CITY INTELLIGENCE.

FRANKFORD.

Public Meeting in Regard to Paving the Streets.

A large and respectable meeting of the property holders and citizens of Frankford convened at Wright's Institute on Wednesday evening the 15th inst., at 8 o'clock, to take action in reference to the paving of the streets, and for the purpose of forming a Protective Union. Lewis M. Troutman, Esq., was chosen President; Benjamin Rowland, Jr., Nathan Hilles, Charles Deal, and F. K. Womrath, Vice-Presidents; George W. Lukens and William A. Corson, Secretaries.

Mr. Troutman stated the object of the meeting, and severely censured the Highway Committee of Common Council for their course of action in reference to the paving of the streets in Frankford, against the known wishes of a majority of the property-holders. He considered it a high-handed outrage upon the holders of property on Leiper street, and said the time had arrived when the citizens of Philadelphia should elect men to represent their interests in Councils who had some regard for the interests of those they represented; for while the debt of our city and the taxes were steadily increasing there appeared to be a total disregard on the part of Councils to reduce the taxes that are so heavily pressing upon the workingmen of our city; and if the city fathers persist in their reckless expenditure of the people's money, the sufferers by their course of legislation will be compelled to take such action in future elections as will tend to check a further increase of taxes.

He said that no greater injury could be inflicted upon the citizens of Frankford than a general paving of the streets; and, although it might be a source of profit to the contractors, it would bring untold suffering upon those of our working people who have not the means to expend for so unnecessary a luxury; and the man or men attempting by disreputable means to force this large outlay of money upon the *poor* in our midst deserves the *scorn* and *contempt* of every honorable citizen.

The following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

Whereas, The property-holders of Frankford and vicinity, deeming it just and proper that they should be recognized by the Committee of Highways of the Common Council of our city, and having remonstrated against the paving of certain streets in Frankford, for good and sufficient reasons given, we consider the action of the committee in refusing to recognize a committee of our property-holders as illiberal and unjust.

Resolved, That the citizens of Frankford are not opposed to the paving or improvement of streets wherever the public good requires it, and that we endorse the act of the Legislature of Pennsylvania giving a majority of the property-holders on a street the right to determine and ask for the paving of the same, and we repudiate and condemn the means resorted to in Frankford of cutting up lots, and thereby securing fictitious names to represent owners of property.

Resolved, That as a large majority of the property-holders on Leiper street and other streets are opposed to paving the same, and thereby distressing those of our citizens who are unable to incur the expense, and having presented their remonstrance to the Committee of Highways, regularly and legally attested, we therefore respectfully ask the members of Select and Common Councils to protect us in our rights.

Resolved, That the thanks of this meeting are hereby tendered to Amos R. Ellis, Esq., our member of Council, for his indefatigable efforts in preventing the rights of property-holders being trampled upon.

Resolved, That this meeting form itself into a Protective Union, for the protection of the citizens of Frankford against any and every attempt to interfere with their just rights, and that a committee of ten citizens be appointed, who shall be empowered to employ counsel and take such steps as they may deem advisable for the furtherance of the objects of this meeting.

The following are the committee:—Messrs. Chenie Borie, Benjamin Rowland, Jr., Frederick K. Womrath, Charles Lukens, Edward Hay, Nathan Hilles, Joseph H. Comly, Charles Deal, Richard Garsed, William Overington.

On motion adjourned to meet in the same place Monday evening, 20th of February, at 7½ o'clock.

LENT.

Rules for the Faithful.

The first day of Lent, Ash Wednesday, falls this year on the 22d instant. Bishop Wood has issued the following rules for the observance of Lent in the Diocese of Pennsylvania:—

1. All the faithful who have completed their twenty-first year are bound to observe the Fast of Lent, unless dispensed for legitimate reasons.
2. One meal a day only is allowed, except on Sundays.
3. This meal is not to be taken until about noon.
4. On those days on which permission is granted to eat meat, both meat and fish are not to be used at the same meal, even by way of condiment.
5. A collation or partial meal is allowed in the evening. The general practice of pious Christians limits its quantity to the fourth part of an ordinary meal.
6. Bread, butter, cheese, fruit of all kinds, salads, vegetables, and fish are permitted at the collation. Milk and eggs are prohibited.
7. Custom has made it lawful to drink in the morning some warm liquid, such as tea and coffee, or thin chocolate made with water.
8. Necessity and custom have authorized the use of lard instead of butter in preparing fish, vegetables, etc.
9. The following persons are not bound to observe the fast, namely:—All under twenty-one years of age, the sick, pregnant women and those giving suck to infants, those who are obliged to do hard work, and all who, through weakness, cannot fast without injury to their health.
10. By dispensation, the use of flesh meat will be allowed at any time on Sundays, and once a day on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, with the exception of Holy Thursday and the second and last Saturdays of Lent.
11. Persons exempted from the obligation of fasting, by age or laborious occupation, are not restricted to the use of meat at one meal only on those days on which its use is granted by dispensation.

† JAMES F. WOOD,
Bishop of Philadelphia.

Cathedral, Philadelphia.

THE UNION LEAGUE OF AMERICA.—A meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Union League of America will be held this afternoon at the National Union Club Room, Chesnut street, above Eleventh. The committee will sit with closed doors. The subjects to be considered are these:—

The condition of political affairs in Arkansas, Missouri, North Carolina, and Florida has called for energetic action on the part of the committee. A petition from leading colored men in North Carolina will be presented, praying for the interference of the Republican party to save them from destruction.

Action will also be asked of the committee in behalf of the members of the League who have been threatened and intimidated in the attempted exercise of their political rights in Georgia and Marland. In the latter State the farmers have combined together and resolved to employ no one who is known to be a member of the Union League. The condition of Union men in Kentucky is represented as deplorable in the extreme. In the Congressional district known as the "Henry Clay district," the Democratic candidate was elected by less than one hundred majority, and the bad feeling engendered by such a hot contest has brought forth a disagreeable state of feeling, which promises to culminate in outrage. The defeat of universal amnesty in this and other Southern States is desired among Union men. It is represented by prominent members of the League that the time for this amnesty has not yet arrived, and that if it is attempted to pass such a measure, it would render it necessary for every outspoken Union man, black or white, to leave his property and take refuge in a Northern State.

REV. DR. TITUS CRAN.—This distinguished missionary, who for thirty-six years has been laboring in the Sandwich Islands, under the auspices of the "American Board of Foreign Missions," arrived in this city yesterday, and with his family is the guest of Rev. F. L. Robbins.

Friends desiring to communicate with him by letter or personally will find him at No. 1518 N. Fifteenth street.

SOCIAL SCIENCE.—This evening the Philadelphia Social Science Association will hold a special meeting at the hall of the Mercantile Library. Mr. Eckley B. Coxe will read a paper on "Boards of Arbitration, or the Amicable Adjustment of the Wages Question, with Particular Reference to the Present State of the Anthracite Coal Trade of Pennsylvania." After the reading of the paper the subject will be open for discussion.

THE NEW COAL OIL INSPECTOR.—W. J. P. White, Esq., the new Coal Oil Inspector, was sworn into office yesterday. He entered upon the discharge of his duties this morning.

KIRKBRIDE'S.

Are Any Sane Persons Incarcerated in It?—An Answer from the Physician-in-Chief.

"Persons with entirely honest intentions"—says Dr. Kirkbride in his annual report, some extracts of which we gave yesterday—"are often found asking whether sane people are not frequently, either by mistake or from improper motives, placed in hospitals for the insane, and then restrained of their liberty by those who have some selfish end to attain by such proceedings. Such a question as this, coming from an honest inquirer after truth, deserves to be answered, and, so far as Pennsylvania is concerned, unquestionably can be, and in a mode that must remove all rational grounds for uneasiness from those who may have entertained doubts on the subject. I believe I am able to speak positively of what has occurred in this institution during the thirty years it has been in operation, and in which period no less than 5796 patients have been under its care; and I desire to place on record my testimony in regard to this inquiry. In all this long period, and in all this large number of patients, I have neither known any one whose mind was not diseased, or who was not recovering from an attack of insanity, and in a condition requiring this kind of care, to be restrained of his or her liberty, nor have I detected an inclination on the part of the friends of a patient to make such a use of the institution; which, it may be added, if attempted, could not have proved successful, and nowhere else would have been as soon detected and exposed. In regard to the State institutions at Harrisburg and Pittsburg, and the asylum at Frankford, I have the most undoubted authority for testifying to the same effect. I am well aware that many cases, regarded by some as doubtful, have been before the courts for adjudication, in regard to a further detention in an institution, but there has been no one of these, with which I am acquainted, in which experts could have had the slightest hesitation in regard to the original insanity of the patient; not one in which the subsequent results of the case did not justify their opinions; nor one in which any judge, even when deciding a question of a further residence in the hospital, against the opinion of its officers, ever intimated a doubt as to the insanity of the patient when admitted into the institution. In a single case only was the question of insanity left unsettled, owing to the death of the individual before the conclusion of the investigation.

"There are certain cases of intemperance often sent to hospitals by direct order of the courts, or by authority derived from the courts by their legal guardians, or in the usual mode, for their temporary protection, when unable to take care of themselves. Many of these, after a short stay, seem to have recovered their natural state of mind, and are retained only as required in the original order of the court, 'until discharged by due process of law.' A difference of opinion may exist in regard to how much of this kind of mental trouble is real insanity, or whether it is merely a temporary effect from the habit alluded to. Intemperance is sometimes a disease, and sometimes it is only an effect of insanity—a symptom of a disease. While many physicians have no hesitation in regarding all these cases as genuine insanity, there are some in which the officers of this hospital might entertain a different opinion, and on this account all such, although coming here under legal process, are excluded from the statement on a preceding page. Many persons, too, dreading an attack of insanity, or suffering from the incipient stage of it, or from a general disordered condition of the nervous system, ask to have the benefits of the hospital, but they come to it as they would go elsewhere, for medical advice, and as they would enter an ordinary boarding-house; and they leave it whenever it is their pleasure to do so; so that they can hardly be regarded as the ordinary insane, nor can they in any sense be said to be restrained of their liberty. With these explanations, there are no qualifications to be made to the statement that, after the most careful inquiry, I believe there is no ground for the belief that any sane person has ever been admitted into and restrained of his liberty in any Pennsylvania institution intended for the care and treatment of the insane."

LOAD THE SHIP.

An Opportunity to Extend a Helping Hand to France.

To-morrow afternoon there will be an important meeting at the Mayor's office, to devise "ways and means" to aid impoverished France. New York has taken the initiative in this matter. Her merchants have given largely of their means, and ships have been chartered to take out food for the starving Parisians. Boston next followed, and now Philadelphia, whose generosity has hitherto, in all such charitable affairs, been so great, is to send help to France in the way of sustenance. The United States has ordered the United States man-of-war Worcester to proceed from Boston to this port, and receive our contributions. In view of this fact, the Mayor has sent the following notice to our leading merchants and citizens:—

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 14, 1871—Dear Sir:—The Mayor requests that you will favor him with a call, on Friday next, February 17, at 1 o'clock P. M., at this office, to meet some of our other principal citizens, to talk over the proper mode of presenting to the public the subject of contributions of provisions for the French and German sufferers in Europe, to be conveyed in the national ship ordered to this port for that purpose.

Very respectfully,
E. G. WOODWARD, Assistant Clerk.

GUARDIANS OF THE POOR—OPERATIONS OF THE LAW DEPARTMENT.—The report of J. H. Seltzer, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor, and Solicitor for the Guardians of the Poor, shows that during the past year there were:—Desertion cases tried, 104; amicably adjusted before the Solicitor, 100; remaining untried, 22; total desertion cases, 226, other cases tried, 12; settled, 26; untried, 20; total aldermen's returns, 284. In addition, there were twenty-nine citations for the support of aged and infirm parents, of which 9 were tried, 19 were settled, and 1 remains untried. There were also issued 19 warrants for the seizure of property to parties who deserted their families, leaving them destitute. Of these 5 were tried, and the balance (14) remain untried. In 1869 the number of desertion cases tried, settled, and untried was 264, showing a decrease for the past year of 38 cases. Of other cases tried, settled, and untried in 1869, there were 47, showing an increase in the past year of 11. The Solicitor complains of the hardship that women, often with children in their arms, are compelled to attend court Saturday after Saturday, and sit from its opening to its close, and then be sent home, to go through the same on the ensuing Saturday. This is the result of the great mass of business accumulating in the office, and was unavoidable, but he hopes that it will be remedied now that the court has an additional judge.

THE ABANDONED LAD.—The youth who was deserted by his stepmother at the Pennsylvania Railroad depot in Erie, Pa., has found a protector and a home. The parents of the boy have not yet turned up, but his aunt has been found. She resides in Monroe street, in this city. Mr. C. D. Wright, a banker of Erie, Pa., has expressed a willingness to pay the expenses of the lad to this city, so a despatch received by the Mayor reads.

THEFT OF A DIAMOND RING.—Robert Hayes was arrested yesterday upon the charge of the larceny of a diamond ring, worth $100, from Mary Jane Taylor, who resides at No. 333 Shippen street. The allegation is that Robert pawned the article for $10. He will have a hearing at the Central this afternoon.

ANCIENT AND MODERN PAINTINGS.—A collection of ancient and modern paintings belonging to David T. Shaw, Esq., of New York, will be sold without reserve this evening at 7½ o'clock at Scott's art gallery, No. 841 Chesnut street. The catalogue embraces many specimens of rare merit.

WIFE BEATER.—John Doyle, residing at Seventh and Shippen streets, was arrested last night upon the charge of beating his wife. He had a hearing before Alderman Collins, and was held in $500 bail to answer.

THE STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

Meeting of Subscribers to the American Steamship Company To-day—Progress Reported—Additional Subscriptions.

A meeting of the subscribers to the American Steamship Company was held at 12½ o'clock to-day at the rooms of the Board of Trade, Mr. Joseph Patterson in the chair. Mr. Alexander P. Colesberry was appointed Secretary.

The secretary read the report of the Executive Committee on the subscriptions to the stock and bonds of the American Steamship Company. This committee, appointed at a meeting held in the Merchants' Exchange, November 30, 1870, held their first meeting December 5, at the rooms of the Mercantile Library, where the form of the subscription papers having been adopted, sub-committees were appointed for canvassing, and the work was pushed forward so rapidly that at a meeting held December 22, the whole amount of stock was reported as subscribed. "In confining themselves to stock subscriptions, the Executive and sub-committees were actuated by two motives — First, that by having the capital subscribed it would form a basis for bond subscriptions; and, second, they had reason to believe that the banks, insurance companies, and capitalists would promptly take the bonds if the merchants and business men took the stock. After a thorough canvass, however, the Executive Committee found that they would only be able to place about one-half of the bonds among the corporations of our city, and renewed exertions were made to obtain additional subscriptions among the business men. The result of their efforts so far is practically as follows:—

From corporations	$700,000
From business men	400,000
Total	$1,100,000 in bonds

"Thus leaving $400,000 to be taken before the enterprise can be called a complete success.

"After full consultation the Executive Committee considered themselves obliged to ask those gentlemen who had already shown their liberality by investing in the stocks and bonds, to come forward and aid them in raising the additional $400,000, and it is for that purpose that we are assembled here to-day."

The report was adopted.

The following resolution was offered by Mr. Verree and was adopted:—

Resolved, That a committee of twenty-one be appointed by the chairman of this meeting to confer with the Executive Committee as to the best means to be adopted whereby the remaining bond subscriptions may be secured in the shortest possible time, and that these names be announced in the daily papers.

The following-named gentlemen took subscription books for the purpose of securing from sources as yet untouched additional subscriptions:—

A. J. Derbyshire,	S. Flanagan,
F. Fitzpatrick,	C. B. Durborrow,
George H. Stuart,	Henry Disston,
D. B. Potter,	William Massey,
F. C. Hill,	J. Wayne,
J. P. Verree,	William Brockie,
P. S. Justice,	A. Wheeler.

Henry Geiger took a book and guaranteed $5000 of the bonds. Mr. James M. Vance did likewise, also Mr. Joseph Patterson.

H. D. Landis announced that he would subscribe for $5000 of the stock, but being a non-resident could not take a book.

The Chair announced the names of the new committee, after which the meeting adjourned.

SCIENCE AT HOME.

The Franklin Institute Meeting—A Curious Cave—The Hoosac Tunnel.

At the meeting of the Franklin Institute, held last evening, a detailed account of the progress and modes of conducting the excavations at the Hoosac Tunnel was given, from which we make this summary:—"The mountain has been penetrated from the east side 8200 feet, and from the west side 5820 feet, making the total figures 14,220 feet, leaving still 10,811 feet to be cut through. The average daily progress is 18 feet." Mention was next made of a very curious cave deposit recently unearthed at Port Kennedy in this State. Quite a number of remains of extinct mammals were discovered, including those of the mastodon, bear, tapir, several varieties of horse, rat, and many others. Some curious experiments in connection with the passivity of iron were shown, and mention was made of a considerable deposit of saltpetre in Tioga county of this State. The important fact that indigo had been artificially manufactured was announced, two German chemists, Emmerling and Engler, being the discoverers.

THE ALLEGED FORGERS.—Mayor Fox has received a telegram from the Chief of Police of Albany, setting forth that, from reading the Philadelphia papers, he believes the men George H. Moore and R. H. Lennox, arrested here for supposed forgery, to be identical with the geniuses who have been operating in Albany and other places in New York State. They seem to have ordered from an Albany stationer a check-book in the name of R. G. Hunting & Brother. No such firm exists in Albany. The prisoners had a hearing before Alderman Kerr at one o'clock this afternoon, and were surrendered into the custody of an officer from Albany, to be taken to that place for trial.

ASSAULT AND BATTERY AND CARRYING CONCEALED DEADLY WEAPONS.—James Ritchie was taken into custody at Tenth and Fitzwater streets last night, upon the charge of assault and battery on Hugh Gallagher. When searched at the station house, a deadly weapon was found in his possession. He had a hearing before Alderman Collins, and was committed in default of $800 bail to answer both charges.

LARCENY.—Benjamin Herzog, an employe of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, left his boarding house, in Mantuaville, yesterday, and soon after his departure a large quantity of clothing was missed. Benjamin was tracked to Chester county, where he was arrested on suspicion of having stolen the property. He had a hearing before Alderman Clark, and was held in $500 bail to answer.

WHISKY.—At an early hour this morning two men named Thomas Meehan and James Carr were found asleep on the sidewalk at Tenth and Pine streets. They sat on the curbstone with their feet in the gutter. Whisky had got the best of them. A policeman induced them to go to the station-house, where, after sleeping off their stupor, they were released.

RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Edward Reddington, who keeps a junk-shop at No. 612 Penn street, was taken into custody yesterday upon the charge of receiving stolen goods. It is alleged that he purchased a lot of copper from some boys who had stolen the same. Defendant was held for a hearing at the Central this afternoon.

IMPLICATED.—Samuel Carry was arrested at Swanson and Mead streets last night on suspicion of being implicated in the robbery at the Almond street bonded warehouse a few nights ago. He will have a hearing at the Central Station this afternoon.

LEGAL INTELLIGENCE.

THE ROBBINS CASE.

JUDGE PEIRCE'S CHARGE.

The Document in Full—A Complete and Interesting Review of the Law and the Testimony.

Court of Common Pleas—Judge Peirce.

In the case of Robbins vs. Robbins, at the close of the arguments of counsel, Judge Peirce proceeded to charge the jury in the following lucid and able language:—

Gentlemen of the Jury:—After a patient investigation of thirteen days, during which you have given the most faithful attention to the evidence and arguments which have been submitted to you, the issue made in this case is about to be submitted to you for your determination. That issue is whether or not the respondent, Sarah Jane Robbins, has been guilty of adultery with George W. Fetter, or Charles E. Elmes, or with any other person or persons, as she is charged by her husband, the libellant, Charles D. Robbins.

In the determination of this issue you will divest your minds of all prejudice or favor for or against either the one party or the other, and try the case by the evidence which has been submitted to you and by the law, and by these alone.

There are some well-established principles of law applicable to cases of this kind which it is my duty to submit to and explain to you for your guidance in the investigation in which you are engaged.

It is a fundamental rule, says Lord Stowell, in Lovedon vs. Lovedon, 2 Hagg. Con. R., 2, 3, that it is not necessary to prove the direct fact of adultery, because, if it were otherwise, there is not one case in a hundred in which that proof would be available. It is very rarely indeed that the parties are surprised in the direct fact of adultery. In every case almost the fact is inferred from circumstances that lead to it by fair inference as a necessary conclusion; and unless this were the case, and unless this were so held, no protection whatever could be given to marital rights. The only general rule that can be laid down upon the subject is, that the circumstances must be such as would lead the guarded discretion of a reasonable and just man to the conclusion; for it is not to lead to a rash and intemperate judgment, moving upon appearances that are equally capable of two interpretations; neither is it to a matter of artificial reason, judging upon such things differently from what would strike the careful and cautious consideration of a discreet man.

Where there is no direct proof of adultery, the rule has been elsewhere more briefly stated to require that there be such proximate circumstances proved as by former decisions, or in their own nature, satisfy the legal conviction of the court that the criminal act has been committed.

In order to infer adultery from general conduct, it seems necessary that what the law calls a suspicio violenta, or violent suspicion, should be created.

Thus, a married man going into a known brothel raises a suspicion of adultery, to be rebutted only by the very best evidence. His going there and remaining alone for some time in a room with a common prostitute is sufficient proof of the crime. The circumstance of a woman going to such a place with a man furnishes similar proof of adultery.

As to proof by confession of the party, no difference of principle is perceived between this crime and any other. A deliberate and voluntary confession of guilt is among the most weighty and effectual proofs in the law. But in such a case you must be satisfied that the confession was made, and that the party making it intended to be understood as admitting guilt, and that it was not said ironically in frivolousness or in passion. After the patient attention which you have given to this case, I do not propose to read to you any part of the evidence, except that part of it in which the libellant and respondent each give their account of what occurred at their home, Twentieth and Green streets, at and about the time of the separation. The Judge then proceeded to read those portions of the testimony and afterwards continued his charge as follows:—

In weighing the testimony of the witnesses in this case, you will consider its inherent character as evincing truthfulness, or the want of it; the character of the witnesses who testified; their relation to the parties; the motives that would be likely to influence their testimony; their opportunity for knowing the matters about which they testify; and the light, if any, which is shed on the testimony of each by the other testimony in the case.

The testimony in this case naturally divides itself into three groups:—

1. The testimony relative to the alleged confession of guilt of the respondent.
2. The testimony relative to the alleged visits of the respondent to houses of ill-fame.
3. The testimony relative to the alleged improper interviews of the respondent with Mr. Fetter and Mr. Elmes.

The only witness who testifies to the alleged admission of guilt is the libellant himself. For, though there are witnesses who speak of the respondent going on her knees to her husband and asking his forgiveness, they do not say that the forgiveness she asked was for the offense of adultery. If it were true she asked forgiveness, the forgiveness she asked was equally applicable to any other offense, real or supposed, which she may have committed against her husband, as to the crime of adultery. Or, finding her husband's mind incensed against her, she may have hoped to appease him by asking forgiveness, without regard to the influences which were operating on his mind to incense him against her.

So the alleged declaration of the respondent to Mrs. Harriet Robbins, "Dear mother, this is all my own fault! If I had taken your advice long ago this would have never happened," may be understood with reference to one supposed cause of offense or another. Neither Mrs. Harriet Robbins nor the other witnesses say that in that interview there was any reference to the offense of adultery, whilst the respondent says that the alleged conversation was with reference to the jealousy of the respondent of her husband.

The libellant's account of the alleged admission of guilt is that on Sunday previous to sending his wife away he accused her of improper actions in the past, "I told her I was satisfied that she was guilty of adultery with Charles E. Elmes and George W. Fetter, to which she tauntingly replied that it was so and dared me to prove it. I told her I would endeavor to do it, and ordered her out of the parlor."

On re-examination the libellant said the conversation began about Mr. Fetter calling to set an evening when they would go to see Miss Duff. "She said I was entirely too familiar with Miss Duff, that she did not like our actions, that she would not visit her and would not have her visit us. I told her I saw nothing connected with Miss Duff other than a perfect lady. That led to the conversation about Mr. Fetter and George Elmes in which I charged her adultery with them."

In weighing this testimony you will consider whether a woman would be likely to admit her guilt of adultery to her husband. And if it were said, whether it was said deliberately or in an ebullition of passion in a conversation in which there is crimination and recrimination on each side.

You will also consider whether, when the libellant made the charge against his wife, as testified by him, he had any information or evidence upon which he could ground such a charge. In his evidence he does not aver that he had any knowledge of any improprieties of his wife with either of the gentlemen named, or of the alleged visits of his wife to houses of ill-fame, before he made these charges against her. Nor is there any evidence in the case whatever that shows that he had any knowledge of the alleged improprieties of his wife at the time he charged her with adultery with Mr. Elmes and Mr. Fetter, except the circumstance of her leaving the parlor in 1855 where she was alone for a minute or so with Mr. Elmes, and the circumstance of the kissing in 1861 or 1862, when Mr. Fetter kissed Mrs. Robbins and Mr. Robbins kissed Mrs. Fetter in the presence of each other in the entry, on the occasion of the libellant and his wife going to Mr. Fetter's house to tea, and which the libellant seems never to have treated as an offense at the time or since, except that it has been given in evidence in this case.

You will also consider the conduct of the libellant at, and immediately after, the time of the alleged confession of his wife, and whether it was such as a man having had revealed to him the guilt of his wife would have exhibited.

His statement is that, after this alleged confession of his wife, within an hour or two thereafter, he dined with her and the family. After dinner he went to his father's, and took a walk with his father; then returned home; did not take tea, and gave as a reason that he seldom takes it. He then went to see Mr. Northrop, but did not find him; then went to the Continental Hotel, and then home about 10 o'clock. On Monday morning he took breakfast with the family; he thinks Mrs. Robbins poured out; had two or three interviews with Mr. Northrop that day; he went to the Walnut Street Theatre that evening; was there alone a couple of hours, he thinks; went from the theatre right home; got home about twelve o'clock; went up stairs and found his wife in bed; his first remark was she would have to leave that house the next morning. Mrs. Blake and the respondent both say that he breakfasted with the family on Tuesday morning, Mrs. Robbins being at the breakfast table; and this does not appear to be denied by the libellant.

You will consider this testimony, and say whether or not this was the conduct which a man who believed his wife was guilty of adultery would have pursued.

In considering this part of the case you will also bear in mind the denial which the respondent makes of this alleged confession. She says, "In the conversation on that Sunday morning he said nothing about Mr. Elmes; what he said was about Mr. Fetter; he said he supposed that I had been to church with Mr. Fetter; I did not tauntingly reply and admit that I had committed adultery with Mr. Fetter and dare him to prove it; there was no such conversation as that at all."

You will also remember her denials of her alleged asking her forgiveness. She says, "I did not at any time ask him to forgive me."

Your next consideration will be of the testimony relative to the alleged visits of the respondent to houses of ill-fame. The witnesses who testify to this are Jonathan Thomas, John Ridey, Robert Hamilton, and Maria Carey. Each of these persons saw her but for a minute, either as she was coming down stairs, or passing along the entry, or going down the steps, or coming out of the door. You have heard these witnesses, their avowal of who they are, the comments of counsel upon their testimony, and it is not necessary for me to repeat it to you further.

In reply to the testimony of these witnesses, Kate Bond, Ada Patterson, and Susan Templeton, who testify that they were all inmates of the house No. 1313 Wood street, two of them from 1863 to 1868 and one of them from New Year, 1865, to 1868, say that they never saw the respondent in that house. You heard their testimony; you will consider their opportunities for knowing who visited the house, and what reliance is to be placed upon their testimony. The deposition of Fanny Smith, who is since deceased, was also read, and she testified that she had never seen the respondent at her house, and that she did not permit persons from the street to visit her house, other than those who came to visit the inmates of it.

The respondent also denies that she was ever at the house No. 1313 Wood street or at the house No. 1032 Wood street, and says that she never heard that she was charged with being at No. 1032 Wood street until she received a written paper about a month ago.

Mr. Fetter and Mr. Elmes also deny having been at these houses. Mr. Fetter says:—"I never committed adultery with Mrs. Charles D. Robbins at any time nor at any place; I was never at No. 1313 Wood street with Mrs. Charles D. Robbins; I was never at No. 1032 Wood street with Mrs. Charles D. Robbins; I was never at any other house of prostitution or ill-fame with Mrs. Charles D. Robbins; there was not a particle of familiarity between me and Mrs. Charles D. Robbins at any time or any place that would induce such a suspicion." Mr. Elmes says:—"I have never had any improper intimacy with Mrs. Robbins; Mrs. Robbins has never committed adultery with me; I have never been with her in any house in Wood street, nor in any house of prostitution or assignation anywhere."

It is due to both Mr. Fetter and Mr. Elmes to say that there is not a single witness who says that either of these gentlemen were at either of the houses named or at any other house of ill-fame whatever.

The next matter for your consideration will be the testimony relative to the alleged improper interviews of the respondent with Mr. Fetter and Mr. Elmes.

The libellant, neither by himself nor by his witnesses, has been able to establish any such interviews between the respondent and Mr. Fetter. And the only interviews which Mr. Fetter had with the respondent when her husband was not present was when he called one evening to see Mr. Robbins; Mr. Robbins was not in; he spent twenty or thirty minutes with Mrs. Robbins, and returned to spend the evening with Mr. Wilson, where he had left his wife. Again, when he called, with his wife, and they spent the evening with Mrs. Robbins, Mr. Robbins coming in as they were going away. And the last occasion, when he called on the morning of the separation with a message to Mrs. Robbins from Mrs. Fetter, when he saw Mrs. Robbins and her mother at the parlor door, and they narrated to him the unhappy occurrences which were then taking place.

With respect to Mr. Elmes, the only alleged improper interview was on the occasion of his visit to them by invitation to take tea with them in 1855 or 1856. Mr. Elmes says that when he arrived Mr. Robbins had not got home, and he went into the parlor and sat down on the parlor window. Mrs. Robbins came in and sat down on the sofa. She came in and right out again; and at the request of Mrs. Robbins he told Mr. Robbins, who came in two minutes after he arrived there, that "he had not seen her, or that she is up-stairs; I have just this moment come in." This he says he did because he heard that Mr. Robbins was a jealous man, and he obeyed Mrs. Robbins' instructions on that account. "It is all the explanation I can give; it was the work of a moment; I hadn't time to think."

It seems to me that this part of the case entirely fails of any support by the evidence, and that it would be difficult to find in the lives of any three persons charged with the heinous offense of adultery so little even of the ordinary familiarity which frequently accompanies intimacy of acquaintance, as the evidence exhibits existed between the respondent and Mr. Fetter and Mr. Elmes.

You will, however, take all the evidence on this point into consideration, and give it such weight as you think it is entitled to.

You will also take into consideration the conduct of the respondent and the parties charged with her, and see if it is such as you would ordinarily expect of persons charged with so grave an offense as this.

You will also consider the testimony of Lippincott, who says he was induced by the libellant to commit perjury against the respondent, and the testimony of Kate Bond, who says Mr. Robbins asked her if she would not like to have a new silk suit, when he called on her at No. 1106 Sansom street, and she was showed the photograph of Mrs. Robbins by Mr. Smith or Mr. Robbins, and asked whether she had ever seen that lady.

Of course no reliance can be placed on the testimony of a witness such as Lippincott, who admits that he has already committed perjury in this case, unless you find support of it in some other part of the case.

The only circumstance which remains unexplained as bearing upon his testimony is to how he obtained his information relative to the respondent having asked the forgiveness of her husband, and to which he swore before the examiner. If it was not derived, as he avers it was, from the libellant, where did he obtain the knowledge or information? Neither the libellant nor do any of the witnesses say that he was present at the interview in which this is said to have occurred. If Lippincott heard her say it, the presumption is he heard it when he came into the house to get the trunks or other parcels to go in the carriage, if he did get them. Mr. Robbins, the brother of libellant, says it was said in the sitting-room about the time she was leaving, before the conversation about the bonnet, and that in reply to her asking for money to buy a bonnet, libellant told her it was no time to talk of such things, that the carriage was waiting, and to get ready her things as quick as she could and go; which would seem to imply that it was said before the things were got ready to go.

You, however, will consider this testimony, and give it such weight, and such weight only, as you may think it is entitled to.

Another remarkable piece of testimony was that of Mr. Charles C. Knight. He went with the libellant and assisted him in the preparations to have his wife leave. He says that when the wife in tears and excitement appealed to him to be permitted to explain, and the scene was so unpleasant that he went into the adjoining room, he refused to listen to her, telling her that Mr. Robbins had made no explanation to him. He afterwards said it was true that he had made no explanation to him, and only said he wanted me to go with him; he was going to separate from his wife.

I make no comments on this testimony, but leave it with you for your consideration.

You will also consider the evidence relative to the intimacy of the libellant with another lady, and give to it such weight as you may think it justly entitled to in your consideration of the case.

There is but one circumstance to which I call your attention in considering this part of the evidence.

The libellant says "it was, he thinks, about 1863, if may have been 1864, was his first visit to the family of Mr. Shourds."

This was a year or two before the difficulties with his wife began. "I visited the family often," he says, "in 1865." This was the year he sent his wife away.

This sad case is about to pass into your hands. Your patient attention to it during the progress of the trial assures me that it has received, and will receive, from you that just and intelligent consideration to which it is entitled.

You will try it by the evidence, and by the law as I have instructed you in the law, and by these alone. The burden of proof is on the libellant. You will judge of the facts as other men of discernment, exercising a sound and sober judgment on circumstances that are duly proved, judge of them, and they must be such as convince your understandings that the respondent is guilty of the offense of adultery with which she is charged. The burden of proof is on the libellant. You will dismiss from your minds all improper feeling for or against the one party or the other. You will not suffer your sympathies either on the one side or the other to improperly influence your judgment. Not that human feeling is to be entirely disregarded in the judgments which we are called on to form; for the heart is sometimes wiser than the head, and I think it may be safely said that where a man has no heart to feel he has no head to judge. But you will decide the case from the evidence, trying that evidence by the clear judgment of your minds and your knowledge of human nature, and you will render such verdict, whether for the libellant or the respondent, as is and may be the result of your clear and deliberate judgment.

The jury retired, and after being out all night, this morning sent word to the Court that they had not yet been able to agree.

N. Y. MONEY MARKET YESTERDAY.

From the Herald.

"Money was easy at four to five per cent. The stock houses generally paid five per cent., but were accommodated at four when they presented the better class of stock collaterals. Borrowers on Governments were supplied, as a rule, at four per cent., but some of the dealers paid five per cent.

"Commercial paper is quoted 6@7 per cent. discount as the extreme range of first-class notes and acceptances.

"Foreign exchange was rather firmer on the basis of 109½ for prime bankers' sixty days sterling, and 110¼ for sight bills. The decline in gold the past few days induced the importers to buy freely, and some of the leading bankers were disposed to-day to mark up the rates.

"The gold market was heavy in the forenoon on the continued influence of the suspicion that the Government had sold gold the previous day, and before the acceptance of the bonds at the Sub-Treasury the price had fallen from 111⅛ to 110¾, the dealers being very uneasy as to the truth of the suspicion referred to and betraying their feelings by a feverish market. All eyes were turned to the Sub-Treasury, as the amount of bonds to be purchased would solve the mystery which has been a sort of nightmare in the Gold Room for the past forty-eight hours. Consequently, when it became known that the amount accepted was confined to the figure already specified in the Treasury programme for the current month, the suspicion was disbelieved and gold ran suddenly up to 111¼, its progress beyond the opening prices being attributed to purchases by the foreign bankers, who had advices from London that the specie in the Bank of England had fallen off, and that British consols and United States five-twenties in London were down an eighth per cent.—the which gave rise to an apprehension that the directors of the Bank of England at their weekly meeting to-morrow morning would advance the rate of discount."

—Rumors are current in Arkansas that articles of impeachment are being prepared against Governor Clayton. The Supreme Court will render a decision on Thursday in regard to the ousting of Lieutenant-Governor Johnson.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

For additional Special Notices see Inside Pages.

☞ NOTICE THIS!

In Gents' Furnishing Goods we keep constantly a LARGE, VARIED, and FASHIONABLE stock of

COLLARS, CUFFS, CRAVATS,
HOSIERY AND HANDKERCHIEFS,
UNDERWEAR AND UMBRELLAS,
GLOVES AND GOWNS,
WALKING STICKS AND WRAPPERS.
Etc., Etc., Etc., Etc.

WANAMAKER
818 AND 820 CHESNUT STREET.

☞ ACADEMY OF MUSIC.

THE STAR COURSE OF LECTURES.

WENDELL PHILLIPS.
Monday Evening, February 20,
Subject—Street Life in Europe.

JAMES E. MURDOCH.
Thursday Evening, February 23,
Subject—An Actor's Views and Impressions of the Character of "Hamlet," illustrated by remarks and readings.

MISS LILLIAN S. EDGARTON, Feb. 27.
REV. E. H. CHAPIN, D. D., March 2.
DANIEL DOUGHERTY, Esq., March 13.
JOSH BILLINGS, March 16.
A. MINER GRISWOLD (The Fat Contributor), March 20.
GENERAL KILPATRICK, March 23.
MRS. CADY STANTON, March 27.
MENDELSSOHN QUINTETTE CLUB, March 30.

Admission, 50 cents. Reserved Seats, 25 cents extra. Tickets to any of the Single Lectures for sale at Gould & Fischer's Piano Rooms, No. 923 CHESNUT Street. [2 16 tfrp

Ticket Office open daily from 9 A. M. to 6 P. M.

☞ THE PHILADELPHIA SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION will hold a special meeting of the DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND MANUFACTURES at the Hall of the MERCANTILE LIBRARY, on THURSDAY EVENING, Feb. 16, 1871, at 8 P. M.

MR ECKLEY B. COXE will read a paper on "Boards of Arbitration