THE NEW YORK PRESS.

EDITORIAL OPINIONS OF THE LEADING JOURNALS UPON CURRENT TOPICS—COMPILED EVERY DAY FOR THE EVENING TELEGRAPH.

Resignation of General Sickles—Progress of the Obstructive Plan.

From the Herald.

General Sickles has asked to be relieved of his very important command; and this request is natural, in view of recent events; for, since the President and the law are distinctly and widely at variance, he clearly cannot obey both. Mr. Johnson, by placing before the country a legal argument from his official adviser, palpably accepts the argument as a basis of action, and thus compels commanders to choose between a distorted interpretation of the law and the more obvious one they have themselves made. Indeed, the publication is a harsh rebuke to which the commanders ought not to have been exposed when they had once been left to their own judgments. It is a rebuke, also, accompanied with offensive phrases.

"No legal State governments now exist in the Rebel States," says the Reconstruction law in its very first sentence; and lest this should not be sufficiently positive, it is added that "all interference, under color of State authority, with the exercise of military authority, under this act, shall be null and void." Here are sentences as broad and clear as they can be made; and the Generals, seeing that these words made them absolute, acted boldly and confidently in the execution of the law. Now they are told that they have been guilty of a usurpation of power, and that their "educations" have not been such as to enable them to understand the law. In a case where a commander has been bred to the law this is an insulting sneer, and this sneer is permitted to be made on the authority of a man who is himself either not pure in his motives or no great lawyer; for it comes from one who, in face of the words "no legal State governments now exist in the Rebel States," has declared that the law "recognizes" the existing governments as legal and sufficient, and makes the military a mere police power.

We are assured by the quasi organ of the Executive in Washington that the remedy against the Generals is to be "sternly applied," by instructions that they shall conform their acts to Mr. Stanbery's opinion. Thus they will all be forced to resign, doubtless, and thus the way will be opened for the President to put more convenient men in their places. Such is perhaps to be the process of preventing a satisfactory settlement of the national difficulties.

The Logic of Murder.

From the Independent.

Curran, or somebody, said that the great end of the British Constitution—the chief object for which king, lords, and Commons existed—was to get twelve honest men into a jury-box. His meaning was that, whatever might be the government of a country, no man could suffer wrong, if sure of being tried by a jury of his peers. Where no such trial can be obtained, there every man must take his rights by his own hand. But it is plain that, whether such a trial can be obtained or not, there is no substitute for it so poor as murder.

Trial by jury protects a man against his enemy, and even, if need be, against his judge. In the trial of murder, judge and jury are one, and that one is also the enemy. Under trial by jury, the judgment is made by perfectly impartial men; while, in case of murder, it is made by the very person to whom impartiality is impossible. Before a jury, each man is assumed innocent until proved guilty, while the murderer assumes his victim guilty, and leaves his children to vindicate his innocence, if they can. Indeed, under trial by jury, investigation comes first, and sentence afterwards; while murder kills first, and then permits the public to investigate, if it will.

All this is glaringly illustrated by the late startling occurrence at Albany. Mr. Hiscock, a member of the Constitutional Convention, was instantly killed by General Cole, lately an officer of the volunteer service, for alleged wrong to the wife of the latter. Public sympathy is always excited in favor of a man who avenges one crime by another, especially where the virtue of woman is in any way involved. But public sympathy should remember that usually in such cases—certainly in this case—such a tragedy establishes no fact beyond the frenzy of the assassin.

To be sure, the public will assume that a man must have had some adequate provocation for such a deed. But this is not necessarily true. A man must undoubtedly *think* he has had provocation. But how many blameless women have been killed, like "Desdemona," from unreasonable jealousy; how many innocent men, from insane suspicion! In this case the only important statement made is that of General Cole himself; and when he made it he was, in the words of a policeman, "apparently frenzied." Certainly, it is impossible to ascertain from these confused words what is the precise offense which he charges on his victim. Sometimes he speaks as if deceased had committed violence on an innocent woman, and again as if he had seduced a guilty one. He says that the sinful purpose never was accomplished, and yet speaks of his wife as being "betrayed" and "defiled." Of course, at such a time, perfect clearness of statement is not to be expected. But if Mr. Hiscock's reputation, as well as life, are to be destroyed, it is right to test rigidly the evidence on which it is done.

We have no personal knowledge of the man thus struck down, and unhappily his public prominence does not demonstrate his private virtue. A legislator may be a guilty man; but, on the other hand, a man may be innocent and yet be murdered. The charges against him may exist only in the brain of an insane man; or the alleged facts may have been only the hallucinations of a diseased woman. For such things have been; and we protest, in the name of justice, against the readiness shown to condemn a man unheard.

The murdered man has no opportunity to bring forward evidence; and there may be many facts which he could have explained, which will now remain unexplained forever. If he died innocently, his murderer has secured a great advantage over him; for who can indicate a man's innocence like himself? The only person (except the injured woman) who knew the precise facts of the case has been removed from the investigation. Such is the logic of murder—a thing more unjust than even the ancient "ordeal by battle;" for to that, at least, there were two sides.

It is possible that Mr. Hiscock may yet be proved innocent; and it is also possible that he may be found deeply guilty. In the latter case, the whole series of events will simply add another to the tragedies of real life, more profound and fearful than those of French and English novels, and showing the perils of misguided passion, and the stern retribution it brings. Be this as it may, the truth remains that in a land of law man should not take the law into his own hands. If the wife in this case was guilty, her seducer's death will not restore her innocence; if she is innocent, it will not give her peace; while the children and the children's children of two households will find a shadow forever resting on their innocent lives. However we may regard it, a bad thing is made worse by this deed of violence. Pity and regret, with stern disapproval, should meet all such attempts to unravel the threads of human misfortune by the logic of murder.

Another Muddle in the Reconstruction Process.

From the Nation.

Some of the Generals commanding at the South being in doubt either as to the extent of their powers under the Reconstruction act, or as to the mode in which they should exercise them, have solicited advice from Washington, and the President—we may be sure nothing loath—has called on Mr. Stanbery, the Attorney-General, to furnish an "opinion" on the subject. The opinion was laid before the public in the morning papers on Monday last. A few people, probably, will read it; but for the benefit of those who will not read it, its tenor and effect may be described sufficiently by saying that it denies to all Military Commanders at the South the right to do anything beyond "protecting persons in their rights of person and property, suppressing insurrection, disorder, and violence, and punishing or causing to be punished all disturbers of the public peace or criminals.' Consequently, according to Mr. Stanbery, no commanding officer has any right to remove any Judge or Mayor or Governor, or interfere with the process of any civil or criminal court, or with the operation of any laws actually on the statute-book, or with the obligation of any existing and lawful contract, or, in fact, to meddle in any way with the working of the State Governments at the South any more than at the North, except in so far as may be plainly necessary to repress violence or insurrection or disorder. All these things, however, Generals Sickles, Pope, and Sheridan have done; and should the President act on Mr. Stanbery's opinion, Mayor Monroe, Judge Abell, and Governor Wells would be put back in their places; the military commanders would thus be humiliated, besides being shorn of nearly all their authority, in the eyes of the Southern population; every obnoxious act of theirs, however just or necessary, would be met by an appeal to the President, and the appeal would be supported by clouds of political intriguers, and by the time a decision was reached it would have lost all its value. In fact, during this most important period, when the new State organization is preparing and the negro population being called into political life, the States lately in revolt would, as long as acts of physical violence or outrage did not occur in such numbers as to furnish fair ground for military interference, remain as completely in the hands of the old government as if the Reconstruction act had never been passed.

Now, everybody knows that, whatever the act may say, this is not what Congress intended, and nobody was better satisfied of it than Mr. Johnson himself. In his message vetoing the bill he claimed for the military commanders all the powers under it which they have been lately exercising, and which Mr. Stanbery now denies them—a circumstance which has set many people asking who wrote the message, or, at all events, who supplied the law for it. When it appeared, the popular impression was that the rough outline, at least, of the scene of horrors which Mr. Johnson predicted in it as likely to be witnessed under the operation of the new law was supplied by Mr. Stanbery, the some gentleman who now shows that it was one of the most harmless acts that Congress has ever passed. *Then*, it was neither more nor less than the establishment at the South of military despotism pure and simple, without a single mitigating feature. *Now*, it appears it is simply an authorization to military men to act as police in aid of the local authorities, and to try men for criminal offenses in the absurdly improbable contingency that the local courts should refuse to exercise or make any show of exercising their authority. Certainly, if Mr. Stanbery's present construction of the law he correct, somebody cut a very ridiculous figure last spring when the act was vetoed; but whether it was Mr. Johnson or his advisers, of course we have do means of knowing.

The question now is, What is to be done or will be done? It is but just to Mr. Johnson to say that he did not call for the opinion for his own guidance, and, therefore, its appearance is no indication that he wishes to put any construction on the law different from the one he put on it last spring. But then there is some danger that, now that it has appeared, he may act on it. He is under no obligation to do so. The opinion of the Attorney-General is no more binding on him or on anybody than the opinion of any other lawyer off the bench. It expresses Mr. Stanbery's own views, ably and clearly stated, no doubt, and very likely quite correct; but it in no way alters the President's duties or responsibilities. He has already declared, as solemnly as a man can, that he considers the law unconstitutional. We have little doubt that Mr. Stanbery also thinks it unconstitutional—utterly, wildly unconstitutional. Upon that point not a shadow of doubt, we venture to say, has ever crossed the minds of either of them. They have both accepted it not as a measure which Congress had a right to pass, or which it was well for it to pass, but as an evil for which there was no earthly remedy. Mr. Johnson well understood that its faithful execution was not expected or required of him; that it was the intention of Congress that this should be left to generals selected by General Grant; and in fact, it was well known when the session closed that the President's meddling in any matter not purely one of routine would be the signal for his impeachment. The two Houses went home leaving this penalty hanging over his head *in terrorem*. Therefore, he is under no moral obligation to interfere with the actions of the generals in the South in any way, unless they should commit violations of substantial justice. He does not owe it to his own dignity to do so, nor yet to the interests of society. Nothing, everybody will confess, would be gained by the reversal of the action of Generals Pope and Sheridan, except a triumph for one of the local factions, while the passions of the North would be once more roused by it, to subside heaven knows when.

Is he under any legal obligation to interfere, even supposing the Attorney-General's interpretation be the true one, and the President accepts it in its full extent? None whatever. Mr. Stanbery shows by a citation from the judgment of the Supreme Court in dismissing the Mississippi bill, that the duty imposed on the President by the Reconstruction act and the supplemental act, as regards the supervision of the military commanders at the South, "is in no just sense ministerial. It is purely executive and political." Now, when the President fails or refuses to perform "an executive or political act," there is only one remedy. Congress can impeach him, but no other power on earth can call him to account. Therefore, if he should put Mr. Stanbery's opinion in his pigeon-hole, and let the military commanders alone, so long as their action really hastens the end which everybody has now in view—the speedy and satisfactory restoration of the Southern States to their old places in the Union—he would have nothing to fear from any quarter. Of the wisdom of silence and self-control there is apparently not much in his composition; but, if there be one particle, he has now such a chance of showing it as has never before offered itself.

We shall probably hear a great deal of the danger to constitutional liberty of allowing even an unconstitutional law to be disregarded by military officers; but the fact is that it is to the use of arguments of this kind by persons of influence and authority that we owe most of the violations of constitutional forms which have taken place during the last six years. What is dangerous and what is not dangerous as a precedent is something on which no two men will agree, and about which nobody's opinion is worth much. What is certain is that the majority of the Northern people are determined to have justice done at the South, and to prevent all secessionists of high degree, and all knaves and charlatans of whatever degree, from in any way guiding or controlling the process of reconstruction; that it does not particularly care whether this be done with or without the forms of law; and that the less this determination is checked or resisted, the sooner will that abnormal state of things which is now exciting alarm pass away and be forgotten. The real enemies of constitutional government are those who, with their "quiddits, their quillets, and their cases," are trying to stay the execution of the national will.

We cannot conclude without calling attention to Mr. Thaddeus Stevens' letter, in which he cries out for an extra session of Congress to mend what he admits to be the defects in the Reconstruction act exposed by Mr. Stanbery. There is a lesson in what has happened which Mr. Stevens, old and experienced as he is, we think might very well learn, and that is the mischievousness of the habit, in which he more than anybody else indulges, of checking and stifling debate on important measures. If the Reconstruction act had been fully discussed, nobody would have been the worse of it; more time would have been given for consideration, the objections of its enemies would have brought out its defects, and its friends would have had an opportunity of perfecting it before it passed from their hands. But in order that an enormous majority might enjoy the paltry pleasure of crushing a feeble and insignificant opposition, the bill was hurried through, and when passed it was found that it had provided no machinery for its own execution. A supplemental bill was then passed, and now both together, on being taken to pieces by an acute lawyer, are found to confer in terms no more authority on commanding officers in conquered territory than a commanding officer in Massachusetts might very safely and becomingly be permitted to exercise. The "previous question" has here carried its friends almost to the last ditch of absurdity and confusion.

A Premium on Vice.

From the Tribune.

When Bishop Colenso attempted to coax the fetich-worshipping natives of Southern Africa into the Episcopal Church, he found himself obliged to choose between two evils—either to entirely abandon the work of regeneration or to tolerate polygamy. Believing that half a loaf was better than no bread, the Bishop laid his monogamistic scruples aside, and received his black sheep, together with their very peculiar institutions, into the Christian fold. Now, if Mrs. Frances D. Gage is to be credited—and we see no reason for doubting the statements of so clear-headed and conscientious a woman—a difficulty distently akin to that which Bishop Colenso overcame is likely to be encountered by Christian teachers among the freedmen of America. Our difficulty consists in the endeavor to regulate marriage according to law. Illegitimate in itself, slavery knew that legitimacy in any form was to be dreaded, and hence brought all its immoral strength to bear against an institution that was well enough for white folks, but not at all necessary for "niggers." The latter did not go into society; therefore, why defer to the prejudices of Mrs. Grundy? Now, however, we have changed all that "Niggers" have been transfigured by the war into colored people, are even considered as men and brothers, and in course of time will be allowed to vote for their former kind and indulgent mrsters. Society being in some little danger of coming in contact with the former chattel, Mrs. Grundy is becoming interested in the question of marriage, and throws up her hands in holy horror when told by Mrs. Gage that the black women of the Sea Islands very persistently object to legal ties, whereas the men are strongly in favor of them. Is it because the women are more depraved than the men? Not at all. Are they more fickle in their affections, and are they opposed to marriage because of its imposing the cleaving unto one man for life? No, again. Thousands of black couples in the South have known no other marriage ceremony than the acknowledgment made in their own hearts before God, and yet have lived as faithfully as though law had made the compact.

Why, then, this objection on the part of the women, who ought to desire, beyond all else, that their children should be honored in the eyes of the world? Let them speak for them. selves. "We don't want to be married in the church," said one woman to Mrs. Gage, "because, if we are married in the church, our husbands have a right to all our wages, and can do just what they please with us!" The question is not one of morality to the freedwomen. According to the reasoning of their untutored minds, nothing but mischief can accrue from the performance of a ceremony to which they have never been accustomed. Of what avail to send teachers down South for the purpose of preaching the holiness of marriage, when the taught can prove that it entails the most outrageous injustice? Men advocate it for the very reason that it gives them a tremendous power, which, having been reared under the benign influences of slavery, they will be likely to exert with unexampled tyranny. "Nancy is a likely hand, and ought to be working in the field instead of nursing her own child," was the grumbling complaint made by a colored man to Mrs. Gage because she insisted that Nancy should remain at home and perform the duties of a mother, rather than be converted into a money-making beast of burden. Is it matter of surprise if Nancy sets her face against a law that places her at the mercy of a stronger party?

At present, then, so far the freedwomen are concerned, there is a premium upon vice. If the marriage law, which is alike for both white and black races, does not meet with equal opposition from the former, it is because women see in it the only avenue to respectability, and men are enlightened and manly enough in the majority of cases not to take undue advantage of the broad margin accorded to them. Black women are ignorant of the meaning of social respectability; black men—at least those of the Sea Islands—are not sufficiently humanized to discriminate between justice and license. What remedy, then, is to be applied to so dangerous a disease? Education will do much; but would Christians go the shortest way to work and labor for the greatest good of the greatest number, they will see to it that the marriage laws are so modified as to fall alike on both of the contracting parties. There is a society for the prevention of cruelty to animals. Are women less worthy of protection from abuse?

The Summer Session.

From the Times.

A July session of Congress, we suppose, may now be deemed a certainty. The alleged necessity for it predicated upon the probability of a rendering of the Reconstruction law in a sense adverse to the intentions of its authors, is but one of several causes of the meeting.

The advocates of impeachment are the prime movers behind the curtain. Foiled in the Judiciary Committee, they are eager to try anew their strength in the House, with the advantage of such auxiliary help as may be derived from the expected course of the President in regard to the District Commanders and their acts. The circumstances which lend plausibility to a summer session are circumstances on which the Ashleys and Butlers of the House rely for fresh accusations against the President.

The *Evening Post* adds the high tariff men to the list of those who are underhandedly at work for a meeting on the third. This is hardly probable. That they chafe under the defeat of the last session is undeniable, and that they are prepared to combine with anybody, in any way, for the furtherance of their sinister policy is at least probable. But their greed has not quite deprived them of their senses. They cannot be acquainted with the temper of the people touching taxation, and they will find the judgment of all but a narrow party inimical to any tinkering with revenue until the whole question be ready for discussion. If anything would excuse a meddling with fiscal matters, it would be the scandalous whisky frauds of which the press affords abundant illustration. But it is not expedient, even in this case, to attempt legislation, except with an assurance of greater thoroughness than is possible just now.

Infinitely more probable is it that an effort will be made by the speculators to raise the question of the currency, with the view of preventing any further contraction. These are the inflationists—the jobbers and gamblers who would sacrifice industry and trade in a desperate endeavor to bring back the ballooning days of 1864. The process of restoring currency and business to a healthy standard does not accord with their plans. They would like more paper issues, if they could get them; and failing to obtain these, they desire it to be understood that by no possibility can the Secretary of the Treasury interfere with their movements. There is but one term applicable to this scheme. It is a conspiracy to sacrifice the interests of the many for the benefit of a class whose operations come within the category of gold and stock gambling.

The inflationists and speculators are intriguing with the clamorers for impeachment to secure not simply a summer session, but a session that shall take cognizance of their respective projects. If they succeed, the immediate effect will be most disastrous. Business matters are bad enough now, but they will be immeasurably worse if they are to be exposed to the tricks and dangers and demagoguism of a long session at the present season. Instability will be infused into everything, and a want of confidence which no prudent man would knowingly increase.

A session limited to the object which has been proclaimed—the perfecting of the Reconstruction law in the light of the Attorney-General's criticism—may well be defended. If not necessary, it is not inexcusable, perhaps not inexpedient. But a meeting with this purpose before it ought not to be an occasion for reopening questions which have no special urgency, and the end whereof no one can foretell. It is right that obstacles to reconstruction should be removed, promptly and effectually. But there can be no defense for intrigues which, to serve party purposes, would expose the country to the turmoil and uncertainties which seem now to be hovering around the halls of the Capitol.

EXCURSIONS.

EXCURSIONS UP THE RIVER.—The splendid steamboat JOHN A. WARNER makes daily Afternoon Excursions to Burlington and Bristol, stopping at Riverton, Torresdale, Andalusia, and Beverly, each way. These excursions leave CHESNUT STREET WHARF at 2 o'clock in the Afternoon. Returning, leave Bristol at 4 o'clock, arriving in the city at 6 o'clock P. M. FARE—Excursion, 40 cts. Each way, 25c. [5 25 3m

EXCURSIONS ON THE SCHUYLKILL.—Steamers leave Fairmount Park (foot of Coates street),
EVERY HALF HOUR,
FOR LAUREL HILL CEMETERY,
AND
THE FALLS OF SCHUYLKILL.
First boat leaving Fairmount at 7:20 A. M.; last boat at 6:35 P. M. Last boat leaving Falls of Schuylkill at 6:35 P. M. 6 5 1m

LEGAL NOTICES.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA—In Divorce.
LAWRENCE H. THOMPSON vs. MARY C. THOMPSON, December Term, 1866, No. 54.
To MARY C. THOMPSON, Respondent.—You will please take notice of a rule this day granted on you to show cause why a divorce a vinculo matrimonii should not be decreed. Returnable Saturday, June 29, 1867, at 10 o'clock A. M.—personal service of notice on you having failed on account of your absence.
CHARLES W. BROOKE,
THOMAS MULLEN,
Attorneys for Libellant.
6 21 22 25 27 4t*

IN THE ORPHANS' COURT FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA.
Estate of NANCY K. RISK, deceased.
The Auditor appointed by the Court to audit, settle, and adjust the account of A. K. COLHOUN, Executor of the last will of NANCY K. RISK, deceased, and to report distribution of the balance in the hands of the accountant, will meet the parties interested for the purpose of his appointment, on MONDAY, June 24, 1867, at 3 o'clock P. M., at his office, No. 433 WALNUT Street, in the city of Philadelphia.
6 13 1tsm6t* THOMAS J. WORRELL, Auditor.

IN THE ORPHANS' COURT FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA.
Estate of PHILIP REAP, deceased.
The Auditor appointed by the Court to audit, settle, and adjust the account of JOSEPH LANE and ROBERT OSSELL, Executors of the last will and testament of PHILIP REAP, deceased, and to report distribution of the balance in the hands of the accountant, will meet the parties interested for the purpose of his appointment, on MONDAY, July 8, 1867, at 4 o'clock P. M., at his office, No. 433 WALNUT Street, in the city of Philadelphia.
THOMAS J. WORRELL, Auditor.
6 22 stuth4t*

ESTATE OF DANIEL LACK, DECEASED.—Letters testamentary upon the estate of said deceased having been granted to the undersigned, all persons indebted to said estate will make payment, and those having claims against the same will present them to GEORGE PFEIFFER, Jr., Executor.
No. 610 CHESNUT Street.
Or to his Attorney, OCTAVIUS A. LAW,
No. 12½ S. FOURTH Street.
1 6 s6t*

JOHN CRUMP,
CARPENTER AND BUILDER,
SHOPS: NO. 213 LODGE STREET, AND NO. 1733 CHESNUT STREET,
5 24 PHILADELPHIA

Old Rye Whiskies.
THE LARGEST AND BEST STOCK OF
FINE OLD RYE WHISKIES
IN THE LAND IS NOW POSSESSED BY
HENRY S. HANNIS & CO.,
Nos. 218 and 220 SOUTH FRONT STREET,
WHO OFFER THE SAME TO THE TRADE, IN LOTS, ON VERY ADVANTAGEOUS TERMS.
Their Stock of Rye Whiskies, IN BOND, comprises all the favorite brands extant, and runs through the various months of 1865,'66, and of this year, up to present date.
Liberal contracts made for lots to arrive at Pennsylvania Railroad Depot, Ericsson Line Wharf, or at Bonded Warehouses, as parties may elect.

Carpetings, Canton Mattings, Oil Cloths.
Great Variety, Lowest Cash Prices.
REEVE L. KNIGHT & SON,
NO. 807 CHESNUT STREET,
(Below the Girard House).

FIRE AND BURGLAR PROOF SAFES
MORE ABOUT
LILLIE'S CHILLED-IRON SAFES
IMPORTANT FACTS
WHICH THE PEOPLE SHOULD
"MAKE A NOTE OF."

FACT I.—LILLIE'S CHILLED-IRON SAFES have been largely introduced for the last twelve years, and sold to those having the largest amount of valuables, as the best and most thoroughly Burglar-Proof Safe; and, up to the last three years, it has been as rare to hear of one of Lillie's Safes having been robbed by burglars, as to see or hear of a white blackbird or a white elephant.

FACT II.—It is notorious that the profession of the burglar has advanced at a rapid pace within the last eight years, and what was thoroughly burglar-proof then is not so now, which accounts for the fact that within the last three years very few of Lillie's Safes have been robbed, and the secret anonymous circulars distributed by other safe-makers latterly, showing a *very few* cases *only*, is the strongest evidence that b t a very small number have been robbed to this time, notwithstanding the large number in use, and the amount at stake if successful.

FACT III.—There are two, and only two, general and leading principles upon which all burglar-proof safes are constructed. The one is pouring liquid iron between and around bars of wrought iron, hardened steel, or any proper combination of metals. This principle is adpted by Lille, in the Chilled-iron Safe, and covered and controlled by his letters patent.

The other is made up of layers of plates, of different metals, held together by bolts or rivets, or both. To this principle there are various objections:—The cost is double. The wrought iron plates, which are the strength of the safe, are outside, and are operated upon by the whole catalogue of burglars' tools. The bolts or rivets are easily forced by suitable tools, with or without powder, and cannot be sustained. *The former principle*, adopted by Lillie, avoids all these objections, can be made any thickness, and withstand any amount of resistance required; avoids the rivets, bolts, etc.; has no wrought iron outside to be operated upon by burglars' implements.

FACT IV.—Mr. Lillie, the Patentee, so soon as he learned that it was possible with the modern improved tools for burglars to grind through chilled iron or hardened steel, began experimenting to avoid the difficulty, and after much labor and expense he has perfected a system for chilling iron and combining metals that is entirely proof against the burglar's drill, or any other of his tools, even the wedge, warranted to stand the hardest test practicable for any burglar to make. As a proof of his success, the following certificate is now offered from the Novelty Works, New York:—

OFFICE NOVELTY IRON WORKS,
NEW YORK, 15th December, 1866.
Messrs. Lewis Lillie & Son.—
GENTLEMEN:—We have subjected the sample of Chilled Iron you furnished us to the most severe tests (as regards drilling through it) that we could bring to bear upon it, and without success.
It is our opinion that it can only be penetrated by the use of a large number of drills, and the expenditure of much power, with days of time.
And we think it impossible for a burglar, with his time and power, to penetrate it at all.
Yours truly,
ISAAC V. HOLMES, Superintendent.
LYMAN G. HALL, Foreman.

And the following extensive Iron manufacturers in Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago, after the most thorough tests, find the result to be substantially the same.
And their principal Iron Workers so certify:
Messrs. Merrick & Son, Southwark Foundry, Philadelphia.
The Finkley & Williams Works, Boston, Mass.
The Union Foundry and the Northwestern Foundry, Chicago, Ill.

FACT V.—The proposition made the public heretofore is now renewed: I will furnish Safes or Vault Doors, of same size and capacity of other best makers, and at one-third less price; and the same may be tested when finished, and I will furnish the man to test the work of any other maker, and he shall furnish the man to test my work; and the party so ordering may accept the work which stands the most resistance, in any way or manner practicable for a burglar to work.

FACT VI.—I would now say to any of the owners of Lillie's Safes, that, in view of the preceding facts, if they feel the need of additional security, I will exchange with them, on fair terms, giving them all the late improvements, and the increased security, which is claimed to be beyond the reach of Burglars, until some new system shall be developed in the working of Iron, which would now seem hardly possible.

FACT VII.—It is true that the Sheet-Iron or common Safe, as now made, under ordinary circumstances (and when not crushed by the fall of walls or timbers) usually saves the written matter, but if the fire is severe it has to be copied, for the ink will soon fade out; besides, the safe is twisted up and useless.

It is equally true that the Chilled-iron Safe saves the written matter in a perfect state, that it does not fade out or require copying, and that the safe itself is ready for further use. Any number of trials in fires, certified to, prove these facts, and if any of the safe venders who are distributing secret, anonymous circulars to injure the reputation of LILLIE'S SAFE, are not satisfied with these statements, they can have the opportunity of testing by fire one of their own Safes with LILLIE'S, on equal terms, whenever they so decide.

FACT VIII.—In answer to the story circulated by interested parties, that Lillie's Safe had gone up, and had ruined Lillie, etc., I would say that at no time in the last two years could Lillie & Son half supply the demand for Safes, and were under the necessity of forming a large stock company, with a very large capital, to meet the demand; and Mr. Lewis Lillie, Sr., is now the president of that company, which is located on the Delaware, in Pennsylvania, near Easton, and is the largest Safe Works probably in existence, and will be able to supply all demands for Safes, Locks, Chilled-Iron Vaults, etc.

In conclusion, I beg to call the attention of my patrons and friends, and the public, to the facts here presented, and to say that I am very thankful for past favors, and that I am prepared to furnish LILLIE'S BURGLAR AND FIRE AND BURGLAR-PROOF SAFES, VAULT DOORS, CHILLED IRON VAULTS and COMBINATINN LOCKS, all at short notice, warranted to be the best and cheapest in market. I also keep constantly a large assortment of second-hand Fire Proofs, taken in exchange for Lillie's Burglar Proofs, of the best-known makers, all put in good order, and offered at below usual auction prices.

M. C. SADLER,
AGENT FOR LILLIE'S SAFE AND IRON COMPANY,
No. 639 ARCH Street,
5 9 tuths2m PHILADELPHIA.

C. L. MAISER,
MANUFACTURER OF
FIRE AND BURGLAR-PROOF
SAFES,
LOCKSMITH, BELL-HANGER, AND DEALER IN BUILDING HARDWARE,
NO. 434 RACE STREET.
6 5

A LARGE ASSORTMENT OF FIRE and Burglar-proof SAFES on hand, with inside doors, Dwelling-house Safes, free from dampness. Prices low. C. HASSEN FORDES,
6 5 No. 422 VINE Street.

REMOVED.
OUR BEDDING STORE
IS REMOVED
FROM THE OLD STAND TO
No. 11 South NINTH Street.
5 27 R. L. KNIGHT & SON.

MILLINERY, TRIMMINGS, ETC.
SPRING AND SUMMER
FASHIONS
OF
BONNETS
HATS,
FLOWERS,
FEATHERS,
RIBBONS
BRIDAL WREATHS,
LACES,
ORNAMENTS,
FRAMES
ETC. ETC. ETC
NOW OPEN
THE ABOVE SPLENDID STOCK
OF
MILLINERY GOODS,
AT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
MAD'LLE KEOGH,
No. 904 WALNUT St.,
WHOSE ELEGANT SHOW ROOMS have already been visited by numerous purchasers: and she respectfully announces that she is constantly receiving NEW STYLES, and selling always at LOW PRICES.

MOURNING MILLINERY
RECEIVES AT HER ESTABLISHMENT MOST SPECIAL ATTENTION, AND THEREFORE SHE OFFERS THE BEST STOCK OF
MOURNING BONNETS
IN THE CITY.
MAD'LLE KEOGH,
4 11 thstuam] NO. 904 WALNUT STREET.

MOURNING MILLINERY.
ALWAYS ON HAND A LARGE ASSORTMENT OF
MOURNING BONNETS,
AT NO. 904 WALNUT STREET.
3 27 6m MAD'LLE KEOGH.

MRS. R. DILLON,
NOS. 323 AND 331 SOUTH STREET,
Has a handsome assortment of SPRING MILLINERY.
Ladies', Misses', and Children's Straw and Fancy Bonnets and Hats of the latest styles.
Also, Silks, Velvets, Ribbons, Crapes, Feathers, Flowers, Frames, etc. 7 18

237.—LADIES ABOUT LEAVING THE city for the Summer can find a large and handsome assortment of Velvet and Cord Edge Dress Trimming Ribbons, in all the desirable shades for Summer Dress Trimming. We sell these ribbons by the piece at less than jobbers' prices.
6 6 thstu 12t MARKLAND, No. 237 SOUTH 8t.

237.—STRAW GOODS! STRAW GOODS!—We have received from recent auction sales a large and fine assortment of Hats and Bonnets, for Ladies, Misses, and Children, which we are selling at a greater reduction than ever before offered, wholesale and retail.
6 6 thstu 12t MARKLAND, No. 237 SOUTH 8t.

REMOVAL.
REMOVAL.
A. & H. LEJAMBRE,
Late No. 1012 Chesnut street, have removed their
FURNITURE AND UPHOLSTERY WAREROOMS
To No. 1103 CHESNUT STREET,
UP STAIRS. 4 20 3m