Pittsburgh Gazette.

VOLUME LXXXIII. PITTSBURGH, TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1868. NUMBER 100.

FIRST EDITION.

TWELVE O'CLOCK M.

FORTIETH CONGRESS.

The Impeachment of the President—Proposed Rules Deferred—Argument of Thaddeus Stevens—Manager Williams Follows, but Does Not Conclude His Remarks.

[By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.]

WASHINGTON, April 27, 1868.

SENATE.

The Court opened at noon.

The pending question was stated to be the order of Senator Edmunds that the official reporters be admitted to secret session to take debate on the final question, to be reported with the proceedings.

Senator SUMNER moved to amend by inserting the following at the end: "But no Senator shall speak more than once, nor to exceed fifteen minutes, during such deliberation."

At the desire of Senator JOHNSON rule twenty-three was read.

Senator JOHNSON said that will be on each article.

Senator HOWARD moved to amend the amendment by inserting after the words fifteen minutes the words "on one question."

The amendment was rejected—nineteen to thirty.

Senator BAYARD moved to amend the amendment by allowing thirty minutes instead of fifteen. Rejected—sixteen against thirty-four.

On motion of Senator HOWARD the further consideration of the subject was postponed until after the argument is concluded.

The additional rules offered by Senator Sumner were, upon this motion, laid over until the close of the argument.

The CHIEF JUSTICE directed that the argument proceed, and at 12:30 Manager STEVENS mounted the Clerk's desk and read his argument in a pretty firm voice from printed slips. After about ten minutes he took a chair and read sitting. At five minutes before one his voice showed signs of weakness, and Manager BUTLER read the remainder of the argument.

Mr. STEVENS said: The single charge which I had the honor to suggest, I am expected to maintain. That duty is a light one, easily performed, and which, I apprehend, it will be found impossible for the respondent to answer.

When Andrew Johnson took upon himself the high duties of his office, he swore to obey the Constitution and take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That, indeed, is and has always been the chief duty of the President of the United States. The duties of legislating and adjudicating the laws of his country fall in no way to his lot. To obey the commands of the sovereign power of the nation, and to see that others should obey them, was his whole duty—a duty which he could not escape, and any attempt to do so would be in direct violation of his official oath; in other words, a misprision of perjury.

I accuse him, in the name of the House of Representatives, of having perpetrated that foul offense against the laws and interests of his country.

On the 2d day of March, 1867, Congress passed a law, over the veto of the President, entitled "An act to regulate the tenure of certain civil offices," the first section of which is as follows:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That every person holding any civil office to which he has been appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and every person who may hereafter be appointed to any such office and shall become duly qualified to act therein, is and shall be entitled to hold such office until a successor shall have been in like manner appointed, and duly qualified, except as herein otherwise provided; *Provided*, That the Secretaries of State, of Treasury, of War, of the Navy, and of the Interior, the Postmaster General, and the Attorney General, shall hold their offices respectively for and during the term of the President by whom they may have been appointed, and for one month thereafter, subject to removal by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The second section provides that when the Senate is not in session, if the President shall deem the officer guilty of acts which require his removal or suspension, he may be suspended until the next meeting of the Senate; and that within twenty days after the meeting of the Senate the reasons for such suspension shall be reported to that body; and, if the Senate shall deem such reasons sufficient for such suspension or removal, the officer shall be considered removed from his office; but if the Senate shall not deem the reasons sufficient for such suspension or removal, the officer shall forthwith resume the functions of his office, and the person appointed in his place shall cease to discharge such duties.

On the 12th day of August, 1867, the Senate then not being in session, the President suspended Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of the Department of War, and appointed U. S. Grant, General, Secretary of War *ad interim*. On the 12th day of December, 1867, the Senate being then in session, he reported, according to the requirements of the act, the causes of such suspension to the Senate, which duly took the same into consideration. Before the Senate had concluded its examination of the question of the sufficiency of such reasons, he attempted to enter into arrangements by which he might obstruct the due execution of the law, and thus prevent Edwin M. Stanton from forthwith resuming the functions of his office as Secretary of War, according to the provisions of the act, even if the Senate should decide in his favor.

And in furtherance of said attempt, on the 21st day of February, 1868, he appointed one Lorenzo Thomas, by letter of authority or commission, Secretary of War *ad interim*, without the advice and consent of the Senate, although the same was then in session, and ordered him (the said Thomas) to take possession of the Department of War and the public property appertaining thereto, and to discharge the duties thereof.

Touching the point as to whether or not Secretary Stanton was embraced by the Tenure-of-Office law, Mr. Stevens said: The learned counsel contends that the Vice President, who accidentally succeeds to the duties of President, is serving out a new Presidential term of his own, and that, unless Mr. Stanton was appointed by him, he is not within the provision of the act. It happened that Mr. Stanton was appointed by Mr. Lincoln in 1862 for an indefinite period of time, and was still serving as his appointee, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Mr. Johnson never appointed him, and, unless he held a valid commission by virtue of Mr. Lincoln's appointment, he was acting for three years, during which time he expended billions of money and raised hundreds of thousands of men, without any commission at all. To permit this to be done without any valid commission would have been a misdemeanor in itself. But if he held a valid commission, whose commission was it? Not Andrew Johnson's. Then in whose term was he serving, for he must have been in somebody's term? Even if it was in Johnson's term, he would serve for four years, unless sooner removed, for there is no term spoken of in the Constitution of a shorter period for a Presidential term than four years. But it makes no difference in the operation of the law whether he was holding in Lincoln's or Johnson's term. Was it not in Mr. Lincoln's term? Lincoln had been elected and re-elected, the second term to commence in 1865, and the Constitution expressly declared that that term should be four years.

By virtue of his previous commission and the uniform custom of the country, Mr. Stanton continued to hold during the term of Mr. Lincoln, unless sooner removed. Now, does any one pretend that from the 4th of March, 1865, a new Presidential term did not commence? For it will be seen upon close examination that the word "*term*" alone marks the time of the Presidential existence, so that it may divide the different periods of office by a well recognized rule. Instead of saying that the Vice President shall become President upon his death, the Constitution says, "in case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the *powers and duties* of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President." What is to devolve on the Vice President? Not the Presidential commission held by his predecessor, but the "duties" which were incumbent on him. If he were to take Mr. Lincoln's term he would serve for four years; for term is the only limitation to that office, defined in the Constitution, as I have said before. But the learned counsel has contended that the word "*term*" of the Presidential office means the death of the President. Then it would have been better expressed by saying that the President shall hold his office during the *term* between two assassinations, and then the assassination of the President would mark the period of the operation of this law.

If, then, Mr. Johnson was serving out one of Mr. Lincoln's terms, there seems to be no argument against including Mr. Stanton within the meaning of the law. He was so included by the President, in his notice of removal, in his reasons therefor given to the Senate, in his notification to the Secretary of Treasury; and it is too late, when he is caught violating the very law under which he professes to act, to turn and deny that the law effects the case. The gentleman treats lightly the question of estoppel, and yet really nothing is more powerful, for it is an argument by the party himself against himself, and although not pleadable in the same way, is just as potential in a case *in pais* as when pleaded in a case of record.

The respondent, in violation of this law, appointed General Thomas to office, whereby, according to the express terms of the act, he was guilty of a high misdemeanor. But whatever may have been his views with regard to the Tenure-of-Office act, he knew it was a law, and so recorded upon the statutes. I disclaim all necessity, in a trial of impeachment, to prove the wicked or unlawful intention of the respondent, and it is unwise ever to aver it.

In response to the argument of the President's counsel, to the effect that the action of the President in the case of Mr. Stanton, was designed to test the constitutionality of the civil tenure law before the Courts, Mr. Stevens said: The President says that he removed Mr. Stanton simply to test the constitutionality of the Tenure-of-Office law by a judicial decision. He has already seen it tested and decided by the votes, twice given, of two-thirds of the Senators and of the House of Representatives. It stood as a law upon the statute books. No case had arisen under the law, or is referred to by the President, which required any judicial interposition. If there had been, or should be, the courts were open to any one who felt aggrieved by the action of Mr. Stanton. But instead of enforcing that law, he takes advantage of the name and the funds of the United States to resist it, and to induce others to resist it. Instead of attempting, as the Executive of the United States, to see that that law was faithfully executed, he took great pains and perpetrated the acts alleged in this article, not only to resist it himself, but to seduce others to do the same. He sought to induce the General in Chief of the army to aid him in an open avowed obstruction of the law, as it stood unrepealed upon the statute book. He could find no one to unite with him in perpetrating such an act, until he sunk down upon the unfortunate individual bearing the title of Adjutant General of the Army. Is this taking care that the laws shall be faithfully executed? Is this attempting to carry them into effect, by upholding their validity according to his oath? On the other hand was it not a high and bold attempt to obstruct the laws and take care that they should not be executed? He must not excuse himself by saying that he had doubts of its constitutionality and wished to test it. What right had he to be hunting up excuses for others, as well as himself, to violate this law? Is not this confession a misdemeanor in itself?

The President asserts that he did not remove Stanton under the Tenure-of-Office law. This is a direct contradiction of his own letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, in which, as he was bound by law, he communicated to that officer the fact of the removal. This portion of the answer may, therefore, be considered as disposed of by his subsequent report to the Senate.

Recurring to the action of the Senate on the message of the President, in which he communicated to that body the order of Mr. Stanton's removal, Mr. Stevens said:

The action of the Senate on the message of the President, communicating his reasons for the suspension of E. M. Stanton, Secretary of War, under the act entitled an act to regulate the tenure of certain civil offices, was as follows:

"IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, SENATE OF THE U. S., January 13, 1868.

"*Resolved*, That having considered the evidence and reasons given by the President in his report of December 12, 1867, for the suspension from the office of Secretary of War of Edwin M. Stanton, the Senate do not concur in such suspension."

And the same was duly certified to the President, in the face of which he, with an impudence and brazen determination to usurp the powers of the Senate, again, removed Edwin M. Stanton, and appointed Lorenzo Thomas, Secretary *ad interim* in his stead. The Senate, with calm manliness, rebuked the usurper by the following resolution:

"IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, SENATE OF UNITED STATES, February 21, 1868.

"Whereas, the Senate has received and considered the communication of the President stating that he had removed Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War, and had designated the Adjutant General of the army to act as Secretary of War *ad interim*; therefore,

"*Resolved by the Senate of the United States*, That under the Constitution and laws of the United States, the President has no power to remove the Secretary of War, and to designate any other officer to perform the duties of that office *ad interim*."

Yet he continued him in office. And now this offering of assassination turns upon the Senate who have thus rebuked him in a constitutional manner, and bids them defiance. How can he escape the just vengeance of the law? Wretched man, standing at bay, surrounded by a cordon of living men, each with the ax of an executioner uplifted for his just punishment. Every Senator now trying him, except such as had already adopted his policy, voted for this same resolution, pronouncing his solemn doom. Will any one of them vote for his acquittal on the ground of its unconstitutionality? I know that Senators would venture to do any necessary act if endorsed by an honest conscience and an enlightened public opinion; but neither for the sake of the President nor of any one else would one of them suffer himself to be tortured on the gibbet of everlasting obloquy. How long and dark would be the track of infamy which must mark his name, and that of his posterity! Nothing is, therefore, more certain than that it requires no gift of prophecy to predict the fate of this unhappy victim.

Mr. Stevens dwelt at considerable length upon the points indicated in the foregoing extracts, and concluded as follows: The counsel for the respondent allege that no removal of Mr. Stanton ever took place, and that therefore the second section of the act was not violated. They admit that there was an order of removal and a recision of his commission, but as he did not obey it, say it was no removal. That suggests the old saying that it used to be thought that "when the brains were out the man was dead." That idea is proved by the learned counsel to be absolutely fallacious. The brain of Mr. Stanton's commission was taken out by the order of removal—the recision of his commission—his head was absolutely cut off by that gallant soldier, Gen. Thomas, the night after the masquerade. And yet, according to the learned and delicate counsel, until the mortal remains and everything which could purify was shoveled out and hauled into the muck-yard, there was no removal. But it is said that this took place merely as an experiment to make a judicial case. Now, suppose there is anybody who, with the facts before him, can believe that this was not an afterthought, let us see if that palliates the offence. The President is sworn to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. In what part of the Constitution or laws does he find it to be his duty to search out for defective laws that stand recorded upon the statutes, in order that he may advise their infraction? Who was aggrieved by the Tenure-of-Office bill that he was authorized to use the name and the funds of the Government to relieve? Will he be so good as to tell us by what authority he became the obstructor of an unrepealed law instead of its executor, especially a law whose constitutionality he had twice tested? If there was nothing else than his own statement, he deserves the contempt of the American people, and the punishment of its high tribunal. If he were not willing to execute the laws passed by the American Congress and unrepealed, let him resign the office which was thrown upon him by a horrible convulsion, and retire to his village in obscurity. Let him not be so swollen by pride and arrogance, which sprung from the deep misfortune of his country, as to attempt an entire revolution of its internal machinery, and the disgrace of the trusted servants of his lamented predecessor.

After the death of Mr. Lincoln, instead of being content with the position the people had given him, he sought to become thereafter, as then, the chief executive of the nation. This he knew could only be done by changing principles and creating a new party to sustain him. After some little hesitation he resolved upon that course, and perpetrated a betrayal of the party that elected him and the principles he professed, baser than the betrayal by Judas Iscariot, who betrayed only a single individual. Johnson sacrificed a whole nation and the holiest of principles.

ARGUMENT OF MANAGER WILLIAMS.

Manager WILLIAMS then took the floor. After speaking of the august character of the tribunal, and the interest which is felt all over the country by the entire people, who were awaiting with anxiety the verdict, which is either to send thrills of joy to an afflicted land or rack it anew with the throes of anarchy and despair, he proceeded to state that the matter now presented for discussion was not a quarrel between two officials but an issue between the Executive and the American people. He, too, would ask, who is Andrew Johnson? and would answer the question in a different manner from the President's counsel. He then intimated that Mr. Johnson's opposition to secession in the Senate was perhaps prompted by a doubt whether the step was advisable at that particular time; but, however, that might be, he would consider him as he is now, and as he had been since he came into power. Mr. W. held that the master-key to all his conduct as President was his desire to favor and uphold traitors and force the rebel States into the Union on his own plan against the expressed will of Congress and the loyal people, and went on to recite a great number of acts of the President which, he claimed, were usurpations and offences explicable only on the above supposition. The culmination of the long series of usurpations of his oath of office and indecencies was his attempt to displace Mr. Stanton, in contempt of the Tenure-of-Office law. Mr. Williams took up the answers made by the President's counsel to the charge of violating that law, and first discussed the proviso which, it was alleged, excluded Mr. Stanton from its operation. He had himself suggested that amendment and explained its meaning, and had never dreamed that such a construction would be put upon it as had been by the President's counsel. It would be contrary to the purpose of the bill. Mr. Stanton's case was certainly meant to be covered, if it was not the originating cause of its introduction. He claimed that the principles of construction require the proviso to be construed in the light of the purpose of the law, and held that the objection made, that Mr. Stanton did not come within its effect, because he was not appointed by Mr. Johnson, might almost be termed a quibble.

The Senate here took a recess. (On reassembling Mr. Williams considered the point set up by the defense, that the law is unconstitutional, which he characterised as a defiance and a challenge to Congress. From the fact that the Constitution does not provide for removals except by impeachment, he drew the inference that a Legislative body must possess the sole power of judging when good behavior ceases and when removals should be made. He also claimed that the right to remove in certain cases was either a power delegated to the Executive by Congress, or merely implied by the Constitution, and therefore not to be extended to apply to all cases. He then discussed the Judicial authorities cited by the President's counsel, arguing that these afforded no countenance to his views, but settles the point that Congress may fix the tenures of office so as to prevent removals by the President, and that his power to remove, so far as it existed, was only implied from his power to appoint. Against the legislative construction which was adduced in support of the President's theory on this subject, he cited passages from Webster's and Calhoun's speeches, and the writings of Kent and Story, to show that the interpretation put on the Constitution by the Congress of 1789 was erroneous and worthy of reversal, and called attention to the fact that the laws referred to were passed by a very small majority in the House, and in the Senate only by the vote of the Vice President, who had a direct interest in their passage.

He denied that all wisdom had died with our fathers, and claimed that this Congress had as good a right to construe the Constitution as their predecessors. Maintaining the power of Congress to determine the Tenure of Office, he referred to numerous laws fixing the tenure of various offices at a certain number of years.

At this point, four o'clock, on motion of Mr. MORRELL, (Vermont) who stated that Mr. Williams was unwell and would not be able to finish his speech to-day, the Court adjourned and the Senate, after receiving several Executive communications, also adjourned soon afterwards.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. ORTH offered a resolution of inquiry as to the power of Congress to regulate the safety and fare of passengers on Railroads. Adopted.

Mr. PAYNE introduced a bill to admit Arkansas to representation in Congress. Referred to Committee on Reconstruction.

The Speaker submitted a report from the Light House Board that the Light House at port Austin, Michigan, will not be required until the break water shall have been built. Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WELKER introduced a bill to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Black River, Lorain county, Ohio. Referred to Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BLACK introduced a bill extending bounties to certain soldiers who were discharged on account of disability incurred while in the service of the United States. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ECKLEY introduced a bill to repeal a portion of the act entitled "an act to revise and extend the provisions of an act granting the right of way and making a grant of land to the States of Arkansas and Missouri to aid in the construction of a railroad from a point upon the Mississippi opposite the mouth of the Ohio river, *via* Little Rock to the Texas boundary near Fort Fulton in Arkansas, with branches to Fort Smith and the Mississippi river," approved July 28, 1866, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The members of the House then proceeded to the Senate Chamber.

ST. LOUIS.

Raid on the "Whiskey Ring"—Treasury Agent Murderously Assaulted.

[By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.]

ST. LOUIS, April 27.—John C. Fry, Geo. P. Little, Capt. Dan Able and Capt. James Christie, of the steamer Laura, were arrested to-day for a violation of the revenue law, in connection with distilling spirits. All plead not guilty, and were bailed, Christie in $3,000, Able in $2,000 and Fry and Little in $1,000 each. The two latter have held positions as special agents of the Treasury Department.

Ten other members of the "Whiskey Ring" have been indicted by the Grand Jury, but their names have not transpired.

E. R. Phillips, a Special Treasury Agent, was assaulted on the street on the night of the 16th inst., by two men, who knocked him down with a slung shot and beat him very badly. Phillips states that about three weeks previous to the attack he had pointed out the distilleries of Wright & Co. and D. C. Freeman to General Burbridge, a Treasury agent just arrived from Washington, as having been reported by him to the authorities at Washington. These distilleries were subsequently seized by orders from Washington. A short time afterwards Phillips was offered ten thousand dollars and a place in the "Whisky Ring" to compromise, which he declined. He was then told his life was in danger and a night or two afterwards was assaulted. The distilleries were subsequently released, at a cost to the owners, it is said, of $25,000. Phillips thinks the design was to kill him.

THE WEST INDIES.

The Samana Purchase—The Revolution in Hayti Progressing.

[By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.]

HAVANA, April 27.—Mr. Fabius, Dominican Commissioner to the United States to negotiate the sale of Samana, with Senor Jessua, banker of Curacoa, and agent of Baez, arrived here to-day and will leave by the first steamer for the United States. The people of St. Domingo are greatly exasperated against Baez and a revolution is momentarily expected, which will probably place Luperon or Cabral at the head of the Government. The report that a considerable amount of specie arrived at St. Thomas from the United States for the purchase of Samana is contradicted. It is believed the Baez party are acting in concert with President Salnave of Hayti.

Advices from Hayti show the war continues. It is reported the Cacos are commanded by American officers. President Salnave was losing ground daily. The attempt of Gen. Chevalier to reinforce Salnave failed. The party under his command was defeated by the Cacos and with difficulty got back to Cape Haytien.

VIRGINIA.

Delegates to Republican State Convention.

[By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.]

ALEXANDRIA, April 27.—The Wells wing of the Republican party of Alexandria county, on Saturday night, appointed another set of delegates to the Richmond Convention, two white and two black, and instructed them to vote for Wells for Governor. The Radical party of Prince William county, composed principally of blacks, have appointed Wells' delegates to the State Convention.

The Georgia Election.

[By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.]

MACON, April 27.—Bibb county official: Bullock, 2,192; Gordon, 1,911; For Constitution, 315; majority, 15. Additional Southwestern counties received to-day give Gordon over 1,100 majority. Houston county, with over 2,000 negro majority on the registry, gives Gordon 334 majority, and elects a full Democratic ticket. Tift, Democrat, is elected to Congress in the Second District by 800 majority. Gove, Radical, is elected in the Fourth District by upwards of 1,500 majority. It is very close between Alexander and Edwards in the Third District.

—A convention of the Radicals of Missouri is to be held at St. Louis on the first of May, to effect a more thorough political organization for the coming campaign.

SECOND EDITION.

FOUR O'CLOCK A. M.

FROM EUROPE.

Details of the British Victory in Abyssinia—Previous Accounts Confirmed—Great Rejoicing in England—Trial of the Clerkenwell Fenians Concluded—Barrett the Only One Convicted—Prince Alfred's Assailant Condemned to Death—Meeting of the North German Parliament—Speech of King William.

[By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.]

ABYSSINIA.

FURTHER PARTICULARS OF THE BATTLE AT MAGDALA.

LONDON, April 26.—Still later advices from Abyssinia, dated at Zoula, on the 18th of April, have been received here. The very latest reports had at that point from the scene of action at Magdala, represent that 14,000 native troops had laid down their arms to General Napier, and that Theodorus had five hundred soldiers killed and fifteen hundred wounded in the late engagement. Advices from Gen. Napier's headquarters in Magdala, without date, are at hand. They state that the Europeans lately held captive there numbering sixty souls, including men, women and children, were already on the route to Zoula for home, and that the entire force of Theodorus' army had been either killed, wounded or captured. Gen. Napier takes by his victory the twenty-eight large guns just used against him, five thousand stand of small arms, ten thousand shields, such as are used in battle in the open fields by the Abyssinians, ten thousand spears, and many other articles of war equipment. After the works were completely taken, King Theodorus was found dead by the English soldiers, on entering the centre of his stronghold. He was shot through the head. Some say he was killed during one of the battles; others incline to the opinion that he committed suicide when he found that the fortunes of the day were against him. The King's body was recognized among the killed and wounded by the British captives when released. Theodorus' two sons were taken prisoners. The interior of the Fortress of Magdala presented a splendid sight, the place glowing with Barbaric splendor. The British troops plundered it at once. They found four royal crowns made of solid gold, twenty thousand dollars in silver, one thousand silver plates, several lots of rich jewels, and other articles of great value.

DISPATCHES FROM GEN. NAPIER.

LONDON, April 27.—Two dispatches from General Napier have been received by Sir Stafford Northcote, the first of which, without date, says:

"An engagement took place before Magdala on Good Friday. The King was defeated with heavy loss. Our loss is fifteen wounded, rank and file. No killed. During the next two days the King gave up all the European captives and employes, but has not yet surrendered himself and I have given him twenty-four hours to decide whether he will do so or not. His troops are demoralized.

The second dispatch, dated April 14th, says:

Theodorus' army was disheartened by the severe losses of the 10th. Some of the chiefs surrendered the most formidable positions, and many thousand men laid down their arms. The King retired into Magdala with those who remained faithful. Madala was taken by assault on the 13th, under cover of the Armstrong steel guns, the eight inch mortars and rocket battery. The ascent to the gates of the fortress was most formidable. King Theodurus was killed while defending the place to the last. Our loss is small. The army will return to-morrow.

STILL FURTHER DETAILS.

Bashelo River, April 8.—A second reconnoissance to the front towards Magdala was made to-day. The King has twenty-eight guns mounted outside. To-day Gen. Napier has sent him a letter demanding the release of the captives. Our army is concentrated on the river. Scaling ladders and torpedoes have been got ready for an attack on the fortress.

Before Magdala, April 10.—The army has arrived here, six miles from the Fortress. The King's camp is on a great height in full view of our forces.

Magdala, April 13.—The temporary truce ended this morning. The King refused to surrender the prisoners. General Napier with the First and Second Brigades moved up the hill. Scalesze surrendered without resistance. The King retreated into Magdala. He planted six guns at the base of the wall, and when Napier came in sight he King opened upon him, with the guns. The English replied from a twelve pound Armstrong gun and a seven pounder and with rockets. The King abandoned his guns and barricaded the sallyports of the town wall, keeping up a fire of musketry. A bombardment by the British for three hours followed, when Gen. Napier ordered the men to advance, and the town was carried by assault after a vigorous resistance on the part of the enemy. The King's loss is sixty-eight killed and two hundred wounded. The British loss is fifteen wounded, rank and file. The King was found dead, shot through the head. Some say he was killed in battle, others assert he committed suicide. His two sons were taken prisoners. All the European prisoners have been liberated, and leave for home to-morrow. The army will return at once to the seaboard.

REJOICING OVER THE NEWS.

LONDON, April 27—*Evening.*—Great joy prevails throughout the nation over the news from the British troops in Abyssinia, and the safety of Prince Alfred. To-day was observed as an impromptu holiday. At the Stock Exchange national hymns were sung and enthusiastic cheers for the Queen given. The press and the people everywhere are exultant.

GREAT BRITAIN.

THE ATTEMPTED ASSASSIN CONDEMNED—THE CLERKENWELL FENIANS.

LONDON, April 27.—Advices from Sydney, Australia, to-day, state that Farrell, who attempted to assassinate Prince Alfred, had been tried, found guilty and sentenced to death.

The trial of the Fenian prisoners who are accused of causing the Clerkenwell explosion was resumed to-day. The Attorney General concluded his argument. He sifted the evidence designed to prove an *alibi* in the case of Barrett, and asserted that all the witnesses who had sworn to his presence in Glasgow on the 18th of December were either avowed members of the Fenian organization or persons who sympathised with it. The defendants, he said, to make a strong case, should have called the employer or the landlord of Barrett to prove his absence. He would have been a competent witness. But this attempt to prove an *alibi* was part of a concocted scheme planned by Barrett himself. In conclusion he called the attention of the jury to the direct and incontrovertible evidence, given by witnesses whose integrity was unimpeachable, that Barrett did come to London for the express purpose of joining this murderous conspiracy to release his co-laborer, Burke.

Mr. Green, counsel for Barrett, replied in an elaborate speech for his client. He admitted Mr. Barrett's employer or landlord would have been a competent witness, but explained [illegible] and consequently had neither landlord nor [illegible].

Lord Chief Justice Cochburn, in handing the case over to the jury, explained the law in the case where doubt might arise. He sifted the evidence on both sides and commented on the part of Burke and Murphy in the plot. He cautioned the jury in regard to the evidence of the witnesses for the prosecution, Mullaney and Vaughan, and on the other hand, said he was compelled to admit the proof of an *alibi* in the case of Barrett was open to grave doubt. If there had been no doubt, why was not evidence to that effect offered on the first examination? The Chief Justice charged rather favorably in the case of Timothy Desmonds. He expressed great surprise that Mrs. Mullaney had not been produced.

The jury then retired to consider their verdict. After a brief delay they returned. Barrett was found guilty and all the other prisoners acquitted.

BUCKINGHAM PALACE INCENDIARY.

The case of the prisoner Barry, connected with the Greek fire plot at Buckingham Palace, came up at Bow street to-day for preliminary examination. The Greek fire proved to be phosphorus only. The case against the prisoner was strong, and he was remanded for trial.

ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN.

LONDON, April 28, 2 A. M.—Both Houses of Parliament to-night, without a dissenting voice, voted an address to the Queen upon the subject of the attempt to assassinate Prince Alfred, expressing the sympathy of the British nation with the Royal family in the untoward event which has filled them with sorrow and the country with horror, and the hope that the Prince may soon be restored to health.

D'ISRAELI AND THE ABYSSINIAN WAR.

In the House of Commons Mr. D'Israeli, in reply to a question by Mr. Layard, made some remarks on the subject of the Abyssinian war, in which he spoke in the most flattering language of the achievement of General Napier, his army and all who gave aid to the expedition. The conquest of Abysinia he said was only equalled by that of Mexico by Cortez.

IRISH CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT.

The House subsequently went into Committee on the Irish church question. The first of Mr. Gladstone's resolutions was debated at length, but none of the most prominent of the House took part in the discussion. Among the speakers were Mr. Dillwin, Mr. Charles Mr. O'Donogue and Mr. Horseman, in favor of the resolution, and Mr. Harslake, General Peel and Lord John Manners in opposition. No points were made by the speakers which have not already been repeatedly urged in the former discussion.

GERMANY.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT—THE KING'S SPEECH.

BERLIN, April 27.—The third session of the North German Parliament has commenced. King William, of Prussia, made the opening speech. He said to the members that their aim should be the mutual and natural interest of Germany. He advised a fulfillment of the treaties with Austria and Spain, and hoped a desire for national good would rule them in all their proceedings. He congratulated them on the peaceful and friendly local relations, and trusted that those of North Germany with the Great Powers of Europe would justify the belief that the maintenance of peace was the great and only object. The King's speech was very pacific throughout. He concluded by expressing the hope that during the present sessions and in all events, he might count upon the united power of Germany. His remarks were very favorably received. On the conclusion of his speech he shook hands heartily with the Bavarian Minister. The latter called for three cheers for the King which were given with a will.

FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL.

LONDON, April 27.—*Evening.*—Consols close steady at 94@94¼. American Securities close firmer; 5-20s, 70¼@70⅜; Erie, 46¼; Illinois Central, 94¼.

FRANKFORT, April 27—*Evening.*—Five-Twenties closed firm at 75¼.

PARIS, April 27—*Evening.*—Bourse firm; Rentes, 69 francs 25 centimes.

LONDON, April 27—Linseed Cakes declined to 10f. 10s.

ANTWERP, April 27.—Petroleum quiet at 42¼ francs.

HAVRE, April 27—*Evening.*—Cotton closes active and higher; 154 francs for *tres ordinaire* on spot and to arrive.

LIVERPOOL, April 27.—*Evening.*—Cotton market closed somewhat easier at a slight decline; middling uplands on the spot 12¾@13, afloat 13¼; Orleans 13⅛@13¼; sales 15,000 bales. Breadstuffs quiet and steady without material alteration in prices. Provisions closed quiet and steady. Lard however, firmer at 66s. 6d. for American; others unchanged. Rosin advanced to 7s. 3d. for common North Carolina. Other articles unchanged.

Nashville Items.

[By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.]

NASHVILLE, April 27.—John Hart to-day stabbed Tim McCarthy, and was himself subsequently shot by James Hennessy. Both are dangerously wounded.

Captain W. Walsh was at the March election elected a tax collector of Davidson county. Comparatively a stranger, he could not give a bond satisfactory to the County Court. Gov. Brownlow has authorized the Registration Commissioner to take his bond and induct him into office. The bond required by law is three hundred thousand dollars.

Boiler Explosion in Philadelphia—Three Men Killed and Thirteen Wounded.

[By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.]

PHILADELPHIA, April 27.—The boiler in the Penn Treaty rolling mill of Messrs. Leibert & Co., in Marlborough street, exploded this afternoon, demolishing the building. John McGill, Frank Smith and John Davis were killed. Four persons were wounded seriously and many others slightly. Up to the present time thirteen wounded have been taken from the ruins.

—Monday morning, about two o'clock Peter Weis, who keeps a lager beer saloon near Carthage, in Hamilton county, Ohio, was shot and instantly killed by two men who attempted to gain admittance into his establishment. The murderers escaped.