LOCAL MISCELLANY.

PARK DEPARTMENT IMPROVEMENTS.

ADDRESS TO THE WORKINGMEN'S DELEGATES—THE DELAY ABOUT RIVERSIDE PARK—ANOTHER LETTER TO THE CONTROLLER.

There was no meeting of the Park Commissioners yesterday, as a quorum was not present. Commissioners Martin and Wetmore received the workingmen's delegates, eight or nine in number. They said their object in calling upon the Commissioners was to ascertain what could be done about giving unemployed laborers work. They understood that there was a large appropriation made for Riverside Park, and Controller Green said he was willing to pay the money when called upon. They wanted to find out whose fault it was. They said that under this reform government there appeared to be no head from whom they could learn where to fix the responsibility. With a reform Controller and so many reform office-holders, the workingmen were worse off than under Tweed.

Commissioner Martin, in reply, said that the ground for Riverside Park was purchased six years ago for about $6,000,000, half paid by the city and the remainder by the property-owners benefited. This was done while Controller Green was a member of the Park Department. Ever since, the property-owners had been anxious to have the park finished, but after Mr. Green left the department and lost control of the work he had steadily delayed it by technical objections, so that the Department and the property-owners were unable to go on. The Department had tried each year to have bills for this work passed by the Legislature, but had been defeated by Mr. Green until the last Legislature passed a bill directing the department to do the work and assess those benefited. This act was signed by the Governor on June 2, and since that time engineers had been at work preparing specifications, which would be presented at the next meeting of the Board. When these were approved the work would be pushed on as rapidly as possible. Commissioner Martin also said that there was no fund now in the hands of the department for Riverside Park, and it would be paid for by assessments. The other works now in hand were of maintenance and construction. The maintenance fund for 1876 was $157,000, while in 1875 it was $350,000. The Board of Estimate and Apportionment was willing to give $25,000 more, but this was cut down by motion of Mr. Green. The construction fund was granted by the Legislature in 1875, and as it was unlikely that there would be any appropriation for it for 1876, the department kept its unexpended balance for 1875, with which men were now employed to finish the works already commenced, such as Tompkins-square and East River Park.

There was also present a delegation of property owners from Riverside Park, of whom Samuel A. Church and others addressed the workingmen, saying that for five years their efforts to have the park completed had been thwarted by Controller Green.

Commissioner Martin, as President of the Park Department, wrote a letter to Controller Green yesterday, declaring that work on the roads in the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Wards was prevented by his delay in acting on the sureties of John B. Bouker, to whom the contract for supplying gravel and broken stone was awarded on May 19. The proposal was sent to the Controller on May 13 for his action on the sureties. President Martin adds:

With the claims on the part of some of the other bidders that they were entitled to the contract, you have nothing to do. The samples of some of these bidders were rejected, and the contract was awarded to the lowest bidder whose sample was up to the required standard. We set a high and a precise standard of quality, because in laying gravel on a road the price of the material is one element of the cost, and the labor of laying it another. We must therefore have a quality of gravel that packs well and is laid with the least amount of labor. And thus it may happen that between the samples of gravel, which you might suppose alike, we can make a discrimination in favor of a quality which, though the price be a few cents higher by the cubic yard, will at the same time cost us a great deal less when it is laid on the road. We have exercised this judgment in this case and awarded the contract accordingly. Your inexcusable delay has greatly interfered with the work on the roads in the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Wards. The Spring and early Summer is the most effective season for working on roads, and our plans were prepared for using a large amount of gravel and broken stone for putting them in good repair. This you have prevented. The roads are in bad condition, and the people suffer the inconvenience.

ATTITUDE OF THE LONGSHOREMEN.

THE STRIKERS STILL HOLDING OUT—NO DIFFICULTY EXPERIENCED BY THE STEAMSHIP COMPANIES.

There was no change in the condition of the Longshoremen's strike yesterday. The men say that they will not yield, while the steamship companies are equally obdurate. As yet there has been no disturbance, the men generally keeping quiet, although they walk up and down West-st. in groups, or stand on the corners discussing their prospects. The work on all the piers was carried on yesterday as usual, and no new vessels having arrived, there was no need to seek for any more men. The Havana line at Pier No. 9, the New-Orleans line at Pier No. 29, and the Anchor line at Piers Nos. 20 and 21, employ the old hands, paying them 40 cents an hour. The French line at Pier No. 50 employs its own crews, and fills up the vacancies with the old hands. The National line at Pier No. 44, the Inman line at Pier No. 45, and the Williams & Guion line at Pier No. 46, employ new hands entirely, paying them 25 cents an hour. These new men consist chiefly of Italians, with a few Germans and Irishmen. At the Inman pier the City of Montreal is loading. She is advertised to sail on Saturday, and Mr. Brewster, who is in charge of the dock, said that there was no doubt that she would be ready to sail on that day with a cargo stowed as well as it ever was. Mr. Brewster said that he has had no difficulty in getting all the men he wanted, and indeed could not employ all that applied for work. He had sent many applicants to the other piers. He laughed at the idea advanced by one of the strikers that the work could not be done as well by the new hands, and said that there was no difficulty in obtaining insurance. The Company's officers always superintended the stowing of cargo, even when done by the longshoremen, and they superintended it now, and the work was being done rapidly and well. This report was corroborated at the other piers. The work was progressing to the entire satisfaction of the companies, and no apprehension that the steamships would not be ready to sail on their advertised days was felt. It was thought that there was no possibility of the strike being a success.

The longshoremen declare that the companies will have to yield, and that the work of the new men is poorly done, and will not be satisfactory. They say they do not intend to make any trouble or disturbance of any kind, but that they are determined not to work at the lower rates. Even at the old rates, they have difficulty to support themselves and families. Yesterday, as the new men who were working at Pier No. 46 were going to their dinner, two or three boys threw stones at them. The longshoremen who were at hand immediately stopped the boys, and said that they did not want any such things done, as the blame would rest on them. The only disturbances have been two or three fights between some of the longshoremen themselves, occasioned by indulgence in too much liquor. Sergeant Gastlin, of the Steamboat Squad of Police, is continually on duty along the wharves, with a force of nearly one hundred men. He has scouts out all the time, who report to him every occurrence in relation to the longshoremen. He said that there could not possibly be any trouble that he could not quell in a very few minutes. It is the general impression that the strike will fail, but that the men will not come back in a body but singly. Yesterday one of the strikers came to Mr. Brewster, at the Inman pier, and told him that he had only 8 cents to buy breakfast for himself and family, and asked him for work. Mr. Brewster put him to work with the others. He has not been molested so far by his old companions.

DISPOSITION OF CITY REFUSE.

GARBAGE SCOWS STILL SENT TO SEA—SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE.

Capt. Gunner stated yesterday morning that the fleet of scows loaded with the street dirt, ashes, and garbage collected in this city on Tuesday night and yesterday was sent out to sea at the proper time to catch the ebb tide. Scows also will continue, he said, to be sent to Guttenberg, but the quantity of refuse that can be dumped there is not large. The Street-Cleaning Department has been endeavoring for the past two years to find the best method of disposing of the refuse from the streets and dwellings of this city. At times it has been able to accept small contracts for filling, but no continued arrangement has ever been made. Commissioner Brennan of the Department of Charities and Correction stated that the northern portion of Blackwell's Island had been filled with the ashes and street dirt collected in this city. This section, which was a bar on waste previously, has been made one of the most attractive and healthful on the island, and a large and valuable tract of land has been added to the city's possessions at a comparatively trifling cost.

It has been proposed that the Street-Cleaning Bureau should make a contract with Swift & White to dump all the refuse from the streets and dwellings upon Barren Island. It is also said that it has been suggested that the portion of Coney Island that is now only a sand waste could be made a green and fertile tract if it could be covered by the refuse from this city. It has been urged that if this tract was filled with ashes and street dirt after Oct. 1, when travel becomes light, it would not prove offensive to many persons. After the refuse had been lying there all Winter and the greater part of the Spring, the grass and wheat sowed would spring up, and the spot would be a great addition to the next Summer's attractions on this island. Col. Prentice, the counsel to the Board of Health, said yesterday that science was making such rapid strides toward improvement that he believed that by the time Francis Swift's contract for the removal of dead animals, offal, and night soil had expired all the slaughter houses and abattoirs would render and use up their own refuse. For the past two months, he added, several of the large slaughter-houses have been using up all their own refuse and converting it into valuable fertilizers. Their operations have been watched with unceasing vigilance by the Board of Health, but nothing offensive has been found. In these processes all the gases are consumed. These advances, Col. Prentice thinks, indicate that these processes can be conducted in this city without being at all offensive. The Board of Health will encourage this work both on scientific and economic grounds, believing that it will prove the true solution of the problem that has so long puzzled great cities.

AN OLD SWINDLE REVIVED.

Hugo Fritsch, the Austrian Consul in this city, informed Superintendent Walling yesterday that persons living in Germany were being swindled by Germans in this country by means of an old confidence game. The principals are said to be E. T. Myers, Griswold Muller and J. P. DeGarno. The men address letters to different persons in Germany, generally persons in Vienna who have relatives in this country, stating that some person related to them has died and left a large quantity of jewelry, personal property, and other articles of value. The letters are written on paper with the printed heading, "The San Francisco Hotel Café, No. 137 California-st., and are signed sometimes by "E. T. Meyer, 51 Johnson-st., Brooklyn," and again "G. Muller, care of Mr. Hurst, No. 199 South Third-st., Brooklyn." The person to whom the letter is sent is told to send $30 to pay the expenses of the trunks, of advertising, and then the valuable property will be forwarded. They are recommended to send bills and not drafts, as the latter can with difficulty be cashed. The Consul-General sent to Superintendent Walling several letters which had been received by persons in Vienna who had been swindled. These letters also contained printed slips which purported to have been cut out of American newspapers, advertising for the relatives of the deceased persons. The police are searching for the swindlers. This swindle was carried on some years ago with success upon people in England, but was finally broken up by the police.

THE TAX LEVY.

DISCUSSION OVER THE AMOUNT TO BE ALLOWED FOR A DEFICIENCY.

The Controller, Tax Commissioners, and Committee on Finance of the Board of Aldermen met yesterday afternoon in the City Hall to consider the ordinance providing for the city and county tax levy of 1876. Aldermen John Reilly, Cole, Billings, and Morris of the Committee, Controller Green, and Tax Commissioners Andrews, Wheeler, and Hayward were present. A draft of the proposed report and ordinance was read, in which it was stated that the amount agreed upon by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment in December, 1875, to be raised by tax in 1876, was $30,904,395 64. The total valuation of real and personal estate for 1876, as assessed by the Commissioners of Taxes and Assessments, was $1,111,054,343. The Legislature at its last session increased the amount to be raised by tax by directing the following to be included in the tax levy: $25,000 for expenses of conducting the civil and criminal suits growing out of the frauds against the City and County of New-York, and $10,000 and $25,000 for the payment of certain old claims against the Board of Education. These additional appropriations increase the amount of the levy to $30,964,395 64, to which it was proposed to add the sum of $922,861 to meet the deficiency in the collection of the tax of the present year, a little less than three per cent of the gross amount required for city and county purposes. This would swell the total amount of the tax levy to $31,887,259 64, and fix the rate of taxation at $2 87 on each $100, as against $2 94 last year.

The total amount of the deficiency in the collection of the taxes from 1870 to 1875 inclusive was reported at $6,000,000. The proposition to increase the tax levy by adding nearly a million dollars to provide for expected deficiencies in the collection of the tax led to a discussion between Tax Commissioner Andrews and Controller Green, Mr. Andrews contending that it was unwise to impose the full amount permitted by the law, three per cent on the gross sum, and that a much smaller amount would be sufficient. Mr. Andrews also said that while there was a loss caused by the rebate of interest to prompt tax-payers, it was offset by the penalty imposed on the delinquents. Moreover a surplus remained of the appropriations for certain departments. Controller Green replied that the deficiency in the collection of the tax must be provided for by bonds, or tax, or be put on next year's levy. The experience of the past had shown that 3 per cent was not too much. It was wiser to meet the case directly and provide for it in the present levy. The Controller then stated that the additional amounts authorized by the Legislature would have to be approved by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment before action could be taken by the Supervisors.

The Committee then adjourned until Friday.

CASTLE GARDEN'S FUTURE USE.

HEARING BEFORE A COMMITTEE OF THE ALDERMEN.

A meeting of the Committee on Lands and Places of the Board of Aldermen, to which had been referred the resolution of Alderman Morris opposing the rebuilding of Castle Garden at the Battery, or its further use as a depot for immigrants, was held yesterday afternoon to hear arguments. Messrs. Kauffmann, Lynch, Starr, and Forrest of the Commissioners of Emigration appeared in opposition to the adoption of the resolution.

Commissioner Lynch said that Ward's Island, which was suggested in the resolution as a suitable place for receiving the immigrants, was too far away, as the time required to take them from the Battery to the island would be a serious loss to the immigrants, and the extra expense for transportation would prove considerable. Moreover, the foreigners passing through this port to the West would have no opportunity of visiting the city, as at present, which could not fail to result in serious loss to the merchants of New-York. Ward's Island he thought better adapted to hospital purposes, to which it was now principally devoted. Castle Garden was not so seriously damaged as has been intimated, and the work of reparation should be done at once. The roof of the rotunda and the baggage shed were about all that had been destroyed; the hospital, waiting room, labor bureau, &c., were in good condition. The business of the Commission had experienced some inconvenience, but the work had not been interrupted; the lease had not been canceled, and the burned portion should be rebuilt at once. Mr. Lynch added that the elevated railroad had recently taken possession of the Battery ground, and if Castle Garden was to be abolished as an immigrant landing place, he would venture the prediction that in a very short time it would be a freight depot—another St. John's Park. Whether or not this private corporation was worth more to the city than the immigrants arriving annually was a question to be decided.

Peter Bick appeared in behalf of the property-owners opposed to the removal of the immigrant depot from Castle Garden, after which the Committee adjourned to Wednesday next.

TAKING EVIDENCE ON ARMORY CLAIMS.

At a meeting of the Armory Commissioners—the Mayor, Controller, and Tax Commissioner Andrews—held yesterday at the Controller's office, the claim of Robert T. Ford for the rent of the armory at Broadway and Forty-fourth-st. was presented by Thomas E. Stewart, counsel for the claimant. The claim is for rent from Feb. 1, 1874, to May 1, 1876, at the rate of $24,000 per annum, in addition to which the city is asked to pay the tax during the past four years, amounting to nearly $24,000. Mr. Ford testified that he had made a lease of the armory to Peter Gilsey, then Chairman of the Armory Committee of the Board of Aldermen, at the rate mentioned. The premises had been occupied since Jan. 1, 1871, by the 12th Regiment, N. G., the Washington Gray Troops, the Separate Troop of Cavalry, and Battery K. The rental of the first floor during the past three years has been about $17,500 per annum. The further hearing of the case was postponed to Friday, at 11 a. m.

Wm. D. F. Manice presented the claim of himself and Edward Manice for the rent of the armory at present occupied by the 71st Regiment, at Broadway and Thirty-fifth-st. The claim is for one quarter year's rent in 1873, one quarter in 1874, and for the occupancy of the building without lease from May 1, 1874, to May 1, 1876, making a total of $54,500. Col. Richard Vose of the 71st Regiment testified that, in his opinion, it was the best location for an armory in the city. E. H. Ludlow, the real estate agent, testified that $25,000 per annum (the rent paid up to May 1, 1874) was not an excessive rent before the panic. The first year after the panic the rent should have been $4,000 to $5,000 less, and a further reduction of from $1,000 to $2,000 should have been made for the Spring of 1875. The present rent of $12,000 per annum, in his opinion, was very reasonable. The rent for a second floor, he said, ought to be about one-third less than for the first floor and basement, while the third floor was not worth over one-half as much as the first, and during the past four or five years it had been difficult to realize this relative amount.

The Commissioners have decided that the bases of all evidence submitted to them shall be: (1) The ownership of the premises; (2) the occupancy of the same during the time for which rent is claimed, and (3) the legal character of the occupants, showing whether or not they belonged to the regular organizations of the State of New-York.

THE MARKET FOR WATERMELONS.

For three days the watermelon market has been dull, and fears are entertained by the speculators that they will only get a trifle more than the first cost of the fruit. This stagnation is due to the arrival of many vessels loaded with melons from North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland, flooding the market. Yesterday prime melons were bringing $15 to $25 per hundred, and "cullings" were sold for $8 and $10 per hundred. Hucksters cried melons of fair quality for 10 and 12 cents apiece, and many poor people availed themselves of the fall in prices and had a sort of picnic feast. The first melons which are brought to this market come from Georgia, and sell at prices ranging as high as $80 and $100 per hundred. As the season advances they are brought from North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland, when the prices fall to $20 and $40 per hundred. The season for the first cuttings is about closing, and the second cuttings will begin to come in about next week, and so continue until the middle of September, when a few of the third cuttings will come into market. The first cuttings are those which are cut from the vine nearest the stem, while those which are to be the second cutting are about the size of an egg and the third cuttings are in blossom.

The melons of this year are said to be superior in flavor to the general average, owing to the dry season, which, however, has prevented them from attaining more than a medium size. It is claimed that of a cargo of 10,000 not more than 200 will be found specked. It is estimated that between 300,000 and 400,000 melons are brought to this market every season by the speculators, of whom the chief is Joseph Monyea of Washington Market, who disposes of over one-third of the total quantity. A number of persons who are engaged in business distinct from that of fruit have chartered schooners and brought cargoes of watermelons here, and claim to have made considerably more than their expenses.

VALUABLE STOLEN PROPERTY RECOVERED.

In looking after the effects of William Peyton Jones, the notorious burglar, who escaped from the City Jail of Baltimore, Detectives Field and O'Connor of the District-Attorney's office yesterday morning succeeded in recovering a camel's hair shawl belonging to the wife of James M. Johnson, valued at $850. Among the persons who have called at the Central Office to see whether they could identify any of the stolen property found in Jones's apartments, was Phillip Renzone, whose house, at No. 232 East One-hundred-and-twelfth-st., was robbed on May 29, only a few days after Jones had escaped from the jail, of $600 worth of clothing. Mr. Renzone yesterday morning identified four coats, several pairs of trowsers, and other clothing, as his property. This arrest is considered as being one of the most important that has been made for some time, both in the quantity of goods that has been recovered, and the valuable set of burglars' tools that has been captured. Jones is on his way to Baltimore Jail.

At the Tombs Police Court yesterday, Mary Ann Jones was brought up on a charge made by Detectives Field and O'Connor, for having in her possession one pair of gold earrings, set with diamonds, of the value of $257, stolen from the residence of August Seligman, of No. 412 East Fifty-seventh-st., on June 20, during a burglary alleged to have been committed by her husband, when property consisting chiefly of jewelry of the value of $1,500 was stolen. Bail on this charge was placed at $5,000. A similar charge was preferred against the accused woman of having in her possession the clothing identified by Mr. Renzone. The bail in this case was placed at $1,000.

NEW-YORK SAVINGS BANKS.

LAST OF THE LIST OF JULY REPORTS—A COMPARATIVE TABLE OF GENERAL RESULTS.

[FROM A REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.]

ALBANY, Aug. 2.—The accompanying savings bank reports conclude the list of banks in New-York City. They are accompanied by a comparative table showing the important features in the aggregate of the present report and of that of January last. In making a comparison between the two it must be remembered that the Security and the Mechanics' and Traders' Banks have both failed since January, and that their resources, liabilities, and open accounts do not appear in the July statements. These alone represented in amounts due depositors $2,351,000, and over 6,000 depositors; so that the apparent falling off in the amount due depositors may be accounted for by these failures alone, while the number of depositors or open accounts, it will be seen, has increased 22,144, notwithstanding the "wiping out" of so large a number by the failures. These are the crucial tests for determining the progress of thrift among the classes who deposit in savings banks. Considering the universal depression of business, the indications are exceedingly encouraging. In other particulars it will be seen that the amount on deposit in other banks, or in other words, the money for which the savings banks are unable to find investments, has been reduced $863,764, while the total resources have increased $1,955,228, and the surplus, $2,559,110. The following are the reports:

BOWERY SAVINGS BANK.

Resources.

Bonds and mortgages		$5,276,208 00
Stock investments		26,212,295 50
U. S. bonds	$16,224,163 75	
N. Y. State	1,000,400 00	
Other States	2,314,692 25	
Cities in this State	6,356,069 50	
Counties, this State	235,000 00	
Towns in this State	82,000 00	
Amount loaned		576,190 00
Banking house and lot		309,929 81
Other real estate		49,499 62
Cash in other banks		605,326 19
Cash on hand		772,234 82
Interest		392,323 54
Total		$34,145,027 51

Liabilities.

Amount due depositors		$28,561,847 94
Excess of assets		5,583,179 58
Open accounts, 57,966.		
The January statement shows:		
Due depositors		$28,193,129 73
Surplus		4,594,818 28
Open accounts, 55,527.		

GERMAN SAVINGS BANK.

Resources.

Bonds and mortgages		$4,765,500 00
Stock investments		5,442,120 20
U. S. bonds	$1,890,721 20	
N. Y. State	103,000 00	
Other States	509,200 00	
Cities in this State	2,075,769 00	
Counties in this State	853,399 00	
Amount loaned		1,135,000 00
Banking house and lot		597,156 79
Other real estate		76,016 42
Cash in other banks		1,176,196 64
Cash on hand		306,433 45
Interest		225,173 86
Total		$13,693,533 27

Liabilities.

Amount due depositors		$12,669,118 04
Excess of assets		1,024,455 23
Open accounts, 25,815.		
The January statement shows:		
Due depositors		$13,251,933 72
Surplus		925,070 99
Open accounts, 25,472.		

TEUTONIA SAVINGS BANK.

Resources.

Bonds and mortgages		$778,220 00
Stock investments		724,783 68
Other States than N. Y.	$70,000 00	
Cities in this State	281,492 11	
Towns in this State	373,291 57	
Amount loaned		1,295 00
Banking house and lot		65,141 20
Other real estate		22,581 71
Cash in other banks		103,026 49
Cash on hand		14,614 28
Interest		22,282 67
Furniture		5,466 93
Total		$1,799,307 53

Liabilities.

Amount due depositors		$1,792,191 08
Excess of assets		67,146 45
Open accounts, 5,977.		
The January statement shows:		
Due depositors		$1,862,327 85
Surplus		45,030 46
Open accounts, 6,161.		

TRADES SAVINGS BANK.

Resources.

Bonds and mortgages		$55,375 00
Stock investments (cities in this State)		7,000 00
Amount loaned		11,250 00
Cash in other banks		10,081 25
Cash on hand		8,229 13
Other assets		228 32
Interest		2,973 63
Furniture		2,000 00
Total		$97,208 63

Liabilities.

Amount due depositors		$94,913 06
Excess of assets		2,294 97
Open accounts, 842.		
The January statement shows:		
Due depositors		$120,323 15
Surplus		1,469 58
Open accounts, 839.		

YORKVILLE SAVINGS BANK.

Resources.

Bonds and mortgages		$8,500 00
Stock investments (cities in this State)		6,702 50
Cash in other banks		127 55
Cash on hand		3,960 72
Interest		211 24
Furniture		2,500 00
Total		$21,005 01

Liabilities.

Amount due depositors		$20,161 19
Excess of assets		843 82
Open accounts, 213.		
The January statement shows:		
Due depositors		$24,641 25
Surplus		2,936 40
Open accounts, 228.		

METROPOLITAN SAVINGS BANK.

Resources.

Bonds and mortgages		$2,305,617 00
Stock investments		3,412,405 25
U. S. bonds	$1,875,500 00	
Cities of this State	1,419,755 25	
Towns of this State	117,150 00	
Amount loaned		184,100 00
Banking house and lot		213,334 75
Other real estate		85,350 00
Cash in other banks		419,953 02
Cash on hand		91,532 58
Interest		48,555 45
Total		$6,873,481 05

Liabilities.

Amount due depositors		$6,397,347 48
Excess of assets		476,133 57
Open accounts, 8,966.		
The January statement shows:		
Due depositors		$6,522,675 50
Surplus		455,129 36
Open accounts, 9,871.		

WEST SIDE SAVINGS BANK.

Resources.

Bonds and mortgages		$86,500 00
Stock investments		134,855 00
Cities of this state	$110,855 00	
Counties of this state	24,000 00	
Real estate		41,295 45
Cash in other banks		3,033 75
Cash on hand		737 81
Interest		2,108 12
Furniture		1,845 42
Total		$270,875 95

Liabilities.

Amount due depositors		$265,823 00
Excess of assets		5,052 95
Open accounts, 2,269.		
The January statement shows:		
Due depositors		$310,871 95
Surplus		2,779 78
Open accounts, 2,288.		

NORTH RIVER SAVINGS BANK.

Resources.

Bonds and mortgages		$393,552 00
Stock investments		346,980 00
Cities in this State	$295,180 00	
Towns in this State	51,500 00	
Amount loaned		3,500 00
Cash in other banks		43,316 17
Cash on hand		6,468 84
Interest		25,203 37
Total		$809,617 38

Liabilities.

Due depositors		$732,826 64
Excess of assets		76,790 74
Open accounts, 4,324.		
The January statement shows:		
Due depositors		$776,486 29
Surplus		55,236 63
Open accounts, 4,407.		

COMPARATIVE TABLE.

The following is a comparative table of the resources and liabilities of the Savings banks of New-York City by the reports of January and July, 1876:

Resources.	January.	July.
Bonds and mortgages	$66,358,877	$62,220,095
Stocks and bonds	*198,913,840	122,862,273
Amount loaned on collateral	3,516,054	2,788,992
Banking houses and lots (not exceeding cost)	3,977,741	3,735,473
Other real estate (not exceeding cost)	947,318	1,361,059
Cash on deposit in other banks and trust companies	9,439,246	8,575,482
Cash on hand	4,161,368	3,036,664
Other assets	9,040,111	2,853,698
Total resources	$295,415,425	$297,370,653
Liabilities.		
Amount due depositors	$184,188,216	$184,058,172
Other liabilities	539,529	65,621
Total liabilities	$184,727,742	$184,123,793
Surplus	20,687,683	23,246,793
Open accounts	468,652	490,796

*The stocks and bonds are given at their cost value in the January report, and at their estimated market value in the July report, the excess of market value being included as "other assets" in the January report, and accounting thereby for the great difference shown in the two reports under that head.

EXTRADITION.

THE WINSLOW CASE.

THE ENGLISH POSITION SUSTAINED BY THE AMERICAN LAW REVIEW—THE PRISONER MUST BE TRIED FOR THE CRIME FOR WHICH HIS SURRENDER WAS ASKED.

The current number of *The American Law Review* opens with an article on the Winslow case, in which the English view is upheld and the logic of Secretary Fish and nearly all the American journals, and, indeed, of some of the English newspapers, is condemned. The writer of the article holds "it to be clear, on grounds of reason and authority, that a person surrendered by one sovereign to another, under a treaty of extradition, is to be tried for that crime, and that only, for which his surrender was asked and obtained." The question at issue is so important, and the article itself so clear, that liberal extracts are taken from it.

The controversy that arose so suddenly, and has been carried on some months so industriously between the United States and England, touching the extradition of two forgers, discusses an interesting question of international law, concerning which the only wonder is that it was not settled long ago, and that it takes so much writing to set it at rest now. The question is a simple one; the answer, to an ordinary mind, seems equally so; and the writers on the general subject have expressed but one opinion upon it, so far as they have expressed any. It is, whether a person, surrendered by one government to another upon charge and proof of the commission of a certain crime, can lawfully, and against the objection of the surrendering government, be tried for a different crime committed before his surrender. That he cannot seems at once the dictate of common sense and of ordinary justice; and so are the authorities. * * *

THE PRINCIPLE AT STAKE.

We hold it to be clear, on grounds of reason and authority, that a person surrendered by one sovereign to another, under a treaty of extradition, is to be tried for that crime, and that only, for which his surrender was asked and obtained. It is remarkable that not a word upon this subject is to be found in the works of any of the principal writers in the English language who have treated of international law, public or private. Wheaton and his commentators, Kent, Story, Phillimore, Wharton, Westlake, will be searched in vain for any utterance upon the point. Even Clarke, whose valuable book on Extradition is to our lawyers the principal source of information upon the subject, gives no opinion of his own, though he explains the practice of some countries and the decisions of some courts. The writers of Continental Europe are of one accord in support of the view which we maintain.

Let us examine for a moment the reason of the rule. Extradition, from being a matter of courtesy between princes, used almost wholly for the confusion of rebels and traitors, has become an important police regulation, never now applied to political offenses, but, on the other hand, extended to a great variety of ordinary crimes. The one change is due to the mutations of dynasties since 1789, which have brought home to many ruling powers a sense of the convenience of an asylum; and the other, to the vastly increased intercourse between countries even the most widely separated. It may be said, in general, that the exceptions to extradition, besides mere minor offenses not worth the trouble and expense of employing international machinery for their punishment, are of those crimes upon which the laws or sentiments of the contracting nations are not in accord, such as political and ecclesiastical offenses, game laws and revenue laws. There is one other class, that of crimes committed by soldiers and sailors in service, such as desertion, which are rarely included in treaties, for the reason, perhaps, that although all nations agree in punishing them with great severity, yet all feel that this punishment ought to be applied promptly, and, as it were, at the drum-head, or not at all.

Now, the reason, as Mr. Gibbs intimates, why a person is not to be tried for an offense for which he was not surrendered is, that in no other way can the right of asylum for these excepted crimes be maintained. If a man given up for embezzlement can be hung for treason, or be transported for shooting a rabbit, what becomes of the asylum? It has been said that the question is only one of good faith in asking the surrender. No doubt, if a case shows the absence of honesty from the beginning, the whole world would cry shame upon the Government which has been guilty of such fraud. But this is a very inadequate view of the subject. Good faith is not asylum. It is no consolation to a man who is about to be hung for treason, that the Government honestly suspected him of having embezzled five dollars; nor is it an answer to the foreign Government whose asylum has proved nugatory. The question is one of right, not of good intentions in a collateral matter. Besides, good faith in this connection means the good faith of Detective Bucket or Vidocq, a substance as evanescent as the domicile of a fugitive criminal.

AMERICAN LOGIC.

Such being the reason and the opinions of writers of the highest consideration, let us see what is brought to meet them. It appears that in France, where this important principle was first enunciated, the courts acted upon it for a quarter of a century. In 1867 another circular from the Minister of Justice, who now represented an emperor, and no longer a citizen king, admonished the judges that this was a political matter, and that all courts could do was to postpone the trial until the Government had been applied to. A criminal could acquire, he said, no right against the justice of his country; the tribunal could only try the facts; it could not take cognizance of the conditions upon which extradition had been granted, except upon a notification from the Minister of Justice. Mr. Clarke thinks the Courts have acquiesced in this view, but the careful reader of his 6th Chapter will find, we think, some reason to doubt his conclusion. It seems to us probable that the highest Court of France has not yet yielded its independence to the dictation of executive authority; the last case mentioned by Mr. Clarke having been carefully decided upon its own circumstances, which were held to take it out of the rule. At any rate, the French have not abrogated the rule, but merely changed the department charged with its execution. This may amount to a practical denial of justice in cases which excite no diplomatic interest, as we shall show; but the principle is still fully admitted in France.

In the few cases that have been decided within the British jurisdiction and that of the United States, the courts, with some difference of opinion, have, on the whole, followed the later French doctrine, putting it precisely on the French ground, and two of these citing the phrase that a criminal cannot acquire any right against the justice of his country. Only two of these cases are reported at length. It is matter of surprise that these cases should be cited as deciding a point of international law, when they most explicitly and unmistakably refuse to consider it. That they do not and cannot, according to the opinion of the courts themselves, touch any such point, is well shown by an early case decided before the Ashburton Treaty was made. * * *

The distribution of powers is such in constitutional countries that the Executive department, however well disposed, cannot impose its will upon the courts. It happens fortunately, in Lawrence's case, that the President can act through the prosecuting officers, Lawrence being charged with crime against the General Government; but in the great majority of instances this would be impossible. Our people have not yet forgotten McLeod's case, which threatened at one time to bring on a war with England on a similar question. Nor is it to be overlooked that we are so accustomed, in the United States and in England, to defer to the opinion of the courts, that we are in danger of mistaking a refusal by them to decide such a question for a decision of it, of which this discussion furnishes a notable example. If, however, the practice of the courts has become inveterate, which we are not willing to admit, it is essential that the older treaties should be speedily changed, so as to contain full covenants on this subject, which many of our late treaties, such as that with Italy, do contain. So established, our courts must take notice of them. If murder and forgery and other crimes, for which we are ready to ask and to grant surrender, are to be committed by wholesale, as some late occurrences seem to indicate as probable, there is no objection to providing that any crime within the scope of the treaty may be tried, though not specially noticed in the demand; but this is as much as any Government ought to ask or to yield. If treaties are not made, statutes should be passed to give the courts the necessary powers.

England became uneasy on this matter in 1870, and passed a statute forbidding the Government to surrender a criminal until assured by the demanding Government that he would be tried only for the crime proved against him at the time of the demand; and requiring their own courts to observe similar restrictions. This law was, in its essence, declaratory only of that which already obtained; but, so far as it required an arrangement with foreign governments beyond what existing treaties called for, it could, of course, have no effect; and there is a somewhat obscurely expressed clause in the statute which appears intended to except them from its operation. At all events, the Government of Great Britain made no attempt to apply it to the Ashburton Treaty until the extradition of Winslow was asked for; and thereupon arose the controversy which we hope will be settled to the satisfaction of both parties before these pages are read.

THE LAWRENCE CASE.

The case of Winslow is inextricably bound up with that of Lawrence, which is the *fons et origo* of the bitter waters of this dispute. Lawrence is a person who calls himself an Englishman—we know not with what truth—and who had lived a long time in New-York. He was accused of having defrauded the revenue to an immense extent, and fled to England. Our Government produced in England evidence that he had forged 12 or 13 bonds and other papers, forgery being one of the few crimes within our somewhat old-fashioned treaty. By some mistake of our agents in London, the warrant for Lawrence's extradition mentioned the forgery of only one bond and affidavit. Soon after the prisoner reached this country he was indicted for his frauds, and petitioned the President that he might be tried for the forgery specified in the warrant, and for nothing more. Mr. Bliss, the Attorney of the United States for the southern District of New-York, where the indictments were found, furnished a brief of the cases we have above mentioned, and contended that they warranted the Government in trying him for other crimes, though, as we have seen, they have no relation to Executive action. The Attorney-General, having been of counsel in the case, took no part in deciding this point; but it seems by Mr. Fish's dispatch that the Solicitor-General agreed with Mr. Bliss. The President, with admirable good sense, sent orders to have Lawrence tried for the crime mentioned in the warrant, and for no other. Thereupon he was arraigned for that offense, as the District-Attorney understood it; but, taking advantage of some real or supposed ambiguity in the indictment, he pleaded that it set forth a different offense; and the Government, instead of taking issue upon the fact, demurred. Judge Benedict reiterated the rule laid down by him in 1871, and, as we understand, for the same reason—that it was inconvenient and improper for the courts to pass upon the question. Within a short time now passed, Lawrence has pleaded guilty to this indictment, admitting, we believe, that it is for the forgery mentioned in the original warrant. To the outside world it looks as if this plea were part of an arrangement that is to settle all pending cases, including the surrender of Winslow. If so, all's well that ends well.

In the mean time, months had passed since Lawrence was sent to the United States, and he was still awaiting trial; and the rumors filled the newspapers that he was to be tried for all his frauds upon our revenue, whether forgeries or not. And there was abundant foundation for such a report, though, happily, it was untrue. The British Government, instead of making Lawrence's case the subject of direct complaint, took the opportunity of our demand for Winslow, whose offenses could not possibly be misunderstood or substantially varied in any event, to require of us a conformity with their law of 1870, with which we had no concern, by requiring an assurance that Winslow should only be tried for the forgery or forgeries specified in our demand. They merely referred to Lawrence's case to account for their present action. Our Government had a ready answer to the Lawrence allusion, but they did not choose to avail themselves of it, and took the broad ground, which we have ventured to call that of criminal rather than of international law, that, when we hold a man, it is of no concern to any one how we obtained him. As part of a diplomatic discussion, we have no criticism to make upon this reply; but we repeat that, whatever may be the rights of the party, the surrendering nation has a right to require that its treaty shall not be used for such a purpose in good or bad faith. When this right is finally abandoned, the end of all extradition treaties can be confidently predicted. The United States, above all other nations, perhaps—certainly above all but England—is interested to maintain the right of asylum inviolate; and we are sure that it will not fail of its high duty in this regard.

BELKNAP'S ESCAPE.

PRESS COMMENTS ON THE DECISION.

The acquittal of Gen. Belknap will prove a great disappointment, although it will occasion no surprise. The acquittal of this man will prove a gain only to himself, while in some respects it will be hurtful to good government and pure administration. If 22 Senators had not had greater regard for their own opinion upon a question of jurisdiction which few of them are capable of understanding than for the principles of justice, the decision would have been the reverse of what it is. It was a vote to let a guilty man escape, and, construe it as we may, we can make nothing else out of it. The people will look upon these proceedings with shame, and an indelible reproach will attach to the national honor and the good name of the United States.—[New-York Herald (Ind.)

The result of the impeachment trial is described as Belknap's escape; but it is such an escape as no man of the slightest sensibility would care to accomplish. He went out of the Senate Chamber yesterday a morally convicted man, with a brand upon him which shuts him out from public confidence, and so in effect disqualifies him.—[N. Y. Evening Post (Rep.)

The judgment of the Senate was really upon the jurisdiction rather than upon the guilt of Belknap. We are inclined and glad to think that politics did not enter to any great extent into the decision. The issue was of no great political importance, and affected partisan hopes, fears, or prejudices very little. There can be no doubt about Belknap's guilt, and the damage done by his career to the Republican party is beyond being affected by the result of his trial.—[New-York World (Dem.)

The verdict in the Belknap impeachment case was in accord with public expectations. Thus ends a trial that ought never to have begun. It has been a disgraceful exhibition of partisan feeling, and of infirmities that should have been concealed rather than exposed to public view. The offense was at the most comparatively petty, and should have been left to the courts, where it properly belongs.—[N. Y. Graphic (Rep.)

The trial was not, as some of our cotemporaries believe, a useless proceeding. On the contrary, it was one of the most important events that has recently come to pass. It has decided a vexed question, has put at rest one that might have been very disturbing at some future time. It was necessary to formally put this question at rest.—[N. Y. Commercial Advertiser (Rep.)

While he was acquitted upon a mere technicality, the fact of his guilt is very clearly established, and the man who so short a time since enjoyed the love and respect of the American people is to-day as effectually disgraced and dishonored as though the Senate had pronounced him guilty.—[N. Y. Evening Mail (Rep.)

What shall be said of a court that goes out of its way to place a stigma of reproach upon a high-minded, pure man (President Johnson) for an alleged technical violation of law, not judicially proven, and allow a self-convicted felon to pass unbranded.—[N. Y. Express (Dem.)

The real merits of the case have not been passed upon at all by the Senate. Such a vote is an absurdity, but it is only one of several absurdities in the proceedings of this trial. It was, in fact, engaged for some weeks in trying a private citizen upon whom it could not pass judgment. The whole thing was an absurdity.—[Boston Globe (Ind.)

It would be well if he and his case could slip quietly out of the public mind, for he is not worthy of the attention he is likely to receive at the hands of the Criminal Court at Washington, where he has been indicted and must in future stand his trial.—[Philadelphia Inquirer (Rep.)

It is merely a protest against the perversion of the impeachment process from its constitutional function of ousting unfaithful officials from their places, to the minor business of punishing private citizens for offenses committed while previously in office.—[Philadelphia Press (Rep.)

He is as dead, politically, as though the Senate's verdict had been unanimously guilty. Perhaps the trial has been useful. It has helped to ventilate the corruptions of the times and to show the need of reform.—[Boston Herald (Ind.)

Mr. Belknap has secured a technical acquittal. Anything more than that no tribunal on earth could give him. For the sake of the national character and the security of public morals it is unfortunate that the record will not show that a deliberate offender against both received his just deserts.—[Boston Advertiser (Rep.)

Judge Black was right. He knew the Senate and the accepted standard of political integrity better than we supposed, when he demanded the acquittal of Belknap because he had done, in a small way, what greater than he did in a great way.—[Philadelphia Times (Ind.)

Probably the ex-Secretary's best friend would hesitate to congratulate him upon such an escape as this. But the fact that he, a high dignitary of the Republican administration, notoriously guilty of scandalous offenses, escapes formal condemnation by Republican votes, gives the Republican party so much additional load to carry through a doubtful canvass, in which they were already dangerously weighted.—[Springfield Republican (Ind.)

Belknap is acquitted, but the acquittal brings no honor to the Republican party. Can any one tell us the value of the words, "Let no guilty man escape?"—[Newark Register (Dem.)

It will be well for those who are swift to find comfort in the punishability of Belknap by the civil courts, not to run before they think. The point to be raised will be, of course, whether Belknap's liability under the criminal statute on which he is still indicted can be avoided by the common law rule of a single jeopardy. Washington courts only want a pretext on which to clear Belknap and remove him from observation in this sharp political year.—[Brooklyn Eagle (Dem.)

The case is an extreme illustration of what partisan bitterness may accomplish through the means of *ex parte* and hearsay testimony, extracted through the Star Chamber process. A happy family has been thrown into the deepest sorrow and humiliation and an honorable officer deposed from high official position for the gratification of the personal spite of an envious woman and the insane and diabolical desire to make political capital.—[National Republican (Wash. Adm. organ).

This result is not greatly to be regretted if the judicial officers of the District of Columbia will now do their duty promptly. Belknap's conviction on an indictment will reach quite as far as impeachment by the Senate. The case establishes a precedent under which the country will not be the sufferer. The whole spirit and intent of the impeachment clause was misinterpreted in this proceeding.—[Utica Herald (Rep.)

DEFRAUDING A GAS COMPANY.

The Mutual Gaslight Company, it is alleged, has been systematically defrauded by some of the clerks in its employ, who have collected money belonging to that corporation and appropriated it to their own use. When given statements to serve upon householders who were in arrears for gas, with directions either to collect the money or disconnect the meters, these clerks in several cases, it is asserted, have been paid the sums due, and instead of turning them over to the Company put the money in their pockets and reported that the meters had been disconnected. Complaints from persons who had paid multiplied to such an extent that the Company determined to make an example of the first person who should be detected. Detective Reilly discovered that the chief person was a young man named James O'Brien, who having been paid $10 by Mr. Scott of No. 185 Hudson-st., appropriated it to his own use. The young man was arrested yesterday upon complaint of Richard Earle, the bookkeeper of the Company, who expresses the opinion that a large sum of money has been misappropriated in the manner indicated. O'Brien was taken to the Tombs, and remanded until to-day for examination.

ARMY ORDERS.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2.—Lieut.-Col. H. C. Merriam, 2d Infantry, is ordered to join the detachment of his regiment at Mount Vernon Barracks, Alabama. Major D. P. Hancock, 2d Infantry, is relieved from his present command by Lieut.-Col. H. C. Merriam, and will proceed to Atlanta, Ga., for duty. The following transfers, by order of the President, of Second Lieutenants to the 2d Cavalry are announced: W. J. Robertson, 3d Cavalry; C. B. Scofield, 7th Cavalry; J. F. Chase, 3d Cavalry; J. W. Wilkinson, 5th Cavalry; E. B. Fuller, 8th Cavalry; J. O. Eaton, 5th Cavalry; J. C. Gresham, 3d Cavalry; H. L. Scott, 9th Cavalry; L. S. McCormick, 10th Cavalry; A. J. Russell, 10th Cavalry.

The following officers are relieved from duty at West Point, Aug. 31: Capt. A. M. Miller, Corps of Engineers; First Lieutenants S. M. Mills, 5th Artillery; J. F. Stretch, 10th Infantry; S. Pratt, 3d Artillery; J. M. K. Davis, 1st Artillery; T. H. Barber, 1st Artillery; Frank Heath, Ordnance Department; Second Lieutenant H. G. Harris, 1st Artillery. The Artillery and Infantry officers relieved will join their commands. The Engineer officers will report by letter to the Chief of Engineers, and Lieut. Heath to the Chief of Ordnance. The following officers will report in person on the 28th of August to the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point: In the Department of Mathematics—Second Lieutenant S. E. Blunt, Ordnance Department; Second Lieutenant T. N. Bailey, Corps of Engineers. In Department of Engineering—First Lieutenant C. E. Sears and Second Lieutenant W. T. Russell, Corps of Engineers. In Department of Drawing—First Lieutenant H. A. Reed, 2d Artillery and Second Lieutenant T. G. Townsend, 6th Infantry. In the Department of Tactics—First Lieutenant L. H. Walker, 15th Infantry and Second Lieutenant Ira McNutt, 3d Artillery. In the Department of French—Second Lieutenants W. H. Coffin, 5th Artillery and J. H. Dorst, 4th Cavalry. In the Department of Spanish—Second Lieutenant V. H. Goddard, 4th Artillery. In the Department of Law—Second Lieutenant R. A. Ives, 5th Artillery.

By order of the President, Second Lieutenant R. A. Ives is relieved from duty as Professor of Military Science and Tactics at the Western University, Pittsburgh, Penn. First Lieutenant J. P. Story, 4th Artillery, is relieved from duty at the Artillery School, Fortress Monroe, Va., and will report to the Chief Signal Officer of the army for duty.

A hundred years ago when you called on a girl she kissed you good by. Now if you suggest anything of the sort her father calls you into the library and asks you what you are worth. Are we a nation? And is this progress?—[Norwich Bulletin.

THE COURTS.

TRIBUTES TO JUDGE MONELL.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE COURTS—WORDS OF EULOGY FROM BENCH AND BAR.

The various branches of the State courts were formally opened yesterday, but immediately adjourned without transacting any business upon the announcement of the death of Chief-Justice Monell of the Superior Court. Brief addresses were made by several members of the Bar in the different courts, but no formal eulogies will be paid until the meeting of the Bar on Tuesday next at noon, in Trial Term, Part I., of the Superior Court.

In the Superior Court, Special Term, Judge Sedgwick presiding, James C. Carter said: "May it please your Honor, the intelligence we have all received of the death of the learned Chief-Justice of this Court renders it apparently unfit in your own estimation as well as that of the members of the Bar that any business should be proceeded with in this court to-day. The loss of Chief-Justice Monell will be very deeply felt. Falling as he has in the full maturity of his powers, in the midst of his usefulness, with great wealth of judicial experience, and with the prospect—for there was a prospect of still many years of usefulness before him—his loss will be regretted as a public calamity. He enjoyed the absolute confidence of your Honor and of the members of the Bar and in a high degree of the public. This blow has not been altogether unexpected. Your Honor will recall—some of us at the Bar recollect—the spectacle he exhibited on the bench a few weeks ago, when engaged in the trial of the Elevated Railroad case. It was manifest to us who were engaged in that case that he was struggling under an apprehension that the arm of the destroyer might fall upon him at any moment; but he was animated by a resolution to perform the important duties before him. He refused to adjourn the case, and we were obliged to suggest the convenience of counsel and other reasons to induce him to adjourn it. This is not the occasion to go into a statement of his services or a eulogy of the various merits of his character and conduct, professional and private. A suitable opportunity will doubtless be used by the members of the Bar to give expression to their feelings, and to place in enduring form their sense of his labors and of their high esteem for him as a man, a citizen, and a judge."

Ex-Judge Vanderpoel said: "The tribute we as members of the Bar now ask your Honor to accord to your late associate we know will be cheerfully acceded to by the court. No higher testimonial could be said to Chief-Justice Monell than the fact that he has already been three times elected to the high position of member of this important court, and was selected by his associates for the honorable position of Chief-Justice. His career was one of interest. It was marked by untiring energy, industry, and perseverance, and he brought the same traits on the Bench; and his career I may say has given entire satisfaction, not only to the Bench, but to his constituents."

Judge Sedgwick said: "It is perhaps inappropriate that at this time any expression should be made by the remaining judges of the court of respect or regret for the late Chief-Justice. The occasion will occur hereafter, when a proper tribute will be paid to his memory. But the motion made is proper and should be granted. The business of the court will be suspended until after an opportunity of attending the funeral." The Court was then adjourned until Monday.

In the Supreme Court, Chambers, Algernon S. Sullivan moved an adjournment, which was seconded by ex-Judge Vanderpoel. Judge Westbrook in granting the motion paid a brief tribute to the late Chief-Justice, in which he said he had known him since 1846, and valued his worth as a man, his ability as a judge, and his high character as a citizen.

In the Common Pleas, Special Term, Judge Fullerton moved the adjournment, which was seconded by John McKeon.

In the Marine Court, Chambers, brief remarks on the motion to adjourn were made by Menzo Diefendorf and Robert Sewell. Judge Goepp, in granting the motion, paid a tribute to the character of the dead Chief-Justice.

The Surrogate's Court was adjourned on the motion of Charles H. Glover, seconded by John McKeon and L. A. Lockwood.

The power of appointment to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Judge Monell, until the regular election in November, rests with Gov. Tilden. The name of ex-Judge John J. Freedman was frequently mentioned yesterday about the City Hall and Court-house as the probable choice of the Governor.

TRACING OUT THE PIANO FRAUDS.

THE MANNER IN WHICH THE SWINDLING TRANSACTIONS WERE EXPOSED.

The case of Decker Brothers against Siegmund L. Otto, Marcus A. Decker, and Robert Cashin was closed on July 27 by a perpetual injunction, issued by Judge Van Hoesen, forever restraining the defendants from "selling or disposing of any piano bearing the name of Decker & Brother or Decker & Brothers, or any like name," and from making any use whatever of those names or similar ones. Previous to the issue of this injunction letters were received from Robert C. Cashin and Marcus A. Decker, stating that their answers to the suit of Decker Brothers had been withdrawn, and promising that they would never use the names of Decker & Brother or Decker & Brothers in any future dealings in pianos. In these letters they acknowledged the injury which had been done to the plaintiffs by their transactions, and asked for consideration at their hands. These letters were referred to John D. Townsend, counsel for Decker Brothers, who obtained an injunction, the plaintiff thinking it useless to proceed with the case, as nothing was likely to be gained from a continuance of the suit.

Decker Brothers received another letter signed by Theodore Thomas, Carl Bergmann, S. B. Mills, William Mason, J. H. Bonawitz, Henry J. Andres, E. Marzo, Julia Rivé, and others, stating that they had never used either in public or private any Decker pianos other than those manufactured by Decker Brothers of No. 33 Union-square, New-York, and that to the best of their knowledge and belief this was the only firm bearing the name of Decker who manufactured piano-fortes.

For several weeks past it has been rumored among the detectives at Police Headquarters that Mr. Otto, one of the defendants in the suit, was a detective employed to work up the case, and yesterday a TRIBUNE reporter called upon John D. Townsend, counsel for the plaintiffs, who corroborated the story and made the following statement relative to the manner in which the fraudulent transactions were brought to light:

Now that the case is over and Marcus A. Decker has, by his own testimony and also by his letter, in connection with that of Cashin, shown that they have been engaged in a business detrimental to the interests of my client, I am not unwilling, especially for the purpose of placing Mr. Otto in a proper position, to state what I know in regard to the case. About two months ago Mr. Decker, one of the firm of Decker Brothers, called upon me and stated that for several years bogus pianos had been offered for sale all through the country upon their reputation, and that while not using precisely their firm name, one so nearly resembling it had been employed that the public believed them to be the manufacturers of the spurious pianos, and were swindled. Mr. Decker also stated that for a long time they had endeavored to ferret out the manner in which the business was carried on and the persons conducting it, and he mentioned to me the name of Marcus A. Decker as a person whom they suspected of being implicated. I said that it was a small foundation to start upon, but if they were willing to expend what money was necessary and would give me a little time, I would do my best to discover where the fraud originated. They agreed to leave it entirely in my hands. I sent for Siegmund L. Otto, whom I had known for several years as a man of considerable means, and who had a special fancy for detective work, in which occupation I had always found him efficient. I instructed him to find Marcus A. Decker and in some way make his acquaintance, which in a few days he was enabled to do. This he did, as I understand, by becoming acquainted with a friend of Decker and through this friend with Decker. Mr. Otto was apparently a man desirous of going into the piano business, and this information having reached the ears of Decker a partnership was formed and articles of agreement drawn up between them by which Decker agreed to put the names Decker & Brother and Decker & Brothers on any piano they might purchase. He also agreed to erase the names which were on other pianos and put those names on them, and was to receive $10 for each piano upon which he had placed the name and $15 a week salary. Of course Decker Brothers knew nothing of the manner in which I was to discover these frauds, and it will probably be as amusing to them as to you when they now see it.

Mr. Otto devoted one floor of his house in Bleecker-st. to the business as a salesman, and Decker brought the signs, stencil-plates, circulars, and books which had previously been used in the same business. To discover what manufacturers were willing to sell pianos on which other names were to be put after they had manufactured them, Mr. Otto went with Decker to those places with which the latter had previously had business transactions, as well as to others, and to keep up the appearance of business, bought two pianos at $160 apiece, one of which is now in the hands of Decker Brothers. After Mr. Otto had become familiar with the inside workings of Decker's mode of business, and had obtained all the books, papers, &c., used by the firm, and had satisfied himself of Cashin's connection with Decker, we began proceedings against the whole party. Mr. Otto, of course, put in no answer, but agreed to give us his testimony if we would not proceed against him. After his examination we took Decker's testimony, and it corroborated in every way Otto's statement. Finding that Decker was worth nothing, we concluded, after obtaining the letter from him acknowledging his conduct, that there was nothing to be gained by a further prosecution of the case, and so obtained the injunction.

In answer to an inquiry, Mr. Townsend said: "I think my statement now will inform Marcus A. Decker and Mr. Cashin for the first time that Mr. Otto was not 'the special partner and man of large means' which Mr. Decker in his testimony called him."

THEFT OF STEREOTYPE PLATES.

W. B. Smith of No. 27 Bond-st. reported to Superintendent Walling on July 28, that Peter McLoughlin, a young man employed by him, had stolen, previous to July 26, stereotype plates valued at $1,700. About that date the thief suspected that Mr. Smith had discovered the robbery, and absconded. He was traced to Long Branch, and when arrested agreed to return to this city without awaiting a requisition. He acknowledged the thefts, and gave information that led to the arrest of Patrick McLoughlin of No. 56 Prince-st. on a