The Pittsburgh Gazette.

THE GAZETTE is furnished to the city for six days of the week for 15 cents per week; by mail, $8 per annum; 2 mos., $2.

CITY AND SUBURBAN.

Mayor Drum had four common cases before him yesterday morning. All paid fines.

Pittsburgh Councils will hold a regular meeting this afternoon, at the usual place.

Very Drunk.—A middle-aged woman, well dressed, was arrested on Penn street, between eleven and twelve o'clock yesterday evening, in a beastly state of intoxication. She was confined in the lockup.

Fire.—A stable belonging to Mr. J. W. Meeks, at Fair Oaks, on the P. Ft. W. & C. R. W., was destroyed by fire about five o'clock Saturday evening. The fire is supposed to have been the work of an incendiary.

Fined.—John Barry and John Miller, printers, formerly employed at the *Dispatch* office, were arrested Saturday evening while trying to to enter the office, and were taken to the lock-up. They were fined $10 and costs each for disorderly conduct.

Mayor's Court.—There were forty victims before the Mayor yesterday morning. Eighteen were charged with disorderly conduct, twenty with drunkenness and two with vagrancy. Twenty-one paid fines, thirteen were committed and five were discharged.

The Emigrant's Death.—Saturday morning Coroner Clawson held an inquest on the body of the German emigrant Fredolfon Zollis, who died suddenly, the particulars of which were given in Saturday's paper. The jury returned a verdict of death from apoplexy.

Hand Crushed.—John Riley, a workman employed at the Sligo Iron Mills, was engaged on Saturday in putting a "bloom" in the squeezers, had his right hand caught and terribly crushed. He was removed to his residence in South Pittsburgh, where he received medical attention.

Disorderly.—John P. Smithwick was arrested at the instance of his wife, and taken to the lock-up yesterday. She states that he beats and abuses her, and that he threatened to kill her. She was locked up, and the wife directed to appear before the Mayor this morning and make information against him.

Fist Living.—In this age of luxurious living, late suppers and rich food produce painful eruptions upon the skin by overheating it, especially during hot weather. You can prevent this and keep it cool, soft and white, by using a bottle of Violata. The effect of the use is truly wonderful. Sold by Druggists and fancy goods dealers.

Tore Down His Gate.—Saturday morning Frederick Bluisunis made information, before Alderman Eggers, of Allegheny, charging Michael Hines, with mischievous mischief, the alleged offense consisting in tearing down a gate leading to defendant's premises. The parties reside in the Eighth ward. The Alderman issued a warrant for defendant's arrest.

Alleged Wholesale Perjury.—Information was made Saturday before Alderman Arnt, by Henry Rothe against Thomas Grose, wife and daughter, charging Mrs. Grose with perjury. The offense consisted in swearing falsely in a case before Alderman Mullen, in which the possession of a certain garret chamber in a dwelling in the Third ward was in dispute. Warrant issued.

Insane.—A woman, purporting to be Margaret Kinney, wife of David Kinney, of Freeport, Ill., who is evidently insane, was arrested at the Union Depot by Officer Wilson, and taken to the lock-up for safe keeping. She states that she is the mother of seven children, but cannot tell where they reside. Her husband, she says, abandoned her several months since, and she was on her way to New York to her friends.

City Improved Property at Auction.—See Mellwaine's auction advertisement for particulars of the No. 95 Water street warehouse, No. 205 Liberty street warehouse, No. 337 Liberty street warehouse, and 259 Penn street dwelling, to be sold to-morrow evening, on second floor of Mellwaine's auction rooms, 106 Smithfield street. There are all very valuable city properties, and such as seldom offer at public or private sale.

Savage Threat.—Philip Schauer, Saturday, appeared before Alderman Taylor and complained that Wm. Layling had "pryed at him with a shovel and threatened to put a horse's head on him." This strange vindictive and solemnly portentous threat alarmed Philip to such a degree that he could not rest before obtaining legal protection. The parties are engaged at the Fort Pitt foundry. The police are looking for the accused.

Threw a Brick.—Yesterday afternoon Jacob Eyler was pursuing a circuitous route along Chestnut street, Allegheny, when his attention was attracted to a youth on the opposite side of the thoroughfare who seemed to be an amused spectator of Jacob's proceedings. Jacob glanced at the young man and a second after threw a brick at the offender's head. It missed the mark. Jacob immediately fell into the hands of the police and spent the remainder of the day and last evening in the lock-up.

In the Wrong Hands.—Conrad Eberhardt, made information before Alderman Eggers Saturday afternoon, against man Eggers Saturday afternoon, against James Lude, charging him with larceny. The deponent alleges he observed in the hands of Lude a gold headed cane, which he feels certain is the property of Rev. H. Muhlinghery, it having been presented to that gentleman by members of his ed to that gentleman by members of his congregation. The deponent further alleges he believes Lude to have unlawfully obtained the "walking stick". The accused was arrested and held for a hearing.

Sneak Thieves About.

A bold sneak thieving operation occurred in Allegheny Saturday morning. The residence of Mr. Armstrong, a painter, on Mill alley, near Alderman Bailey's office, was the scene. Mrs. Armstrong had been called into the next house by the death of a little child, and in the excitement she left the front door open as she went out. In about ten minutes she returned, and found that a dress with her pocket book, containing some twenty-eight dollars, had been stolen from the sitting room. The thief seems to have been acquainted with the house, and managed the job quickly. There is no clue.

Caught a Tartar.

Peter Guldner made information before the Mayor on Saturday morning, charging Ella Oyler with the larceny of $47. He alleges that he was accosted on the street by the accused and induced to accompany her to her residence on Virgin alley, and while there he alleges she stole his pocket book and money. Ella was arrested, and, after a hearing, committed to jail in default of bail for her appearance to answer the charge. She subsequently procured the required bail, and made information before the Mayor charging Guldner with *forcer, et cet.*, who in turn was arrested, and, being unable to procure bail, was committed to jail for trial.

A Misunderstanding.

Three Germans, neither of whom could speak the English language, and an Irishman, who could not understand German, were arrested on Penn street, in the Twelfth ward, Saturday night, while engaged in a fight. They were taken to the Twelfth ward Station House and kept over night and yesterday morning were brought before the Mayor for a hearing. On examination it was discovered that the Irishman had accosted the Germans on the street and asked them a civil question which they did not answer intelligently, whereupon he undertook to whip the entire party, and had commenced the job when the police interfered. The Fenian was fined twenty dollars and costs, and in default was sent up for twenty days.

A Dogged Assault.

Yesterday afternoon about four o'clock, officer Wolderkenold was walking along Wood street, when a large mastiff, belonging to Mr. J. R. Weldon, attacked him, tearing his pantaloons. The official was enraged thereat and proceeded to the Mayor's office, where he procured a seven shooter of the most immense proportions. Coming back to the scene of the attack, breathing vengeance on the canine, he arrived just in time to witness what was of its tail as it disappeared the last wag of its tail as it disappeared inside the store room. The officer, not to be cheated out of his revenge, attempted to force an entrance. He failed in this, but succeeded in creating a sensation and attracting a large crowd about the premises. The excitement calmed down, however, in a short time after it was discovered that the object of official wrath was beyond reach.

TELEGRAPH IMBROGLIO.

The Alleged Larceny of Associated Press Telegrams from the "Republic" Office —Hearing in the Case of C. J. Ferdinand—The Shoe on the Wrong Foot—The Case Dismissed at the Costs of the Prosecutor.

Considerable interest has been manifested within a few days among our newspaper men in the controversy which has arisen from the exclusion of the *Republic* by the Western Associated Press. The *Republic* was charged with violation of contract in giving to the Pacific and Atlantic Telegraph office dispatches received, through the Associated Press, over the Western Union line. That such dispatches were so disposed of is not denied; but the proprietors of that paper, averring that it was done without their authority, by C. J. Ferdinand, Esq., lately in their employ as editor, instituted proceedings against him (as we have already announced) for larceny as bailee. The accused was duly arrested on Thursday last, and in default of bail committed for a hearing on Saturday.

Mr. Ferdinand protested his innocence of the charge, and alleged that he was to be made a scape-goat to cover up the wrong-doing of others. Interest was enlisted in his behalf, partly from the fact that he was a stranger in the city, without funds or friends, and during Friday it was determined by a number of local editors that he should be accorded a full and fair hearing.

At three o'clock Saturday afternoon, the time fixed for the hearing, the little office of Alderman McMasters presented quite an interesting scene. His magistracy was overwhilmed at finding himself in such "good company," (as he expressed himself,) supported as he was on either hand by a full corps of reporters, while in his front were assembled representatives from all departments of newspaperdom, and attaches of the different telegraph companies, filling the room to its utmost capacity. The prisoner, Mr. Ferdinand, was present, also the prosecutor, and the Alderman indicated his readiness to proceed with the hearing.

The prosecutor was represented by Hall Patterson and A. J. McCullough, Esqs., and the prisoner by J. D. Ramsey, John J. Case, W. A. Taylor and Hugh Duffy, Esqs.

After a little delay awaiting the arrival of a witness, Mr. Patterson called George W. Leonard.

Counsel for defense thought it in order first to examine the prosecutor.

Mr. Patterson claimed the privilege of trying their case in their own way.

Mr. Case demanded that Mr. Murphy, the prosecutor, be first placed on the stand.

Mr. Taylor said it was the defendant's right that he should be faced by his accuser before the case could proceed. The cuser before the case could proceed. The accuser must be "in court," and the accused could only know of his presence by his appearance on the witness stand.

Mr. Ramsey coincided in this view, and said the defense, unquestionably, had the right to cross-examine the prosecutor.

Alderman—The defense will be allowed such opportunity. I will not dictate to either counsel how they shall conduct their case.

Mr. Case called for the reading of the information. It charged, in substance, that Chas Jos Ferdinand did unlawfully, that Chas Jos Ferdinand did unlawfully, is not denied; but the proprietors of that paper, averring that it was done without their authority, by C. J. Ferdinand, Esq., lately in their employ as editor, instituted proceedings against him (as we have already announced) for larceny as bailee. The accused was duly arrested on Thursday last, and in default of bail committed for a hearing on Saturday.

Mr. Ferdinand protested his innocence of the charge, and alleged that he was to be made a scape-goat to cover up the wrong-doing of others. Interest was enlisted in his behalf, partly from the fact that he was a stranger in the city, without funds or friends, and during Friday it was determined by a number of local editors that he should be accorded a full and fair hearing.

At three o'clock Saturday afternoon, the time fixed for the hearing, the little office of Alderman McMasters presented quite an interesting scene. His magistracy was overwhilmed at finding himself in such "good company," (as he expressed himself,) supported as he was on either hand by a full corps of reporters, while in his front were assembled representatives from all departments of newspaperdom, and attaches of the different telegraph companies, filling the room to its utmost capacity. The prisoner, Mr. Ferdinand, was present, also the prosecutor, and the Alderman indicated his readiness to proceed with the hearing.

The prosecutor was represented by Hall Patterson and A. J. McCullough, Esqs., and the prisoner by J. D. Ramsey, John J. Case, W. A. Taylor and Hugh Duffy, Esqs.

After a little delay awaiting the arrival of a witness, Mr. Patterson called George W. Leonard.

Counsel for defense thought it in order first to examine the prosecutor.

Mr. Patterson claimed the privilege of trying their case in their own way.

Mr. Case demanded that Mr. Murphy, the prosecutor, be first placed on the stand.

Mr. Taylor said it was the defendant's right that he should be faced by his accuser before the case could proceed. The cuser before the case could proceed. The accuser must be "in court," and the accused could only know of his presence by his appearance on the witness stand.

Mr. Ramsey coincided in this view, and said the defense, unquestionably, had the right to cross-examine the prosecutor.

Alderman—The defense will be allowed such opportunity. I will not dictate to either counsel how they shall conduct their case.

Mr. Case called for the reading of the information. It charged, in substance, that Chas Jos Ferdinand did unlawfully, that Chas Jos Ferdinand did unlawfully take into his possession certain dispatches by telegraph, and other documents, received by the proprietors of the *Republic* newspaper from the Western Associated Press, and did unlawfully convert the same to his own private use, to the great detriment and damage of the proprietors of said newspaper, the damages amounting to $5,000.

Mr. Case—On those allegations we wish to cross-examine the prosecutor, before proceeding any further.

Alderman—You shall have the opportunity.

Mr. McCullough—The Commonwealth has the right to open the case.

Alderman—Certainly. Proceed.

George W. Leonard was again called and responded.

Mr. Ramsey—We desire that the prosecutor shall remain in court.

Mr. Patterson—Mr. Murphy will be in town for several days yet.

Mr. Leonard was sworn and testified—Am local reporter and outside business manager of the *Republic*. Know the defendant, Mr. Ferdinand; his position on the *Republic* I did not know of my own knowledge.

Question—Do you know Mr. Murphy's position?

Objected to as irrelevant. Witness did not know defendant's position, and not know anything about the authority Murphy's was of no consequence in the case.

Mr. Patterson said the object of the question was to show, in connection with other evidence, that the defendant had acted without authority in converting the telegraph dispatches to his own use.

Mr. Ramsey objected to the gentleman arguing the case. Nothing as yet had been shown against the defendant.

The question was allowed.

Mr. Leonard—Mr. Murphy was the managing editor of the *Republic*; nothing went in the paper without his consent. He had the entire control of the establishment. He received dispatches from the Western Union Telegraph Company (Western Associated Press) and paid $38 85 per week for them. The dispatches were brought to the office by boys in the employ of the telegraph company, to the composing room of the paper on Third street. Defendant had no authority to handle any dispatches received at the office. Mr. Murphy alone had the right.

Witness, in answer to a question by Mr. McCullough, said each of the Associated papers connected with the Associated Press were assessed a certain amount.

The defense objected to the evidence as irrelevant. No larceny had yet been proved.

Mr. McCullough—Under the charge it is only necessary to prove a bailment.

Mr. Ramsey—Well, prove the bailment before you go any farther.

The witness being turned over for cross-examination, said: Became connected with the *Republic*, last, about four weeks before the defendant left that office. Left there because I was offered a better position. Mr. Ferdinand had access to the Associated dispatches; saw them in the room while the dispatches were lying on the editor's table. Never saw him handling them. I had access to the dispatches. Don't know anything about the *Republic* firm, except Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Case (exhibiting *Republic* newspaper)—Who are "J. R. Murphy & Co." here?

Witness—I don't know.

The prosecutor, J. R. Murphy, was now called, took the stand, and being sworn, said, in answer to Mr. Patterson's questions: I am one of the owners of the *Republic*. Control the entire business of the establishment. No matter goes in without my consent. The defendant's position was writing editor. Every line he wrote was submitted to me before being published.

Question—Did you, as business manager, having entire control of the establishment, ever authorize, or designate any other person to authorize, any person to use the Western Associated Press dispatches, except as according to the contract?

Witness—Never!

Question—State whether you ever authorized the defendant, or any one else, to furnish the dispatches received by the *Republic* from the Western Associated Press, (Western Union Telegraph Company,) to the Pacific and Atlantic Telegraph Company?

Witness—I never did.

Question—What authority did Mr. Ferdinand exercise over the dispatches received from the Western Union office?

Objected to.

Mr. McCullough—We desire to prove the want of authority.

Question—Had he (Mr. F.) any authority over the dispatches, and if so, what was it?

Witness—The only authority I ever gave him was, that when he got through with his labors, or regular duties, he should assist the foreman, relieve him in condensing the dispatches, our paper being too small to publish the telegrams being too small to publish the telegrams entire as received. This was in addition to his regular duties, as writing editor. He so assisted the foreman about the first of this month. It was at night. Got through generally about two o'clock, A. M. He went to the composing room about nine or ten o'clock, P. M.

In answer to a question by Mr. McCullough, witness said: Nobody, by my authority, directly or indirectly, had any right to dispose of the dispatches received from the Western Union office to the Atlantic and Pacific Company.

The direct examination here closed.

Mr. Duffy—Who composes, beside yourself, the firm of "J. R. Murphy & Co."

Mr. Patterson—I object. The question is irrelevant—has no bearing on the case. The firm has not brought suit, Mr. Murphy alone appearing as prosecutor.

Mr. Ramsey—It is certainly relevant. We are cross examining the witness. He has said he was "one of the owners of the *Republic*," and we desire to know who they are in telling the truth or not. We desire to know whether there is such a firm as "J. R. Murphy & Co.," and of whom it is composed. The proprietors of the *Republic*, according to the information, claim the ownership of the premises, claim the ownership of the property alleged to have been unlawfully appropriated to the defendant. Mr. Murphy represents himself as one of the proprietors, and we wish to know who the others are, or whether there exists such a firm as "J. R. Murphy & Co."

Witness—There is such a firm.

Mr. Ramsey—That is not an answer to the question.

Mr. Patterson—The defense do not understand their case. This is not an indictment.

Mr. Ramsey—Before we get through you will know whether we understand our case or not, and may discover you do not understand your case. I insist upon the witness answering the question. Who compose the firm of J. R. Murphy & Co.?"

Mr. Patterson—And we say he shan't answer it. We object.

Alderman—It is scarcely necessary in this proceeding to inquire as to the individual members of the firm. The witness has said there is such a firm as J. R. Murphy & Co.

Witness (seemingly with a feeling of relief)—There is such a firm.

Question—The offense is alleged to have been committed on or about the first of October. How came you not to make information until the 25th?

Witness—Because I was not cognizant of the matter before.

Question—Upon what did you base your information?

Witness—Upon information received from Mr. Garwood, (of the Pacific and Atlantic line,) who received the dispatches from defendant.

Question—Previous to making the information, had not the defendant brought a civil suit against you for money due him?

Witness—He had.

Question—Did the bringing of that suit have any influence upon you in bringing this prosecution against defendant?

Witness—It did not. None whatever.

Question—Did you have any communication, written or verbal, with Mr. Casselberry, Superintendent of the Pacific and Atlantic Telegraph Company, office and Atlantic Telegraph Company, with reference to furnishing him with Associated Press dispatches received by the *Republic* from the Western Union telegraph office?

Objected to by Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Ramsey—The witness has stated that no person was authorized to furnish the Atlantic and Pacific Telegraph Company with Associated Press dispatches received by the *Republic*. We propose to show, by witnesses now present, that he did have an agreement with the Manager of the Atlantic and Pacific Company to furnish all such dispatches, and did furnish the same. We desire his answer to the question for the purpose or contradicting him.

Witness—Put the question in a proper shape and I will answer it.

Mr. Ramsey repeated the question.

Witness—I have had some communication with Mr. Casselberry.

Mr. Ramsey—What was the nature of the communication?

Witness—That's a private matter.

Mr. Patterson—Mr. Murphy (the witness) is not on trial. We object to his answering the question.

Witness—I am on trial and I'll answer the question.

Mr. Ramsey—We insist upon you stating what the communication was.

Mr. Patterson—We object.

Alderman—The question is a proper one.

Mr. Patterson—But, your Honor, we object.

Mr. Ramsey—The Alderman has overruled the objection, and we must have the answer.

Witness—Mr. Casselberry has spoken to me about the matter, but I never answered his proposition. Never gave him (Mr. C.) authority to use the dispatches received by the *Republic*.

Mr. Ramsey—Did you ever furnish Mr. Garwood with any dispatches?

Witness—Mr. Garwood never received any dispatches—either of my offices, with my consent.

Mr. Ramsey—Did Mr. Casselberry, Mr. Garwood, or any other person or persons, within the last two months, receive any dispatches from the *Republic* office outside of Mr. Ferdinand, with your knowledge?

Witness—Mr. Garwood, nor no other person, received dispatches at the *Republic* office, with my consent.

Mr. Ramsey—Did he, or any other person, receive them from or through you, anywhere else?

Mr. Patterson—We object.

Mr. Ramsey—That's another matter.

Mr. Ramsey claimed the right to an answer. No evidence had as yet been elicited going to show the defendant guilty of the offense charged. They proposed to show that the prosecutor (the witness) had caused the arrest of an innocent man to shield himself—that he himself had committed the offense he had sworn against Mr. Ferdinand.

The Alderman ruled that the question was a proper one

Mr. Patterson—But we object, Mr. Alderman.

Witness—I never authorized any man to receive dispatches inside or outside of my offices.

Mr. Ramsey—Did they receive dispatches from you, inside or outside of your offices.

Witness—I'll not state my private business.

Mr. Ramsey—We insist upon an answer.

Mr. Patterson—That has nothing to do with the case. We object.

Witness—I will state anything pertaining to the prosecution of this case.

Mr. Ramsey—We are the judges, not you, of what pertains to the case. Alderman, I submit upon the witness answering the question. If he refuses to answer, I will ask that the prisoner be discharged.

Mr. Taylor—The witness refusing to answer, he shall be committed for contempt!

Witness—Make out your commitment.

Alderman—We'll not do that, but the case can go no further without an answer to the question.

Mr. Ramsey—Inquired whether the cross-examination allowed was purely within the discretion of the magistrate. In this instance he thought improper, and out of place.

Mr. Ramsey thought the cross-examination entirely proper, and declined to withdraw the question. He again demanded an answer from the witness.

Witness—I decline to state my private business.

Mr. Ramsey—It is not your private business we want. We desire to know whether you yourself are not guilty of what you charge another with, and the fact depends upon your answering the question. Failing to answer, I will ask the discharge of the prisoner.

Mr. Ferdinand—I don't want to be discharged, that way.

The witness still declined to answer.

Alderman—We discharge this case, at the cost of the prosecutor.

Constable Ferris had been guarding the prisoner—Will I let him go?

Alderman—The prisoner is discharged. And so ended the case. The crowd in attendance, which had become great, eagerly sought the sidewalk, the heat in the small room having become almost intolerable. Some excitement was visible, and the feeling seemed to be largely in Mr. Ferdinand's favor. Some one shouted "carriage," "carriage," in the street, for the purpose of conveying the prisoner home, but not carried out. Mr. Murphy, the prosecutor, as may well be supposed, was by no means pleased at the result, and seemed to realize the position in which it left him, as the principal man of the *Republic* establishment. He muttered, as he passed out, the end was not yet, and to have better opinion of his discretion than to suppose he will attempt any further explanation of a matter which, so far, has led to his committer which, so far, has led to his committal to the dispatches, except as according to the contract?

Witness—Never!

Question—State whether you ever authorized the defendant, or any one else, to furnish the dispatches received by the Western Associated Press, (Western Union Telegraph Company,) to the Pacific and Atlantic Telegraph Company?

Witness—I never did.

Question—What authority did Mr. Ferdinand exercise over the dispatches received from the Western Union office?

Objected to.

Mr. McCullough—We desire to prove the want of authority.

Question—Had he (Mr. F.) any authority over the dispatches, and if so, what was it?

Witness—The only authority I ever gave him was, that when he got through with his labors, or regular duties, he should assist the foreman, relieve him in condensing the dispatches, our paper being too small to publish the telegrams entire as received. This was in addition to his regular duties, as writing editor. He so assisted the foreman about the first of this month. It was at night. Got through generally about two o'clock, A. M. He went to the composing room about nine or ten o'clock, P. M.

In answer to a question by Mr. McCullough, witness said: Nobody, by my authority, directly or indirectly, had any right to dispose of the dispatches received from the Western Union office to the Atlantic and Pacific Company.

The direct examination here closed.

Mr. Duffy—Who compose, beside yourself, the firm of "J. R. Murphy & Co."

Mr. Patterson—I object. The question is irrelevant—has no bearing on the case. The firm has not brought suit, Mr. Murphy alone appearing as prosecutor.

Mr. Ramsey—It is certainly relevant. We are cross examining the witness. He has said he was "one of the owners of the *Republic*," and we desire to know who they are in telling the truth or not. We desire to know whether there is such a firm as "J. R. Murphy & Co." and of whom it is composed. The proprietors of the *Republic*, according to the information, claim the ownership of the premises, claim the ownership of the property alleged to have been unlawfully appropriated to the defendant. Mr. Murphy represents himself as one of the proprietors, and we wish to know who

JOURNALISTIC CONVULSIONS.

Wars and Rumors of Wars—The "Dispatch" Repudiates the Typographical Union.

The predicted earthquakes must be nigh at hand, or the world waxes near its end, if the signs in newspaperdom amounts to anything hereabouts. The city press has been honored for the first time with a representation in the Board of Directors of the Western Associated Press; an editor has been jailed for stealing news and vindicated, another is sued for perjury, another degrades his profession by getting admitted to the legal fraternity, two more plead in a municipal court and outflank opposing attorneys, a paper is put out from under the sheltering wings of the W. A. P. for certain irregularities, the members of the entire editorial profession organize a press club, and to cap the climax a week's work and finish it up roundly, the *Dispatch* hoists the banner of independence on a Saturday morning, and sails final adieu to the rules and regulations of the "Typographical Union," discharging all its compositors and putting in their places new men. This last unexpected, we learn, has been contemplated by the proprietors of the *Dispatch* several months, but was adroitly concealed from the Union compositors till the new hands marched into the composing room and took possession. The causes which led to the cutting of the Typ—which so long held the *Dispatch* to the Union are variously stated. The proprietors claim that the positive despotism of the compositors drew them, and their assumptions of authority led to the disruption. They announce that they will continue, as heretofore, to pay the full union wages to their hands, but will in the future run their composing rooms to suit themselves and will be entirely independent of any trade organization.

Trouble was anticipated over the change, or, as the union printers say, "ratting," but aside from angry words and a hair room fight where several of the dejosed men were knocked down for a too free expression of opinion, by disinterested representatives, nothing serious happened. It was rumored yesterday that other papers contemplated making a similar change, but it is probable no union journal will follow the *Dispatch* until the success of its bold movement is demonstrated.

DISASTROUS CONFLAGRATION.

Fire on Second Avenue—Little & Baird's Wholesale Grocery Destroyed—Loss over $100,000.

A disastrous fire occurred yesterday morning on Second avenue, by which the Wholesale Grocery Store and Warehouse of Little & Baird, at Nos. 112 and 114, was totally destroyed. The building was a double three-story brick, in rear of which was a two-story building in which was the counting room, and about one o'clock Sunday morning the watchman on duty in that locality discovered flames issuing from a skylight in the back building. The alarm was given, and the fire department called into service, but the flames had made such headway before the firemen got to the scene of the fire as to render the efforts of the fire comparatively useless. The fire communicated to the rear of J. B. Caufield & Co's warehouse, adjoining, and to the warehouse of Fahnestock, Allbren & Co., and the attention of the firemen was directed to saving Caufield & Co.'s building, which was considerably damaged. Fahnestock, Albren & Co.'s slightly, and the one in which the fire originated was burned to the ground. The firm had a heavy stock of goods on hand, consisting of three hundred sacks of coffee, two hundred chests of tea, one hundred tierces of rice, and a large stock of sugars and other articles usually kept in such establishments, and their loss will not fall short of $50,000.

The building was owned by Mr. John L. Hunter, and was valued at over $50,000. Owing to the absence of the *Dispatch* from the city, and the destruction of the *Post* and *Gazette* buildings, reliable reports of the fire could not be obtained, and it was impossible to obtain what insurance was on the stock or the exact amount of the loss.

A Cutting Affray.

Officer Barber, and another member of the force, about eleven o'clock last night arrested a Mr. Higgins, wife of John Higgins, residing on Pike street, near Fourteenth, on a charge of assault and battery. It appears, from what we can learn, that John Higgins, the husband of the accused, was drunk, and while in the act of entering the residence, got into a difficulty with four men or boys, one of whom was a Mr. Hoffman, whose name we were unable to learn, and after fighting for some time, all went home covered with blood. After washing himself he started to go out again, when his wife, fearing he might get into further difficulty, endeavored to keep him in the house. He refused to remain, however, and after he had been gone a few minutes she became alarmed and followed him. At the corner of Pike and Fourteenth streets she found him lying on the ground and three boys or young men kicking and beating him. Higgins was down and one of the party was on top of him, seeing his wife, as she had a right to lug which he drew a knife and pulled the fellow off, who, on seeing his cowardly companions struck the scamps and knocked her down. She got up again, however, and attempted to take her husband home, but was met by a neighbor's son and got him into the valiant officer's house, where he was arrested for. Upon being arrested he asked what authority we had, and it was alleged by one of the cowardly ruffians who had been beating the drunken husband that he had been cut with a knife during the fight, and caused the wound with which he charged the cutting. The wound received was only a slight scratch in the side, not of a dangerous or serious character of a dangerous or serious character of a dangerous or serious character