

ON DIT.

At a very late hour last night it was learned that the leading politicians of Louisiana were to have an interview with the Hon. William Rufus Crane for the purpose of seeking his acquiescence to their demands that he should be put forward as the candidate for Senatorial honors.

When the past services of Mr. Crane are considered, it is not improbable a host of supporters will come to the front. Rufus has always been an avowed champion of the rights of his fellow men and brothers, and as Senator, without doubt, shake the dome of the Capitol.

The committee appointed at the late session of the Legislature to examine the books and accounts of the Funding Board and Board of Audit, went to work yesterday in the office of the Secretary of State on the books of the Funding Board.

A communication has been addressed to the Board of Audit, calling attention to the resolution authorizing the committee to investigate its proceedings, and asking that a time be appointed when the committee shall proceed to discharge its duty.

The committee is composed as follows: G. W. R. Bayley, Esq., chairman; Messrs. W. B. Koozts, Wm. J. Hammond and J. Aldige. Mr. M. M. Simpson is with the committee as an expert, he having accepted the position at the solicitation of both the board and the committee.

The committee have a great task before them, for, it is asserted, it will take several months to make a complete investigation of the Funding Board alone.

The change of venue bill. At the sixty days' session a bill changing the venue in the case of Alex. Newton, charged with murder, from the parish of Orleans to the parish of St. John the Baptist, passed the House and was sent to the Senate for concurrence.

Interested parties, however, insisted on the bill being enrolled by the House committee and sent to the Governor for his signature, but Messrs. Trezovant and Arroyo both refuse to sign the bill, holding that when the Senate adjourned sine die after the sixty days session, all bills in the calendar for action fell, and that the bill came up at the extra session as a new one, and that the concurrence of the House was necessary to make it a law.

In this opinion they are sustained by the Attorney General, and by acknowledged authorities on parliamentary law, and Alex. Newton will have to stand his trial like any other criminal, and will not have the benefit of a packed negro jury.

Real estate. Real estate that showed a very perceptible upward movement when the Extraordinary was in session and there was so much talk of what was going to be done, has received quite a black eye, or as an agent yesterday expressed it: "two black eyes."

There never was a better time for investing there than just at present, for it must be that the tide is at its lowest ebb, and that any turn will be for the better. When the flood tide does set in, real estate will go "booming."

Skilled Labor Too High. There are a great many people out of employment and a great many people actually in want, but somehow labor, except unskilled, is almost as high as ever, and mechanics have, as a rule, not made any reduction upon their regular charges.

A gentleman wanting certain carpenter-work done about his office, was compelled, by the high charges for everything, to change his plans and only have those things done which were absolutely requisite. On one small job one man made an estimate of thirteen dollars, another of eleven, and still another of seven and a half, showing an utter lack of uniformity as to charges.

Builders, carpenters, plasterers, masons and skilled workmen of all kinds, it seems to us, ought, in view of the stringency of the times, to make such reductions in their charges as would make it an object for people with funds to build and improve. Lumber is cheap and money is not scarce in our banks. If the skilled laborer would make possible reductions on existing rates, we are confident there would be much building going on and many thousands employed who are now actually in want.

A Nolle Prosequi. It will be remembered that about a year ago, in May, 1874, one Joaquin Rodriguez was arrested as a defaulter from Havana, he being charged with having appropriated the sum of \$20,000, entrusted to him as paymaster by the Spanish Government.

The proceedings by the police to recover the money, led to a charge against Superintendent A. S. Balger, and Specials J. J. Pierson and Robert Harris, of robbery.

The case has been pending ever since yesterday. District Attorney McPheelin entered a nolle prosequi, stating that the funds taken from Rodriguez had been turned over to the representative of the Spanish Government, the Spanish Consul, and the charge could not stand.

Receipts which read as follows are held by Superintendent Badger: The nineteen bank notes of the Bank of Havana and fifty-four doubloons found in my possession and belong to the Spanish Government, and I deliver them voluntarily to the Spanish Government, the representative of the Spanish Government, and direct the police officer who has charge of them to deliver them to the Spanish Consul.

guez directed them to deliver to me as the property of the Spanish Government. CARLOS PIZ, Spanish Consul. The Streets.

Administrator Burke has sent a circular letter to the presidents of the several railroad companies of the city, calling on them to place in repair the streets through which their lines run, and notifying them that the City Surveyor has been instructed to make surveys for the purpose of ascertaining where repairs are needed, and that on and in accordance with his instructions the repairs must be made.

The Tax Bills. The Governor has under consideration the two tax bills—one for the relief of the over-taxed sufferers and the other for general relief—passed at the late session of the Legislature.

There has been several meetings between the Governor and Conservative members over the bills, but as yet nothing has been definitely decided on. It is, however, probable that the bill for the relief of the over-taxed sufferers will be signed, and that the other will be vetoed.

The Governor will take some action in reference to both in a few days.

THE SITUATION AT PASS-A-LOUIRE.

We are indebted to the United States Engineers' office for the following interesting memorandum in regard to Pass-a-Louire bar: UNITED STATES ENGINEERS' OFFICE, New Orleans, May 3, 1875.

During the month of April, 1875, the depth of channel at Pass-a-Louire at extreme low tide was 16 feet (except a few days during the grounding of the ship Waterloo, when the channel shoaled to 14 feet at extreme low tide, with a least width for that depth ranging from 30 to 100 feet. High tides ranged above extreme low tide from 2 to 3 feet, making the channel at high tide range from 18 to 19 feet.

The following is a list of vessels drawing 18 feet and over, that crossed the bar during the month: April 1—Steamer Vicksburg, 18 ft. 9 in. 4—Steamer New Orleans, 18 " 9 " 9—Bark Poolcar, 18 " 18 " 10—Ship Wyoming, 18 " 18 " 12—Ship Pelican, 18 " 18 " 12—Steamer Haytian, 18 " 18 " 23—Ship Adept, 18 " 18 " 23—Steamer New Orleans, 18 " 18 " 23—Steamer Memphis, 18 " 18 "

The following is a statement regarding all vessels detained by grounding during the month, and the amount of time delayed: Thursday, April 1—Ship Waterloo, 19 feet; George Osgood pilot; bound out; at 4 P. M. grounded on north side of channel above twin cans; got off and towed inside the bar April 8 at 10:10 A. M.

Saturday, April 3—Steamer Hudson, 15 1/2; Jos. Redman pilot; bound in; at 5:30 A. M. grounded on south side of channel about half way between can 4 and twins; got off and passed in at 7:15 A. M.

Sunday, April 4—Steamer New Orleans, eighteen feet; Richard Francis, pilot, bound out; at 4:45 P. M. grounded in channel at twin cans. Got off and sailed at 6:10 P. M. Steamer City of Havana, 16 1/2; Fred Gardolf, pilot, bound out; at 7:30 P. M. grounded at lower end of bar. Got off and sailed April 5, at 6 A. M.

Wednesday, April 7—Steamer Haytian, 19 1/2; R. M. Wilson, pilot, bound out; at 8 A. M. grounded just below the wreck above the Light-House. Got off and anchored outside, April 12, at 7:30 A. M.

Friday, April 9—Bark Poolcar, nineteen feet; George Wirtz, pilot, bound out; at 6:30 A. M., was 1 hour 30 minutes crossing the bar.

Sunday, April 11—Steamer Chilian, 17 1/2; Tom Wilson, pilot, bound out; at 5 P. M. grounded on south side of channel, between twin cans. Got off and anchored outside April 12, at 8:35 A. M.

Tuesday, April 13—Ship Mary E. Riggs, 17; Frank Lowry, pilot, bound out; at 4 P. M. grounded at lower end of bar. Got off and sailed at 5 P. M.

Sunday, April 18—Ship Ellen Southard, 17; Gus Gardolf, pilot, bound out; at 7 A. M. grounded in channel above can 4. Got off and sailed at 7:40 A. M. Steamer Knickerbocker, 17; Richard Francis, pilot, bound out; at 3:30 P. M., grounded on north side of channel, just above can 4. Got off and sailed at 4:45 P. M.

Tuesday, April 20—Steamer Texas, 17 1/2; James Redman, pilot, bound in; at 5:45 A. M. grounded in the channel about half-way between can 4 and twins. Passed in April 21, at 8:50 A. M.

Wednesday, April 21—Steamer Cortes, 17 1/2; Richard Francis, pilot, bound in; at 9 A. M. grounded on north side of channel just above twin cans. Got off April 22, at 6:20 A. M.

Thursday, April 22—Steamer Yazo, 17 1/2; R. M. Wilson, pilot, bound in; at 7:30 A. M. grounded in channel just above twin cans. Got in at 8:30 A. M.

Ship Sarsnak, 17; A. Douglas, pilot, bound out; at 9:30 A. M., grounded in channel just above twin cans. Got off and sailed April 23, at 6:30 A. M.

A CAUSE CELEBRE.

A Druggist's Mistake.

A Fatal Prescription Costs Him \$25,000.

The Supreme Court on Monday decided, after a long and tedious litigation, a cause celebre in the history of our jurisdiction. In the case of McCubbin, tutor, vs. Samuel Hastings, Judge Morgan, as organ of the court, read a long and carefully prepared opinion, giving twenty-five thousand dollars damages for a mistake made by an employee in defendant's drug store, in preparing a prescription, and which caused the death of Mrs. McCubbin.

As this case has been tried three times before juries in the lower court, and a large proportion of our medical profession have testified as experts, the attention of the whole community has been more or less called to it, and considerable interest felt in the denouement.

The facts as gathered from the record are these:

On Monday, the 26th August, 1867, Ellen Leigh, wife of William McCubbin, residing at the corner of Tchoupitoulas and Orange streets, in the city of New Orleans, was taken sick with symptoms of yellow fever; her husband immediately applied the simple remedies within his knowledge, and called in Dr. W. G. Austin, a physician of experience, and employed a competent yellow fever nurse, Catherine Bell, both of whom arrived within a very short time after the commencement of her illness.

From this time during balance of the day (Monday), and during the next day and night (Tuesday), the disease progressed, the fever gradually abating, perspiration returning, and the patient improving very much, and on a fair way to recovery. Up to this time the patient had been very quiet. On Wednesday morning was very much better, and out of all danger.

On that day, Wednesday, 27th August, 1867, at half-past 12 o'clock, Dr. Austin paid his usual visit and found her much better, and said to her husband and the nurse that she was doing well, and only needed one or two more prescriptions, like a charm, and she would be cured. This prescription he ordered and gave particular directions to the nurse and husband as to the manner of administering it.

The following was the prescription:

Rx. Aqua Camphore, 4 ounces.

The clerk of Hastings, in preparing the medicine, instead of putting up aqua camphore, filled the vial with tincture of camphor, which contained of camphor 300 grains, alcohol 1920 drops.

This was given the lady as it came from the druggist, and immediately following its administration the symptoms of the patient changed. She fell into spasms, and so complete was its effect, Mr. McCubbin was called to his wife's bedside by the hired nurse, and he found her almost black in the face and apparently in a fit. She cried out: "Oh my God, Will, what have you given me; I am burning up," and until quite late that night her cries could be heard a square off.

The doctor was sent for, and at 10 o'clock visited his patient. Upon his arrival, he made inquiries as to the condition of his patient, expecting to find her in a perspiration, and much better. He was told her condition was as before, the spasms. He immediately examined Mrs. McCubbin, and expressed his astonishment and regret at the sudden change for the worse that had taken place, and then and there, in very emphatic language, expressed his opinion that a mistake had been committed in the preparation of the prescription.

At the doctor's request another physician was called in for consultation. All efforts proved unavailing, and the sick wife continued to grow worse and on Friday morning died.

The question which arose in the case was whether the druggist had by his mistake in putting up tincture of camphor instead of aqua camphore, caused the death of Mrs. McCubbin. Her change of symptoms immediately after the administration of the medicine was, by some of the medical witnesses, considered as not beyond the strange idiosyncrasies of yellow fever, the effect of the poison. He immediately examined Mrs. McCubbin, and expressed his astonishment and regret at the sudden change for the worse that had taken place, and then and there, in very emphatic language, expressed his opinion that a mistake had been committed in the preparation of the prescription.

Outside the facts of this case, there arises a question which is of considerable importance to the public, and in which they are vitally interested, and that is, the responsibilities of apothecaries towards their patrons. The profession of a pharmacist is one which requires rare application, close attention and the utmost care. The reporter is so often struck, completely ignorant of what they are getting when they receive from their hands the prescriptions of the family physician; and as sometimes the most deadly poisons are ordered in small doses in the most trivial cases—of, say, skin diseases—it can readily be appreciated how an error of a few grains might imperil the life of the invalid.

To prevent this no legal remedy is of avail, and we are left to the extent of the druggist's education to protect. Mr. Hastings, in the McCubbin case, of course knew nothing about what his clerk had done, and it is perhaps hard that he should have to pay \$25,000 for an employee's mistake, but when the public are to be protected it is difficult to say if some rigid rule be not made.

On the Continent and in England, statutory provisions have been made requiring that no person should be permitted to put up prescriptions unless they had passed a thorough examination, and found capable. Pharmacologists warrant the good quality of the article, its correctness in kind, and as well its faithful agreement with the formula represented by it, and although it is rather severe on those who perform the arduous duties of the profession, the danger of mistakes warrants it as almost harsh rule.

Perhaps in no other city in the world have fewer fatal results come from the errors of those connected with the drug business than in New Orleans.

Trivial miscalculations in the quantities of the ingredients of prescriptions are always the facts of a clerk's discharge, and it is rarely that one hears of a case. Naturally when one does not occur public attention is excited, and the community feel an interest in the inquiry as to the cause. As to the merits of the McCubbin case we have nothing to say, as the BULLETIN was not born when it occurred; but leaving aside the heavy sum Mr. Hastings has to pay, it is but just that legislation should provide for a better protection of the public.

BY TELEGRAPH.

WASHINGTON.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS.

WASHINGTON, May 3.—Case of Mechanics and Traders' Bank vs. Union Bank of Louisiana. Error to the Supreme Court of Louisiana. The plaintiff sued in the Sixth District Court in the parish of Orleans, to recover of the Union Bank \$130,000 which they had paid under compulsion of a judgment by the Provost Court of New Orleans in 1862, when the city was occupied by Government troops under Gen. Butler.

The argument was that the establishment of a provost court, the appointment of the judge, and the proceedings in the case before them were invalid, because in violation of the Federal Constitution, which vests the judicial power of the Government in one supreme court and in such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time establish.

It is here held, reaffirming the decision in the case of the Grape Shot, that the court instituted in this case by authority of the President as commander-in-chief, to hear, try, and determine civil causes, was lawfully authorized to assume such jurisdiction. Its establishment by military authority was held to be no violation of the constitutional provision referred to above, and it is said that that clause has no application to the abnormal condition of conquered territory in the occupancy of a conquering army.

The power to establish by military authority courts for the administration of civil as well as criminal justice in portions of the insurgent States occupied by the National forces, is precisely the same as that which exists when foreign territory has been conquered and occupied by the conquerors. What that power is has several times been decided.

The case of Lieftersdorfer & Houghton against Webb, growing out of the conquest of New Mexico in 1846, in 20 Howard, page 176, is cited as a notable illustration of the power. These similar courts were established without any legislation of Congress, and they were held to be lawfully instituted by this court.

In view of these decisions, it is said that it is not to be questioned that the Constitution does not prohibit the creation by military authority of courts for the trial of civil cases during the time of war in conquered portions of the insurgent States. It was but the exercise of the ordinary rights of conquest. The plaintiff, therefore, were properly subjected to the power of these courts, and had no right of immunity.

Gen. Butler, being in command in Louisiana, was invested with all the powers of making war, except so far as they were denied to him by the Commander-in-Chief, and among these powers was that of establishing courts in conquered territory.

It must be presumed that he acted under the order of his superior officer, the President, and that his acts in the prosecution of the war were the acts of his commander-in-chief. Although the order by which the court was created did not define the nature and extent of its jurisdiction, and while it is true that a provost court ordinarily has cognizance only of minor criminal offenses, still a larger jurisdiction may be given to it, but whether such further jurisdiction was given in this case, the court are not called upon to determine. Having affirmed the decision below as to the right questioned, the only point which entitles the case to be heard here, this court declines to inquire whether the Provost Court acted within its jurisdiction, and it is said to be a question exclusively for State tribunals.

The State Constitution of 1868, ordaining that all judgments, contracts, etc., obtained and made in good faith and in accordance with existing laws of the State between the 20th of May, 1861, and the adoption of the Constitution, should be valid, impaired no implied contract on the part of the Union Bank to refund in cash the judgment of the Provost Court, and to hold the judgment of the court as valid for want of jurisdiction, because if the court was lawfully established, no such promise was raised.

Besides, the court cannot admit that the Legislature of a State may not validate the judgment of a court in fact, though in giving the judgment the court may have transcended its jurisdiction. Affirmed.

Mr. Justice Strong delivered the opinion. Mr. Justice Field dissent. WASHINGTON, May 4.—In the case of Rodd against Elgee and others, Justice Bradley read the opinion of the court reversing the judgment of the Circuit Court for the District of Louisiana, holding that there was no lien in favor of material men for supplies in a domestic port, and directing a judgment in favor of appellants, also holding that the admiralty jurisdiction under the twelfth rule extended to liens for such supplies only so far as they have been created by the Legislature, and those furnishing supplies complied with the provisions of State enactments, thus establishing a less liberal course than was carried out under the rule as adopted in 1844. Mr. Justice Clifford read a very able and exhaustive dissenting opinion in favor of a lien of such cases holding that there was a maritime lien and that the judgment of the Lower Court should be affirmed.

Mr. Justice Field concurred in the dissent. In the Elgee case the judgment of the Circuit Court of Claims was reversed and the proceeds of the cotton ordered to go to the Elgee succession. Elgee's heirs, however, get nothing.

D. B. Withers, of New York, has a judgment against Elgee and succession of \$850,000 of the proceeds of the cotton; \$120,000 will be retained by the government to meet the claims of the United States. The cotton will be sold in a suit of the United States. Elgee's surety on a bond of Barrett, a former Collector of the port of New Orleans, wherein it is alleged Barrett was a defaulter for about \$1,000,000.

The retention of this money is in accordance with an act of Congress, passed last session. The Aues Brothers, of St. Louis, claim to have purchased the cotton, and the probable result will be that nobody will get anything.

Groves, executor, et al. vs. United States and others, appeals from the Court of Claims. These are the cases known as the Elgee cotton cases. Another question raised on the argument was whether the contracts under which the several parties claimed were forbidden by the non-intercourse acts, and if not, whether by their true meaning the claimants were entitled to recover.

The view taken by the court, however, renders it unnecessary to decide the former question, and the decision is confined to the latter. The cotton was raised by Elgee, in Wilkinson county, Mississippi, in company with one Chambers; but before seizure the latter abandoned his interest and his title had become vested in Elgee exclusively. In May, 1863, one Gordon, the authorized agent of Elgee and Chambers, made an agreement with one Lobdell, transferring to the latter their cotton crop, about 21,000 bales, at ten cents per pound in currency, the cotton to be delivered at the landing at North Adams, and to be paid for when weighed, but to be at his risk; after the contract thirty dollars were paid on this contract.

agent to watch the cotton where stored, and it remained in his care until seizure by the Government; but it does not appear that there was any surrender of possession to this agent, or that there was any change of possession at all.

At this time the region where the parties were was greatly disturbed by the war, and the cotton was in danger of being burnt by the Confederate forces and of capture by the United States.

Under these circumstances, and it appearing that Lobdell was to furnish the material for baling and putting the cotton in a condition for delivery, and that he did not do so; and further, that the cotton was to be weighed before transfer, the court are of the opinion that the contract was simply an agreement to sell, and that no title vested in Lobdell.

The stipulations that the cotton was to be at the risk of Lobdell, after the contracts and the payment of the thirty dollars to him, the latter did not make out a case of sale in the face of all the other circumstances showing the contrary; so with the contract claimed by Nutt to have been made in October, 1863.

Assuming that it was not void under the non-intercourse act, it was still insufficient. It did not state what cotton was sold nor how much, and was altogether too vague and indefinite. It was but an executory contract, and passed no property in the cotton.

The result is that the title remained in Elgee, and his personal representatives are entitled to the proceeds.

Reversed.—Mr. Justice Strong delivered the opinion; dissenting, Justices Bradley and Hunt. Rodd, Administrator et al. vs. Health, et al., appeal from the Circuit Court for the district of Louisiana.

In this case it is decided that while the general maritime law is the basis of the maritime law by the United States as well as of other countries, it is only so far operative in this or any country as it is adopted by the laws of its own. It has no inherent force of its own.

In particular matters, especially such as approach a merely municipal character, the received maritime law may differ in different countries without affecting the general integrity of the system as a harmonious whole.

The question as to the law which was familiar to the lawyers and statesmen of this country when the Constitution was adopted, was intended and referred to when it was declared in that instrument that the judicial power of the United States shall extend to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction.

This adopted, it became the maritime law of the United States, operating uniformly in the whole country. The question as to the limits of maritime law and admiralty jurisdiction is exclusively a judicial question, and no State law or act of Congress can make it broader or narrower than the judicial power may determine those limits to be; but what the law is, within those limits, assuming the general maritime law to be the basis of the system, depends on what has been received as law in the maritime usages of this country, and on such legislation as may have been competent to affect it.

The decisions of this court illustrative of these sources and giving construction to the laws and Constitution, are especially to be considered, and when these fail us, we must resort to the principles by which they have been governed. It is settled by repeated adjudications of this court that material men furnishing repairs and supplies to vessels in a foreign port, do not acquire thereby an lien upon the vessels by the general maritime law of the United States, whilst it can not be supposed that the framers of the Constitution contemplated that the maritime law should forever remain unalterable.

The courts cannot change it; they can only declare it. If, within its proper scope, any change is desired in its rules other than those of procedure, it must be made by the legislative department. Congress, under the power to regulate commerce, has authority to establish a lien on vessels of the United States in favor of material men, uniform throughout the whole country. In particular cases in which Congress has not exercised the power of regulating commerce with which it is invested by the Constitution, and when the subject in its nature requires the exercise of that power, the States, under the capture of a vessel, may continue to legislate upon it; since liens granted by the laws of a State in favor of material men for furnishing necessities to a vessel in her home port in such State are valid, though the contract to furnish the same is a maritime contract, and can only be enforced by proceedings in rem in the District Courts of the United States.

In the State courts parties can only avail themselves of their common law remedies or such as are equivalent thereto. Any person having a specific lien or a vested interest in a surplus fund in court may apply by petition for the protection of his interests under the forty-third admiralty rule. Separate libels were filed in 1871 against a steambark for wages, for salvage, for supplies furnished at her home port and for the amount due on a mortgage.

It was held that the lien for supplies had not been perfected under the State law, and that the libels for such supplies would not be sustained prior to the recent change on the 12th admiralty rule, also that the libel upon the mortgage could not be sustained as an original proceeding, but that the mortgages having been petitioned for the surplus proceeds of the vessel, were entitled to have the same applied to their mortgage.

Reversed. Mr. Justice Bradley delivered the opinion, Mr. Justice Clifford dissenting. WASHINGTON, May 4.—Mr. Justice Field's dissent in No. 202 Mechanics and Traders' Bank against the Union Bank of Louisiana in the Louisiana Circuit, in which the opinion of the court was stated yesterday, if of such interest as to require notice.

In the opening he said that if the decision had been placed on the ground that the plaintiff bank owed the money, it was compelled to pay by the decree of the provost court, and therefore could not recover back. However illegal the action of that tribunal, he would have made no objection to the judgment, but as the ground was passed, and not only the legality of the establishment of the provost court by the commanding general of the army was affirmed, but the constitutional validity of the jurisdiction in civil cases.

The dissent then proceeds to revise the practice during the war, and asserts upon the authority of the record that after much deliberation on the part of the government it was determined not to enlarge the petty jurisdiction of such courts, and that the graver violations of law should be referred to a military commission, which course was followed.

Many instances are cited showing that the decisions of the government, as emanating from the department of military justice, were uniformly in harmony with this view of the jurisdiction of provost courts, and it is asked how, in the face of these facts, the assent of the President can be presumed as authority for the acts of the Commanding General in New Orleans in reference to these courts; but it is said further that the assent of the Executive can only be presumed in support of such acts.

In instances where the authority here presumed exercised without the direct order of the Executive Department, and it is declared that none of the decisions of this court show any authority or semblance of authority for the doctrines announced by the majority of the court in their opinions.

But it is further pressed in the dissent, that even supposing that the provost court was rightly invested with civil jurisdiction, there being no military chief, and his order had nothing in it which characterizes it as an arbitrary edict of despotic power. The position that the judgment was validated by the new Constitution of Louisiana is not regarded as meriting consideration.

That instrument requires for the validation of the judgment that it must have been rendered in accordance with the laws of the State existing at the time, and that any law of the State at the time authorized the establishment of a provost court, or that such court should rehear a case upon the mandate of a Commanding General of the United States, is a proposition which the dissent has barely the patience to state, but none to attempt a refutation of it.

Mr. Justice Bradley did not sit in the hearing of the case and took no part in its decision. WASHINGTON, May 4.—Besides the cases under the Enforcement acts on Louisiana and Kentucky, which had been argued, the Supreme Court left over for decision for another term, a Granger case from Minnesota; McIlroth, receiver of the Southern Minnesota Railroad Company vs. Coleman; three commercial cases; two from New York and one from Tennessee, and two patent cases, also from New York.

Spain. Amosca Mantilla, who represented the Spanish Republic here as Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary, today presented his credentials to the President as representative of the King of Spain. The usual congratulatory remarks were made. United States vs. Farragut et al.—Appeal from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. This is the case of the commander and officers of the fleet engaged in the capture of New Orleans to recover prize money and salvage. The court sustains the decree entered below, based on the findings of the arbitrators, that the capture was the achievement of the fleet and not the co-joint operation of the army and navy, and the value of all the captured vessels is to be computed in the distribution as well as those which were subsequently restored to the loyal owners from whom they had been captured by the enemy as those which were condemned as prize.

The item of military salvage computed at ten per cent on the value of the restored vessels is disallowed, and as to the rest the decree is affirmed, the court holding that they could not review the case on the facts, an appeal from the decision of the arbitrators there being no allegations of fraud or other sufficient grounds for revision. Mr. Justice Miller delivered the opinion.

MISCELLANEOUS. WASHINGTON, May 4.—The Jackson Democratic Association met here to-night, and a resolution was submitted recommending the nomination of A. G. Thurman, of Ohio, for President, and T. F. Bayard, of Delaware, for Vice President, on a platform recognizing all the amendments to the Constitution, uniform taxation and currency, and no discrimination in favor of bondholders. The resolution was laid over until next meeting.

The employing printers of this city held a meeting to-night at the Republics office, and agreed to submit a proposition to the Typographical Union to reduce the price of composition from sixty to fifty cents per thousand ems for piece work, and twenty-four dollars a week for ten hours per day, or twenty dollars for eight hours per day. The price now paid is twenty-four dollars a week for eight hours per day.

FOREIGN NEWS. LONDON, May 4.—Advices from Calcutta say cholera has abated in the province of Oude.

The bark Rose Brae, from Galveston for Liverpool, before reported lost, struck an iceberg and sunk.

Sir John Holker, Solicitor General, will be elevated to the bench, vice Judge Piggott, deceased.

The steamer Africanus, from the Cape of Good Hope, brought fifty thousand dollars in gold from the diggings—the largest shipment ever sent from South Africa. One nugget weighed nine pounds.

LONDON, May 4.—There are strong symptoms of a collapse of the strike in South Wales. Sixty miners returned to work on master's terms in one colliery.

Three additional deaths by the Bunker Hill disaster reported.

LONDON, May 4.—The schooner Jefferson Rorden, Patterson, master, sailed from New Orleans March 5th for London; when eighteen days from the former port, a large ship, commanded by Capt. Patterson fought the men with revolvers and knives. After a terrible struggle, in which the first and second mates were killed, the captain succeeded in disabling and securing all the men who resisted. He hailed