On a subsequent occasion she commanded the child to wash herself in the fountain, who, supposing she meant the river Gare, which ran close by, she approached, for that purpose, but the presence stopped her and commanded her to dig in the sand at the bottom of the grotto, which were then, and always had been, dry. The child did so, and immediately the fountain burst forth. Its curative properties immediately became known, and thousands of invalids from all parts of France, and the world, have visited Lourdes to be cured by the waters of the spring thus hallowed by the presence of the Mother of God.

CALIFORNIA COFFEE.

It has recently been discovered, says the San Francisco *Chronicle*, that the foothills in some parts of the northern portion of this State, notably in Placer county, are covered with a hardy, wild shrub, which, upon investigation, turns out to be a coffee plant. Those familiar with the genuine cultivated coffe shrub grown in South America and the West Indies propounce this unquestionably a plant of the same species, of course inferior, since it has been neglected and grown only in a wild state, but presumably susceptible of development to such a degree of perfection as to constitue its product a valuable article of commerce. It is, at least, well worth the trouble of experiment to demonstrate the possibility of such a result. Even should this wild coffee bush resist the kindly influences of cultivation and refuse to yield good berries, it may still prove of service in suggesting the experiment of introducing the cultivation of the real coffee. So far as we are informed no attempt has been made to test the suitability of our soil and climate for this crop, and it is too important a matter for the suggestion to be permitted to pass unheeded. Should it be found that we are able to produce a fair article of coffee, a branch of agriculture will have been opened more profitable than any now known in this State.

A French trumpeter lately deserted from Belfort with all the bag and baggage he could carry. Safely arrived on Swiss territory, he took position on a rock, turned his face towards France and his pursuers, put his trumpet to his mouth and played the old melody of Bertraud's Farewell.

OUR SERVING-MAIDS.

GOOD HOUSEWIVES AND BAD SERVANTS.

[New York Commercial Advertiser.]

An able and well-known writer has contributed to one of the magazines an article which is called "On the Side of the Maids," and which is calculated to give much interesting information to those of us whose knowledge of domestic matters is somewhat vague, "Men-folks," to use a familiar, if not a contemptuous phrase, are but loosely acquainted with the relations that exist between mistress and servant. Their notions on the subject are admittedly few, simple, and crude. They have a nebulous suspicion that maid-servants are rather hardly treated; that not much consideration is shown them; and that their mistresses might be a little more gentle and kindly in dealing with a class of persons who are entirely at their mercy.

Now these opinions may be held, but they are not declared. A husband is not going to plunge into a quarrel with his wife mainly because he fancies she has been unjust to a maid-servant. "Very well, my dear," he says, resignedly, when the partner of his bosom demonstrates the necessity of giving Tomkins or Jenkins warning, although he privately rather commiserates Tomkins or Jenkins. And much of this arises from the fact that the master of a house is ordinarily better served than the mistress. He is more feared; his wants are fewer; and he is ordinarily more inclined to give an encouraging word now and again. Moreover, he is not always in the house, watching how things go on, and ready to find fault. Supposing he has his boots and his breakfast all ready in good time, he in most cases leaves the household to itself till the evening, and then he is satisfied if nothing goes wrong at dinner.

He cannot understand why there should be such constant complaints of the people down stairs, when he finds them invariably most attentive and efficient. Of course he sides with his wife openly when he is challenged; but he has a secret belief that women are not very generous toward each other, and that maid-servants have much to put up with. On the other hand, when some clear case of insubordination or neglect comes before him, he is so astonished that he is all for action and violent measures. Nothing will do but the bundling of the maid out of the house forthwith, insomuch that many mistresses of households are rather afraid of complaining to their husbands. In ordinary cases, however, the "men-folks" are invariably "on the side of the maids"—as most wives know.

Well, here is a lady who plays into the hands of the "men-folks" in a very uncompromising way, and gives such a description of our households as will astonish many of the lords thereof. Is it possible, some of us may ask ourselves, that the gentle and beautiful creatures who look so pretty in a drawing-room, who cry over the sorrows of imaginative heroines so that they go sobbing to bed, who appear to be the very personification of all charitableness, unselfishness, and love, are really abominable and black-hearted tyrants, cruel, thoughtless, and revengeful! Here are some portions of the picture that has been drawn of the white slavery over which those harsh task-mistresses preside: "A servant's work is never done potentially, if even actually. She is liable to be rung up at all hours; her very meals are not secure from interruption; she has no time that is absolutely her own, and even her sleep is not sacred. In the dead of night something might be wanted, and she must get up to bring or to do it." * * * "She lives underground, and she either sleeps underground or just below the roof. Damp, drains, want of efficient ventilation, with the constant presence of draughts, surround her in winter; in summer these are supplemented by a furious fire for many hours in the day." * * * "No followers, no friends in the kitchen, no laughing to be heard above stairs; no romping for young girls, to whom romping is an instinct all the same as with lambs and kittens; no cessation of work save at meal times; no getting out for half an hour in the bright sunshine, save 'on the sly,' or after the not always pleasant process of asking leave; and above all no education for the fancy or the intellect beyond a dull magazine for Sunday reading, which is held sufficient recreation for lonely Betty moping in the dreary kitchen on the afternoon of her Sunday in." All this is bad enough, but worse remains behind. Some of us may be willing to confess that we are selfishly less concerned about Betty (although sincerely pitying her condition) than about the opinions which we fondly hold of Betty's mistress. Now, listen to what is said of her: "No lady considers herself degraded by the use of harsh language to her servants, just as no slave-holding lady feels herself degraded if she strikes her slave or orders her out to be flogged. And no one acknowledges that she has been unjust, or apologizes to the maid she has wronged." Is this true? Have we—fathers, brothers, husbands—been caressing rattlesnakes and petting tarantulas? We shall only observe, on this point, that if the tender and gentle things who look so innocent and beautiful in a drawing-room, do really treat their servants so when the backs of the "men-folks" are turned, then their power of acting is most creditable to them, and their hypocrisy most admirable. But a man who values his peace of mind will not hastily take sides in such a question.

It is but fair to remember, however, that our mothers, wives, and sisters tell a very different story, and that the story is at least spacious. They declare, in round terms, that every year the conduct of the maid servants—the claims they make, the airs they assume, the negligence which is their form of revenge—becomes more and more insupportable. They refuse to eat food (Australian beef, for example) which their masters and mistresses find palatable enough. When their own incompetence to cook certain things has become sadly visible at the dinner table, they receive the coming of their mistress into the kitchen, even if the latter, like Balzac, politely taps at the door to avoid unpleasant discoveries. They not only stipulate for so many evenings off in the month, which is legitimate enough, but will not budge from the letter of the agreement to meet some sudden exigency.

They drink as much beer as would stupefy a ploughman (so the story goes;) they wear finery such as the bride of a tradesman never had in her trousseau; they do less and less from year to year, demanding always additional help, and what they do is a perfunctory and disgraceful fashion. They are—but we decline to catalogue further the grievances of the mistresses which, as every one knows, form one of the chief sorrows and subjects of talk wherever a few of our matrons are met together. Nor do we feel competent to adjudicate in the matter. We cannot reconcile these diverse series of statements. When we read such an article as that "On the side of the Maids," we wish that mistresses would be a little more kindly and considerate, and give the poor girls some chance of employing their scant leisure in a healthy and amusing fashion; when we hear a description of the difficulties which the mistress of a household has with her servants, we are inclined to warn all young women against the perils of matrimony.

But if any father, or husband, or brother should become seriously concerned about this subject, we must remind him that little faith is to be placed in generalizations. There are good and bad mistresses, and good and bad maids, even as there are households, presided over with wisdom, kindness, and discretion, and households in which everything, from garret to coal-cellar, inevitably goes wrong. Biddy, however, ought to be thankful for this warm and sincere protest on her behalf; and in some quarters we hope it may do something toward making her life more endurable.

AGASSIZ'S METHODS OF WORK.

Agassiz was singularly unmethodical in his habits. Men who live and work by rule would be puzzled to understand how Agassiz managed to do so much without these helps. He lived and worked by inspiration. If he was suddenly seized with an interest in some scientific inquiry, he would pursue it at once, putting by, perhaps, other work in which he had just fairly got started. "I always like to take advantage of my productive moods," he said to me. Thus often he had several irons in the fire, only one of which might ultimately be finished. Probably he saw that the last iron promised to work up better than the first. He never could be made to work like a machine, turning out a definite quantity at regular intervals.

He never felt bound to regard the rule that you must finish one thing before you begin another, so emphatically presented in the old school-books. His was a method of working which would be ruinous to any man who had not his wonderful facilities, his farsight and insight. With his great, logical brain, and his marvelous powers of observation, there was united a certain telegraphic intuition which made his view of probabilities something more than a guess. He never proposed his own method of working as a model for others. Once, however, in my presence, a near relative ventured to ask him if he did not think he would accomplish more if he finished one thing before he began another. "Every man must work according to his own method," he replied.

He was in himself a great contradiction of the methods by which many have won success. He achieved, but it was after his own way. It was frequently a hard thing to get him to sign a paper, or write a letter, (except for somebody else,) or to look over accounts or reports, or do little routine work. Yet he could never have attained his great eminence in science if he had not paid in this department great attention to the minutest and apparently the most insignificant details. Looking at the drawing of a fish made by his artist, he said, after taking a single glance, "It is a beautiful drawing, but don't you see you have left out two or three of the scales?" This story, which I have seen elsewhere, is vouched for by the draughtsman who formerly drew his specimens for him. —*Boston letter to New York Tribune.*

WOMANLY DIGNITY.

[From the London Saturday Review.]

Nature, which has given weapons of assault or means of defence to almost all living creatures, has made men audacious, and has endowed woman with dignity. And dignity has the best of it. In fact, womanly dignity may be accepted as one among many explanations of that legendary power which turned the bravest man to stone, and made the might of the strongest like water in their bones. What can any one do against it? As well try to penetrate the armadillo's coat of mail by a needle, or make a hole in a pachyderm by a popgun, as fire a woman to passion or melt her to pity when she has once intrenched herself in the stronghold of her dignity. No argument can shake her, no reasoning convince her; despair dies away to querulousness, and the pleadings of love itself fall dull and blunted from her stately self-possession like so many