THE IMPEACHMENT TRIAL.

WASHINGTON, April 9.

SENATE.

The Court commenced at the usual hour. The Chief Justice asked if the Managers had any further evidence. Mr. Butler, on the part of the Managers, called Mr. W. H. Wood, who was sworn.

Mr. H. Wood, of Alabama, testified that he had served in the Union army; called on the President in December, 1866, to ask for Government employment. [Mr. Butler said they designed to prove by this witness the President's hostility to Congress.] Mr. Wood then narrated his conversation with the President, in the course of which the latter said he could not do anything for witness, as it appeared his influence was cast on the side of Congress; and those whom he appointed must side with him.

Cross-examined by Mr. Stanberry.—Had not said to a Mr. Cappell, of this city, that his evidence would be more to the advantage of the President than in the interest of the Managers; had not been instructed by the Managers to state anything which he could not faithfully say. On re-direct examination it appeared there had been a misunderstanding on the part of Cappell, which witness corrected by saying the President had not told him there would be a tax of 25 per cent. on his salary, for the support of the Administration.

Foster Blodgett was appointed in 1865 Postmaster at Augusta. During the recess of the Senate in 1866 he received another. In January 1868 he was suspended by the President, and does not know whether the Senate has been notified of this action.

The letter of Gen. Thomas accepting the appointment as Secretary of War *ad interim*, was then put in evidence, and Mr. Butler gave notice that the managers would file the certificate of proper officers, to show that no reasons for the suspension of Blodgett had ever been sent to Senate.

Mr. Curtiss commenced the opening argument for the defense by alluding to the character of the trial, and to the oaths taken by the Senators in their capacity of Judges. He said the only appeal he should make would be to the conscience and the reason of each and every judge, basing his arguments solely on the question of law and fact. He intimated that he would subsequently combat the position taken by the managers that this body was not essentially and in fact a court, but, at present, he would consider the articles separately and in their order. The substance, the gravamen of the charges of the first eight articles was that the removal of Mr. Stanton was, and was intended to be, in violation of the Tenure-of-Office act, and of the Constitution. He argued to show that the case of Stanton did not come within the scope and provisions of the Tenure-of-Office act, maintaining that the description of his office and its tenure differed materially in the section and in its proviso. Stanton was appointed by Lincoln in 1862 to hold the office during the term for which he was elected, and not to hold it during the subsequent term for which he might be elected. It could not be said that Johnson is serving out the term of Lincoln. The term for which a President is elected is not absolutely four years, but is limited by life and ability. His conditional term expiring, the Vice President succeeds to a new term, which consists of the remainder of the term for which the Vice President was elected. As well might it be said that one sovereign served out the term of another whom he succeeded. There was a purpose in the difference of phraseology between the section and its proviso.

The Constitution authorizes the President to call upon members of his Cabinet for advice, respecting matters concerning his own duties as well as respecting matters connected with their various departments, and such had been the invariable practice since the foundation of the government. Those were the voice and hands of the President, in them he was to repose confidence, and for them he was to be responsible, for this reason they were placed by the Tenure-of-office bill in the same position as the President, whom they were appointed. They were to serve out his term of service, but as to others holding over the case was different.

Mr. Curtis then proceeded to show what the feeling and intention of both houses of Congress was, in the framing and passage of this bill, maintaining that they were in accord with the views he had just expressed. He quoted from speeches, explaining the report of the Committee of Conference made by Mr. Schenck. Also, from speeches of Sherman, Williams and others in the Senate, in which they denied that either the purpose or effect of the bill was to keep Stanton in office. He read these not as expressions of individual opinion, but as explanations of the report of the Committee of Conference.

Returning to the consideration of the articles, he said the sixth section forbids any removal contrary to the provision of the act, but as Stanton did not yield, there was no removal, and if there had been, it would not have violated the act, since he had just shown that Stanton did not come within its provisions. The House of Representatives charge the President with intentional violation of this section, which unequivocally admits of different constructions, but they did not allege that he conceived their interpretation and then wilfully acted in contravention of it. The first duty of the President is to construe an act and decide what is its true meaning. This duty he performed as the constitution provides, consulting with his constitutional advisers, and they all put the same construction upon the act in question as had been assigned to it by its framers.

WASHINGTON, April 10.

SENATE.—The Court opened at noon. The galleries are about half filled, and Gen. Sherman again occupied a seat on the floor.

Mr. Curtis, of President's counsel, resumed his argument.

The charges made in the second article were discussed, and he proceeded to argue that Stanton had not violated the provisions of the section alleged to be violated. He said the first two sections of the tenure of office act referred to removals and suspensions arising from any cause during a recess of the Senate, but the third applies only to vacancies caused by death or resignation. The penalties prescribed in the fifth section were directed solely against violations of the third section. The present case, he claimed, was outside of the provisions, and, said Mr. Curtis, the main charge of this article is, that the letter of authority was given without authority of law. After reading the act of 1795, he claimed that it applied to vacancies of all kinds, and the act of February 20th, 1863, applied only to vacancies arising from sickness and temporary inability, and they extend the former, under which the President had full authority for the account referred to. In reply to the charge made in the third article, that the designation of Thomas as Secretary of War *ad interim* was in violation of the Constitution, Mr. Custis cited the acts of 1792 and others, which authorize the temporary filling of vacancies without making any distinction between vacancies occurring during a recess, or when the Senate is in session, and said the practice of the Government had been uniform in filling vacancies as soon as they occurred. The eighth article Mr. Curtis claimed was not by his answers to the third, and he proceeded to consider the fourth charge made of appointing General Thomas without advice and consent of the Senate could not be sustained because no appointment was made; a simple commission to act *ad interim*, was not an appointment and could not, of course, be submitted to the Senate; the allegation that no vacancy had existed is a beginning of the question that the vacancy was created as soon as Mr. Stanton received the President's order removing him, and this vacancy could properly be contemplated by the President at the time of writing, General Thomas' letter of authority recapitulating his argument. Mr. Curtis then claimed he had shown that the managers could not maintain their charges of violation of the Constitution and laws, and proceeded to consider the various charges of conspiracy, and for this purpose he would take up the fourth and sixth, and fifth and seventh articles together. The fourth and sixth, which charge a conspiracy between the President and General Thomas to obtain by force and intimidation, possession of the War Office and the Government property, one based on the conspiracy act, which by its terms had no application to any individual in the District of Columbia, for it speaks only of the States and Territories of the United States, but it was not necessary to rest the answer upon this ground. In a case of private right no one would deem the issue of authority to an agent to assert it a sufficient basis, for a charge of conspiracy, still less could it be alleged of a public right. The order was besides based on the assumption of military subordination.

The fifth and seventh articles would be answered by his arguments against the tenth. Mr. Curtis then claimed that the charge made in the ninth article, not only failed of proof, but was absolutely disproved by the testimony of General Emory, who swears to having introduced the subject and drawn out the President's opinion. It would appear in proof that the President sent for him for entirely a different purpose from that alleged in the article referred to.

WASHINGTON, April 10.

After Mr. Curtis had concluded his very able argument, the Senate, or "High Court," then took a recess, nominally for fifteen minutes, but as usual the body did not reassemble for nearly half an hour. After order had been restored, Mr. Stanbery called Gen. Lorenzo Thomas. Secretary of War *ad interim*, and the gentleman appeared, and was sworn as a witness. He was examined very minutely by Mr. Stanbery in regard to his military life, after which the matter of his appointment as Secretary of War *ad interim*, was brought before the Court. General Thomas answered all questions in a clear, straightforward manner, which gave evidence of the honesty and sincerity of his statements. After detailing what occurred between Mr. Stanton and himself on the day he was appointed Secretary *ad interim*, he was asked by Mr. Stanbery to state what was said in the conversation he (the witness) had with the President immediately after Mr. Stanton refused to vacate the War Office. The question was objected to by Mr. Butler and the Chief Justice directed that it should be reduced to writing. Mr. Butler then proceeded to argue that the proposed testimony was inadmissible, on the ground that it was simply allowing the President to make evidence for himself, after the commission of the act with which he stands charged, &c., &c. Mr. Stanbery replied that it was designed to show that the President never directed Gen. Thomas to use any force to get possession of the War Office, and therefore admissible in order to negative the allegation that he contemplated the ejection of Mr. Stanton from the War Department by *force*. Butler again contended that the testimony sought by the question would not be competent evidence, and in the course of his remarks got sadly out of temper, exhibiting bad manners as well as bad ideas of the law of evidence.—Mr. Evarts, in a few well-timed and pointed remarks, soon destroyed all of Butler's *bluster*, and accordingly that redoubtable individual subsided, and Mr. Bingham attempted to show that it would be contrary to all principle and every rule of evidence to allow the witness, who, he said, had conspired with the President, to give in evidence the declarations of the latter, &c., &c. The discussion rested here, and the Chief Justice submitted the question for decision to the Senate. The yeas and nays being ordered thereon, resulted—yeas 42, nays 10; so it was decided that Mr. Stanbery might ask the witness what was said by the President after Mr. Stanton had refused to vacate the War office. The result of the vote, on the proposition, surprised nearly everybody present. Even Sumner voted in the affirmative, and when he responded "aye" to the call of his name, there was a suppressed laugh, both on the floor and in the galleries. The examination of Gen. Thomas was resumed, and the question indicated above was put to him by Mr. Stanbery. The witness stated that the President never directed him to use any force whatever to gain possession of the War Department. He simply desired to have the matter settled by the courts. On further examination, General Thomas negatived a number of allegations made by the managers, and in the articles of impeachment, as well the inferences sought to be drawn from the testimony of witnesses of the prosecution. His narration of what occurred at the War Department, between Mr. Stanton and himself, when he demanded possession thereof, was exceedingly plain and simple; the account he gave of how Stanton followed him into General Shriver's room, asked for the latter's bottle, poured out what liquor there was in it, and took a drink with the witness, created great laughter. Mr. Stanbery, taking advantage of the favorable opportunity, asked Gen. Thomas if this (referring to the social drink) was all the force he (Thomas) used on that occasion? Gen. Thomas promptly responded in the affirmative, and then followed another outburst of laughter, which seemed to make *even* Butler ashamed of himself. After Mr. Stanbery had concluded the examination of the witness, he was cross-examined at length by Mr. B. F. B., who still insists on taking charge of the case himself. Now and then Bingham asks a question, or Stevens suggests one. Boutwell, Wilson, Williams, and Logan, have little or nothing to say. Wilson has sense enough to know that he is mixed up in a bad, very bad case, and the presumption is he would like to get out of it if he could.

WASHINGTON, April 12.

The impeachment trial was largely attended yesterday, and opened with an application on the part of the House managers (Mr. Bingham being the spokesman) for an amendment to the twenty-first rule, in order to extend the privilege of speaking on the close of the case to as many on each side as desire to be heard. This proposition was made to accommodate both Stevens and Logan, but notwithstanding that inable(?) motive, the "impeaching Senators," who are anxious to dispose of the case with as little delay as possible, opposed it, and on an objection from Conkling, the subject went over to another day. Gen. Thomas then reappeared on the stand to correct some portions of his testimony given on Friday. He had erroneously stated that on the 21st of February, he received from the hands of Mr. Stanton, a letter forbidding him to act as Secretary of War; that paper he did not receive until the next day (twenty-second), and hence, he could not have shown or mentioned the letter to the President at the interview on the 21st of February. Accordingly he made the correction as above stated. In cross-examining the witness, Butler pursued the same low style of interrogation which has marked his course since the commencement of the trial, and for which he enjoys an unenviable notoriety; even in the courts of Massachusetts. He endeavored to make it appear that General Thomas had wilfully misstated facts on his previous examination, and labored hard to confuse the old soldier, and entrap him into self-contradiction. General T., however, answered the questions put to him with a frankness and candor which bespoke the honesty of his intentions, and the sincerity of his nature. Wherever he had been led into erroneous statements by the adroitness of the unscrupulous individual who cross-examined him, he did not hesitate to correct them, and after all Mr. Butler's disruptible efforts to extract from the lips of the witness something which might possibly assist the partisan posecution he utterly failed in so doing. After General Thomas had retired from the stand, Mr. Stanbery called Lieutenant-General William T. Sherman, and the gentleman advanced to the Secretary's desk, and was sworn as witness. His appearance on the stand attracted general interest and attention, from the Senate and the galleries. He was examined by Mr. Stanbery with reference to his business, &c., at Washington last winter. He answered frankly, thereby giving assurance that he would freely state all he knew on the subject matter of the investigation. After stating that he had several interviews (with the President, during the months of December and January, and, finally, asked by Mr. Stanbery what was said to him (Sherman) by the President, with reference to the removal of Mr. Stanton? The effect of this question, if answered, was to show the "intent" of the President at that time, and if intent has been any purpose to use General Sherman unlawfully or improperly, to disclose it to the Senate and the country. The managers, however, through their spokesman Butler, objected to the admissibility of the evidence, and the answer would be, The admissibility of the question was then argued at length on each side. Mr. Stanbery cited cases of English courts, also Butler's opening speech, charging an attempt to use Gen. Sherman as a "part of the conspiracy," and, finally, the testimony offered by the managers of the Alabama office-seeker and the telegraph to Governor Parsons—all of them long previous to the affair of the 21st of February. Mr. Stanbery was about to state what he expected to prove by General Sherman, when he was interrupted in a way no one can conceive of who has not seen Butler in a court when hard pushed on law and facts. This piece of rudeness was quietly rebuked by the learned counsel, but the rebuke made no impression on the *brazen-faced pettifogger*, although it was relished by a large majority of those who heard it. Upon the conclusion of the argument, the yeas and nays were called on admitting the question propounded to the witness by Mr. Stanbery, and it was ruled by a vote of 28 to 23. Among those who voted in favor of allowing it to be put were the following Republicans, viz.: Messrs. Anthony, Fessenden, Fowler, Grimes, Morgan, Ross, Sprague, Sumner, Trimbull, Van Winkle, and Wiley. The next question objected to was a charge made against the President, and was as follows: "In any of the conversations was any thing said to you (Sherman) about the Department of the Atlantic." The managers again object, and the Senate sustain them, thus closing Sherman's mouth the second time. Mr. Stanbery then asked the witness if the President had ever tendered him the position of Secretary of War *ad interim?* This was likewise objected to by the managers, who seemed to fear that General Sherman might say something that would destroy the fragmentary case to which they are clinging with the desperation of drowning men. The Senate however admitted the question, and the witness responded that the President had twice tendered the office to him, on different days and that he had twice replied in writing. Following up the answer, Mr. Stanbery asked the witness to state whether anything further took place in regard to tender of the office. The response would have thrown light on the purpose and object of the offer by the President. Butler, therefore, objected, and after a brief discussion the Chief Justice ruled the question admissible, but the yeas and nays were called for, and resulted—yeas 23, nays 29. So the objection of Butler was sustained, the Chief Justice overruled, and Gen. Sherman's lips sealed for the third time. The next question related to what the President said concerning his intention to test Stanton's right to hold the War Office before the Court, was incorrectly put, in a leading form, and therefore ruled out by a large majority, Senator Henderson, of Missouri, in order to get some light on the subject of these interviews between the President and Gen. Sherman, proposed the following question in writing to the latter, viz: "Did the President, in tending to you the office of Secretary of War, *ad interim*, express to you the object of so doing?" The interrogatory, coming from the quarter it did, seemed to astonish Butler and his co-conspirators. They whispered for a moment with one another, and then objected to its admission. The Chief Justice put the question to the Senate. The yeas and nays being ordered thereon, resulted—yeas, 25; nays, 27; so it was ruled out. Thus the impeachers manifested their intolerance, even more strongly than ever, by refusing to allow one who is generally supposed to be with them, to obtain a simple fact upon which he might be able to give a more intelligent vote. The lips of General Sherman having been sealed for the fourth time, and the counsel of the President denied the only means in their power of proving what took place at these important interviews between their client and the witness, they were compelled to suspend all further questions in that direction, and permit General Sherman to leave the stand, stating, however, at the time, that they reserved the right to recall him, if they should think proper, at a future day. The conduct of "the managers" and the majority of the Senate yesterday is regarded on all hands as the grossest injustice, and the opinion is freely expressed that it will do the impeachment "conspiracy" more harm than good on the final vote.

WASHINGTON April 13.

SENATE—Chief Justice stated the question to be on the motion, allowing a number of the managers and counsel to participate in the final debate as may wish to do so.

Mr. Sumner offered an amendment providing that no further postponement shall be caused thereby, which was accepted by Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Before the vote was taken Mr. Williams, of the managers, spoke in favor of the motion. He was followed by Mr. Stevens, who said he would desire to speak briefly in support of the article which he had been instrumental in introducing, and would also be glad to have some of his associates afforded an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Frelinghuysen modified his motion by adding a proviso, that only one of the managers could close.

Mr. Sherman offered a further amendment, that the additional time allowed to each side shall not exceed three hours.

Mr. Boutwell opposed the restriction limiting the close to one manager.

Mr. Stanbery strongly opposed any limitation of time to be allowed for final arguments.

Mr. Sherman then withdrew his amendment.

Mr. Butler intimated that in no case would he take an advantage of a chance to speak again.

Mr. Sumner offered a proviso that all the managers who speak shall close.

Mr. Evarts said if the rule were enlarged, four of the President's counsel would probably take an hour, but he considered it unfair that they should be met by six opposing them, and certainly that they should all have to close.

Mr. Williams moved to lay the proposition on the table. The vote was taken, resulting 38 to 1, so that the rule remains unchanged.

The examination of Gen. Sherman was resumed, and Mr. Stanbery asked, after the restoration of Stanton, did you form an opinion as to the desirability, and for the good of the service, of the Office of Secretary of War being filled by another than Stanton, and if so, did you express your opinion to the President? Objection was was made and argued by Mr. Bingham.

Mr. Stanbery replied that the question of intent was of vital importance. They did not offer this testimony as an abstract opinion, but as the judgement formed and expressed by the second officer in the service for its good. He referred to the relations existing between the President and Stanton, and claimed it was competent to prove that distinguished generals like Grant and Sherman believed a change should be made in the interest of the Government. He appealed earnestly to the Senate, for the sake of justice, to admit the evidence.

Mr. Butler rejoined, that by introducing irrevalent testimony the law would be broken, to defend a breaking of the law he said there will be no limit to inquiries, which could be put to the witness and managers could ask him if he had a quarrel with Stanton, if that circumstance influenced his opinion, &c., and so the field of inquiry would be boundless. He said it seemed to be assumed by the other side that an evil intent must be proved by something which the President had said; whereas, his evil intention was sufficiently proved by his act in threatening the law.

It was also immaterial, whether Mr. Stanton was or was not a fit man to be retained in office. The evil could not be done, that good might come, referring to a remark of Mr. Stanbery, that Mr. Stanton did not take part in Cabinet counsels. He said there was no such thing contemplated in the Constitution, and members of the Cabinet were to be called on for advice respecting affairs of their own departments. The President must show that he had ever called on Mr. Stanton for a written opinion, or that he had given him an order which he had disobeyed.

Mr. Conkling inquired if counsel proposed to prove that Sherman had advised the President to procure a change in any particular way.

Mr. Stanberry replied in the negative. The witness had only expressed an opinion as to the durability of some change.

On conclusion of Mr. Bingham's remarks, the yeas and nays were then taken, and resulted 15 to 35, so it was not admitted.

Mr. Johnson offered a question whether the witness before the removal of Mr. Stanton, had advised the President that he should be removed and replaced.

The Chief Justice said the Court must decide whether the question should be put to the witness, and the Senate decided in the negative by a vote of 18 to 32.

Mr. Stanberry then said he had no more questions to ask Gen. Sherman. The managers declined to cross-examine, and the Court took a recess at 2.10.

WASHINGTON, April 13.

On reassembling, R. J. Meigs, Clerk of the District Supreme Court, testified that he affixed the seal to the warrant for the arrest of Gen. Thomas, about 2 o'clock P. M. the morning of February 22d, Mr. Pile, of Missouri, brought it to him at his house. In answer to Mr. Butler he said he had been called on at such an hour before of cases of pressing necessity. Mr. Stanbery then offered to put in evidence the warrant and affidavit of Mr. Stanton on which it was issued. Mr. Butler objected to their objection. Mr. Evarts said they related to the same subject in which the Managers had introduced testimony, and that the President's counsel intended to avail himself of the advantage of the proceeding commenced by Stanton, as the speediest method of bringing the question before the Supreme Court.

Mr. Butler argued, in reply, that the effect of introducing these papers would be to open at the late stage of the controversy, and irrevelant to the case.

Mr. Stanberry referred to the fact that the declarations of General Thomas had been admitted in evidence as declarations of the President to prove his design of employing force, and went on to review the circumstances attending the discharge of General Thomas, which, he said, they would show was ordered so as to prevent the President from testing the question. The evidence would also show that Gen. Thomas was not regarded as a legal criminal by those who procured his arrest.

Mr. Butler rejoined, when the Chief Justice ruled the warrant and affidavit were admissable, and on taking the yeas and nays this ruling was sustained by 34 to 17.

Mr. Evarts read the document, and Mr. Stanbery resumed the examination. The warrant was issued in chambers; has not the docket-book with him.

Senator Johnson then offered this question to be put to General Sherman—"when the President tendered you the office of Secretary of War *ad interim* on January 27th, 30th and 31st, did he at the time of making such tender, state what his purpose in so doing was.

Objected to and submitted for the decision of the Senate.

The yeas and nays resulted 26 to 22; and so the question was put and answered, yes.

Senator Johnson then offered the additional question, "Will you state what he said his purpose was?" Objected to, when the Chief Justice ruled that the question was admissible as it tended to show the import of the President's action, and in expressing his opinion remarked that this Court was not bound by the same restrictive rules in admitting evidence as those of a different character. The yeas and nays were demanded, and resulted 26 to 25, so the question was answered.

The conversation was long. The President told the witness that the relations between himself and Stanton were such, that he could not have the office administered properly in the interests of the army and the whole country while Stanton held his position as Secretary of War. In the desire to promote and care for those interests, the President says he offered witness the position of Secretary ad interim. Witness asked the President why he did not have a case made up by his lawyers, so as to bring about a change without involving witness, an officer in the army in the matter. The President replied that it could not be done, but if it could Stanton's case would not stand an hour.

The question was then asked by Mr. Stanbery, have you answered as to what occurred on both occasions.

Objected to, on the ground that witness had been dismissed from the stand, and that, therefore, the examination could not be renewed.

The Chief Justice ruled that it could be, and a decision by the Court being called for, debate ensued between Messrs. Evarts and Butler. The latter in the course of his remarks having by his tone and manner in saying, "The question was put by the Senator from Maryland, not as counsel for the President," seemed to insinuate the contrary.

Senator Johnson rose, and in a very emphatic and nervous manner repelled any insinuation that he disregarded his solemn duty.

Mr. Butler insisted that he meant no sarcasm, and Senator Johnson expressed himself satisfied.

Mr. Stanbery conducted the argument in defence of the claim that counsel had a right to continue the examination.

Mr. Bingham followed, and in the course of his arguments said the testimony of witness had so far been injurious to the respondent, and that his counsel wished to cross-examine him in the hope of eliciting something better.

Mr. Bingham also maintained at some length that it was in the power of the President to procure a judicial settlement of the case by means of a quo warranto.

Mr. Evarts remarked that they were perfectly satisfied by the evidence given by the witness.

The Chief Justice again expressed his opinion that witness could answer Senator Johnson's question. Have you answered as to both occasions? Witness said, that at the first interview nothing very definite was said by either the President or himself. During the conversation the President expressed a wish to have the constitutionality of the Tenure of Office law decided. He also said to witness that if he accepted the position of Secretary *ad interim*, Stanton would make no resistance, because he knew him to be cowardly. Witness gave no positive answer at the time, but sent one in writing.

Senator Henderson put the question, "Did the President, on either occasion, express a firm determination to remove Stanton from office?"

Witness replied that the President never expressed any intention to use force, but seemed determined that their relations should cease.

Senator Howard asked—"What did the President say about force?"

Witness repeated what he said before in relation to the President's belief that Mr. Stanton would make no resistance.

Senator Henderson asked whether witness gave the President any advice on this subject.

The Senate, without a division, refused to admit the question.

The Managers then notified Gen. Sherman that they would require his attendance in the morning, and he left the stand.

General Meigs was recalled, and produced the docket book, from which he read the entries relating to the Stanton-Meigs case, and the Senate adjourned at 4.45.

Dr. Livingstone Alive.

LONDON, April 8—Evening.—All doubts of the safety of Dr. Livingstone, the African explorer, are now dispelled. Sir Roderick Murchison to-day received a letter from the distinguished traveller, which came by the way of Zanzibar. Dr. Livingstone writes that he is in good health, that his journey of exploration has been successful, and that he will soon return to England.

The War in Africa.

LONDON, April 10.—The War Office is in receipt of later dispatches from the British expedition in Africa operating for the relief of the English captives. Gen. Napier, the commander of the British forces, had reached latitude 21°. The Abyssinian King, Theodorus, was at Magdala, ready for a siege. His force consisted of about 5,000 effective men. He had also 26 large guns. Gen. Napier had already completed his plans for a general assault on the works.

State Items.

Doylestown, with 2,000 inhabitants, never had a fire engine.

A ship to navigate the air is being built at Bethlehem by Professor Leinback.

It is stated that six hundred persons have joined the churches in Danville during the past winter.

Both Houses of the Pensylvania Legislature have agreed to a final adjournment on the 14th inst.

A railroad is talked of between Huntingdon and M'Alavy's Fort, in the upper end of Huntingdon county, Pa.

Hon. A. Brower Longaker, of Norristown, has been re-elected Secretary of the State Agricultural Society for the ensuing year.

Rev. Samul. Sprecher, Jr., an able and eloquent minister of the Lutheran church at Carlisle, has accepted a call of a congregation in Albany, New York.

The Harrisburg papers state that from present appearances the work on the Dauphin County Monument will not soon be resumed.

Wm. Gray, a young chinaman, has been charged with stealing a valuable watch and $280 from the master of a receiving ship in the Port of Philadelphia.

The cold weather is interfering with the shad fisheries, which are not yielding anything like their usual *catch* at this season of the year.

The corner-stone of the new Masonic temple at the corner of Broad and Filbert streets, Philadelphia, will be laid on the 24th of June next.

The Altoona *Vindicator* is the name of a new weekly Democratic paper to be published at Altoona, Blair county, by James F. Campbell.

On Sunday morning, the 29th ult., while Mr. Samuel Condo, of Rebersburg, Centre county, was at church, one hundred and fifty dollars were abstracted from his house by a burglar who broke into it.

Information is wanted of the whereabouts of Thomas H. Williams, who has been for a number of years in the regular army of the United States, regiment unknown, address David H. Williams, blacksmith, Jonestown, Pa.

The cost of building and equipping the North Pennsylvania Railroad to January 1, 1868, was $6,519,345 50. Number of iron bridges, 3; wooden bridges, 8; stone bridges, 2; length of main line from Philadelphia to Bethlehem, 54 miles.

Dr. John Todd, of Boyertown, Berks county, and Dr. W. L. Atlee, of Philadelphia, recently removed a tumor weighing twenty-five pounds from the body of Mrs. Jacob Albright, of Pottsgrove township, Montgomery county.

A tract of coal land, containing three hundred and sixty-one acres, known as "Partnership," in Rush township, Schuylkill county, has been sold by U. S. Marshal Ellmaker for $130,250 to John M. Maris, of Philadelphia.

Work on the Jefferson railroad through Warren county, Ohio, is progressing as rapidly as the inclement weather in that region will admit. It is expected that by the 1st of May the road will be in running order.

The Philadelphia *North American* says: strawberries and tomatoes from the southward are exhibited in the windows of the truiterers. The former are as small in taste as they are beautiful in appearance. The price asked for them is equal to or more than their weight in silver.

The bill autorizing the increase of the capital stock of the Pottstown Market Company from $40,000 to $20,000 has passed the Legislature and been signed by the Governor. As the stock has all been sold, the Company will of course proceed at once with the work of building the market house.

The boating season has now fairly opened on the Schuylkill canal. Freights are plenty, but the rates of transportation are too low to remunerate the owners of the boatmen. The charges on coal from Schuylkill Haven and Philadelphia are $1 per ton, and to New York $1.90 per ton.

The citizens of York, Pennsylvania, have voted, by a majority of 173, against authorizing the corporate authorities to subscribe the money sufficient to purchase two steam fire engines. That such a vote should be given by the intelligent people of that borough is strange.

Books of subscription to the capital stock of the Somerset and Mineral Point Railroad Company will be opened in Somerset borough on Thursday, 16th of April, and remain open three days. This road will connect with the Pittsburg and Connellsville.

There is an effort being made to build an extension of the Allegheny Valley railroad up Redbank to Brookville, and then make an eastern connection. Parties have secured the right of way through Clarion and Jefferson counties, and are meeting determined to encourage the enterprise.

The Northern Central Railway Company through its Superintendent, Mr. J. N. Du Barry, has issued an order prohibiting the sale of newspapers, candies, &c., on the cars, and the conductors are not to be allowed to permit newsboys to ride on the cars, except as passengers provided with regular tickets.

The Selinsgrove, Pa., *Times* says: The work on the railroad between this place and Northumberland has been commenced, and quite a number of hands are at work a short distance below Northumberland bridge. We also learn that an additional subscription of $100,000 has been obtained in New York city and from parties from whom still further aid may be expected.

The Doylestown *Intelligencer* says: "The prospect for a crop of peaches the coming season is said to be unusually alarming in Delaware. In low situations the trees have been somewhat injured by the cold weather, but on the high ground they have sustained little damage. The indications, on the whole, at present, are favorable for a fair yield.

In speaking of the proposed new Court-house at Danville, Montour county, the *Intelligencer* says: "Our County Commissioners are moving in this matter. The precise plan has not yet been settled upon, but their purpose now is to erect a building creditable to the county, and the same time avoid the extravagance which other counties have unwarily run into."

A law was passed by the present Legislature changing the mode of collecting State and county taxes in Chester and Montgomery counties. Instead of having collectors in each township, appointed by the County Commissioners, the County Treasurer is made the Collector, and he is required to visit each district for that purpose, after giving due notice thereof.

The Altoona *Tribune* says that some one recently ascended to the dome of the Catholic Convent building that place, and with a saw almost severed the large cross from its fastening in the dome, and left it in a condition to be toppled over by the first blast of wind. Considering that to ascend to the top of the dome was a perilous feat, even in daylight, yet to saw the cross is constructed out of lignumvitæ wood, and the least kind to run a saw through; the undertaking is certainly to be considered as foolhardy as it was distardly.

Proceedings of the Legislature.

HARRISBURG, April 7.

SENATE.—After the introduction of several private bills, the Philadelphia Gas Inspectorship came up, and its discussion consumed the rest of the session. Adjourned.

HOUSE.—The report on Gettysburg Cemetery favored the transmission of the grounds and property to the National Government. Several local bills were passed. An act limiting the time in which suits can be brought against sheriffs to five years was passed. The balance of the session was taken up in the discussion of private bills. Adjourned.

HARRISBURG, April 8.

In the Senate several bills of a local character were acted upon. The bill fixing township and primary elections at the same time as the general or fall elections, was passed, excluding Philadelphia. Adjourned.

In the House the bill regulating licenses of foreign insurance companies was passed as was also the bill relating to the care of lunatics and non-residents. The supplement to an act establishing the sinking fund passed finally. The first section of the eight-hour law was lost by a *viva voce* vote. The bill revising the laws taxing corporations was passed finally. Adjourned.

HARRISBURG, April 9.

In the Senate, a penalty was laid on parties who obstructed railroad tracks by placing hand-cars thereon. A bill requiring the assent of property owners through whose property a sewer will pass, to be previously filed, was passed. Congress was urged, by resolution, to aid in the completion of the Pacific Railroad. The substitute for the Row officer's fee bills was passed. A commission was raised to prospect the Ephrata Mountain Springs property, and will report at the next Legislature. The bill authorizing the publication of sheriffs' sales in German was defeated.

In the House the report of the committee of conference on the appropriation bill was adopted. The eight hour law was passed, with the proviso that the pay be the same for eight hours as it is now for ten. The act allowing disabled soldiers to peddle without paying for license was extended to soldiers and marines. Canal companies were authorized to make joint connections. The Senate bill revising the laws relating to enrolment tax passed.

The consideration of private bills occupied the whole of the afternoon session.

HARRISBURG, April 11th.

In the Senate, an act requiring proceeds of sales in partition to be paid into court" was passed; also, one repealing the landlord and tenant supplement of 1863. House bill for the organization of co-operative associations passed. The general militia supplement was defeated. Adjourned.

In the House, morning Session—Senate bill incorporating a new insane asylum for northern counties passed. Evening Session —The session was taken up with the discussion of private bills.

HARRISBURG, April 13th, 1868.

In the Senate.—At the morning session, after the passage of several private bills, a message was received from the Governor nominating a Recorder for Philadelphia, which was confirmed. At the afternoon and evening sessions the reconsideration of the Philadelphia Recordership was the chief topic, and after having voted to reconsider, the Senate again confirmed the nomination.

In the House.—Morning Session—Joint resolution for the codification of the railroad and telegraph laws of the State passed; also, a bill requiring telegraph companies to make annual reports to the Auditor General. An act authorizing corporations purchasing railroads, or leasing them to assume the liens thereof, passed finally. At the evening session the bills were generally postponed, which, at this late period of the session, amounts to their defeat.

THE ELECTIONS.

The Democratic Majority in Connecticut on the Increase.

HARTFORD, April 8.—Corrected returns make English's majority 1,735. Total vote 99,323.

MILWAUKEE, April 8.—Complete returns of this city, with one ward estimated, gives O'Neill, (Dem.) for Mayor, 2,200 majority. The Radicals lose three Aldermen and five Councillors, and elect but one member of the Common Council out of twenty-seven. The meagre returns received from various parts of the State to this hour, do not materially change the result.

MINNEAPOLIS, Minnesota, April 8.—The city election was held yesterday. The vote was light, but Harrison (Rep.) was elected Mayor by 240 majority.

ST. LOUIS, April 8.—Sedalia and Jefferson City elected the entire Radical ticket yesterday.

In Kansas City the Democratic ticket was elected, with the exception of Auditor, City Marshal and one Alderman. Harris Democrat, for Mayor, has 200 majority, but he run considerable ahead of his ticket.

In Leavenworth the full Democratic ticket, with the exception of Treasurer, for which office no Democrat was nominated, was elected by majorities ranging from 400 to 700.

This will be the first Democratic administration for six years. National policies and support of the Kansas delegation in Congress were prominent issues in the election.

Carondelet, six miles below here, elected a full Democratic ticket yesterday.

TERRIBLE LAKE DISASTER.

Burning of a Steamer and Loss of One Hundred Lives—Only Two Persons Saved.

CHICAGO, April 9.—A terrible disaster occurred on Lake Michigan at an early hour this morning.

The steamer Sea Bird, a large boat owned by A. E. Goodrich, took fire between six and seven o'clock, while about thirty miles from this city, and was totally destroyed.

A number of lives are believed to have been lost.

CHICAGO, April 9.—The steamer Sea Bird belonged to the Two Rivers, Manitowoc and Sheboygan line. She had made four trips this season, and was on her fifth when she met with the terrible disaster reported today. When off Waukegan, about 6.30 A. M., fire was seen issuing from a pile of miscellaneous freight, stored around the afterguards, outside the ladies' cabin, and in ten minutes time the entire stern of the boat was wrapped in flames.

From the statement of one of the rescued, it appears that all on board became demoralized, even the officers, and no effort was made to lower the boats. The only survivors as far as known are C. A. Chamberlain and Edwin Hanneburg, passengers from Sheboygan. The latter makes the following statement:

There were in all about one hundred persons on board, including eight or ten ladies and seven or eight children. I saw smoke arising from the deck below the ladies' cabin. There was a lot of straw and some tubs lying near by, and the fire got among them. I cried fire, and the crew and passengers rushed from their rooms. There was great confusion, and the fire spread so rapidly as to convince me that it had been burning a long time. Within five minutes the after part of the boat was in flames. I don't think that all the ladies had time to get out of their state rooms, and some of them and the children must have been burned to death. An effort was made by a portion of the crew to reach the small boats, but it failed.

Mr. Chamberlain states that about 6.30 A. M., he was looking over the side of the steamer, and saw a porter come out of the ladies' cabin with a scuttle of coals and ashes, and going to the bulwarks, near where a quantity of miscellaneous freight was, throw the contents overboard. In about ten minutes heard the alarm of fire, and saw the flames issuing from this pile of freight. It seemed not more than ten minutes before the whole after part of the steamer was in flames. In his opinion, when the porter threw the coals overboard, a wind drove some back into the freight. He heard no explosion, and thinks if the fire had caught from a boiler explosion, it would have been discovered sooner.

Captain Yates, of the steamer Cordelia, states that when off Waukegan he saw a burning steamer. He was distant from her four or five miles, and bore down and rescued two passengers. He thinks it is not possible that any others were saved.

We learn from one of the survivors that after the steamer took fire below, the helm was lashed hard aport, causing her to whirl round and round, as long as the engines worked. The Cordelia did not leave the wreck until it was burned to the water's edge.

Local Intelligence.

MAN FOUND DROWNED.—On Thursday afternoon, as Benj Weaver was passing along the road leading from Little Washington to Safe Harbor, near Whistler's run, he saw the body of a man lying in the Susquehanna river, near the shore. Mr. Wertz dragged the body ashore, and gave information of the matter to Jacob Bruns, Esq., who summoned a jury and held an inquest on the body of the deceased. No one knew who he was, and it is supposed he was a complete stranger to that neighborhood. It is not thought he could have floated down the run, as the body seemed not to have been in the water more than a few hours. The following description of the deceased may lead to a discovery of whom he was. He appeared to have been a man of about forty years of age, five feet eight inches in height, heavy set, and would weigh about 175 pounds. His hair was dark brown, and he wore a goatee of a sandy color. He was full faced, and a small spot on top of his head was nearly bald. On his left arm the figure of a bear was tattooed in with India ink, and inside of this were the initials F. R. He had a silver ring on the index finger of his left hand. He was dressed in woollen pants of a small barred figure, a white vest of dark satinet, woollen undershirt, cotton drawers, calf skin boots, and woollen stockings. The verdict of the jury was, that he came to his death by being accidentally drowned. The body was buried in the grave yard at Little Washington, in the lot belonging to Esquire Brush

From the description of the deceased published on Saturday, inquiry was set on foot in regard to a man residing in this city who had been missing since Thursday last. The result was the identification of the