FIFTH NATIONAL BANK, No. 330 Third-ave., N. Y.

THIRD DIVIDEND.—The Board of Directors have declared a SEMI-ANNUAL DIVIDEND OF FIVE (5) PER CENT free from Government tax, payable July 2, 1866.
The transfer books will be closed from June 29 to July 2, 1866.
A. THOMPSON, Cashier.

NATIONAL BROADWAY BANK, NEW-YORK, June 20, 1866.

THIRTY-THIRD DIVIDEND.—A semi-annual DIVIDEND of THREE (3) DOLLARS per share, and the Government Tax, will be paid from the profits of the current half year, on and after the 2d day of July ensuing. The transfer books will remain closed to that date. By order of the Board.
J. L. EVERITT, Cashier.

THE NATIONAL CITIZENS' BANK—New-York, June 22, 1866.—A Dividend of FIVE (5) PER CENT, free of Government tax, has been declared, payable on and after the 2d July next. The Transfer Books will remain closed to that date.
W. H. OAKLEY, Cashier.

UNION TRUST COMPANY OF NEW-YORK, No. 73 BROADWAY, June 16, 1866.

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES have declared a DIVIDEND on the Capital Stock of this Company of FOUR PER CENT, free of Government tax, payable on the second day of July next. The Transfer Books will be closed from the 20th inst. until that date.
W. E. ALDRICH, Secretary.

WILLIAMSBURGH SAVINGS BANK, Corner of South Third and Fourth-sts., Brooklyn, L. I.
DIVIDEND NOTICE.—Depositors are hereby notified that a Semi-Annual Dividend at the rate of SIX PER CENT per annum, on all sums of three dollars and upward, that shall have been deposited three months on the 1st day of July next, will be paid to depositors on or after MONDAY, July 16.
FREE FROM GOVERNMENT TAX.
Interest not called for will be passed to the credit of Depositors as principal. Deposits made on or before the 10th day of July, will draw interest from the 1st.
The Bank is open for business daily, (Sundays and holidays excepted,) on Mondays and Saturdays from 9 to 7 o'clock, p. m., and on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays from 10 a. m., until 2 p. m.
GEORGE RICARD, President.
WM. WALL, NATHANIEL BRIGGS, } Vice Presidents.
SAM'L W. THESLOW, Sec.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

INCREASE OF SALARY—THE NEW COURT-HOUSE INVESTIGATION—REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SAME.

The Board met at 1 o'clock yesterday afternoon, the President, HENRY SMITH, esq., in the chair.

By resolution, the salary of Robert C. Hutchings, Assistant District-Attorney, was increased from $2,500 to $3,000 per annum.

The Special Committee of the Board appointed to investigate into the charges of mismanagement in the matter of the construction of the New County Court-House, presented the following report:

The Special Committee of the Board of Supervisors, to whom was referred for investigation the charge that grossly extravagant and improper contracts have been made by the persons directing the erection of the New Court-House, in reference to the purchases of iron, marble and bricks, and in the employment of firms for personal services, which involve the reputation of the board of Supervisors, respectfully

REPORT:

That in view of the gravity of the charge, involving the reputation of private individuals, as well as members of the Board of Supervisors, your Committee determined that a prompt and thorough investigation should be made, to elicit the facts, and to arrive at a true knowledge of the terms and conditions of the contracts for building the New Court-House, and as to whether its erection was managed and conducted with due economy, so as to protect the best interests of the County.

In carrying out this determination, your Committee held 13 sessions, required all the witnesses to be sworn, and permitted no hearsay evidence based either upon public rumor or private suspicion.

Your Committee were strengthened in limiting upon the requirement by the testimony of the Supervisor making the charge.

He stated, that he had not been in the habit of personal knowledge whenever any fraud; that he had never seen the terms of a contract, and knew nothing of it from his own personal knowledge; and that his charge was based upon the communication of Mayor Gunther to the Board of Supervisors in April, 1864, containing letters addressed to the Mayor by three firms in the iron trade; and that having had nothing to do with the marble and brick contracts, his knowledge was no more distinct with regard to them than it was with regard to the iron contracts.

He was then requested to suggest to the Committee the names of such persons as knew anything in regard to these contracts, and from time to time he suggested the names of certain persons who he thought could give the Committee information, all of whom appeared except one.

The Hon. Mayor Gunther subsequently appeared before your Committee, and also admitted that he knew nothing of his own personal knowledge of any wholesale conspiracy or combination directing the erection of the New Court House, or of extravagant prices paid for materials for its construction.

He all he knew about it was from representations made to him by others, that he was induced to write the letters to these firms by the statement of Mr. Reed of the Architectural Iron Works, who gave him the names of the firms to whom he should write.

Your Committee deem it important that these facts should be kept in mind, in order that the Evidence for these charges may be understood, and you what seem to be additional and accumulative charges are in fact only the continued repetition of the statements of an irresponsible person, now dead, and a rival in business of the contractors on the New Court-House.

At the second meeting of your Committee Supervisor Ely was called as a witness at the third he came with Counsel, and conducted the proceedings.

At the session, during the examination of a witness, the prosecution charged that there was collusion in the bids for the iron contracts. The contractors furnishing the iron for the Court-House then asked that they might be represented by counsel, which was granted, and Messrs. A. Cram, esq., subsequently appeared for them and for the Special Committee on New Court-House.

The succeeding sessions of your Committee up to and including the session devoted to the examination of witnesses for the prosecution.

Two sessions were then occupied in the examination of witnesses for the defence, and the closing session was commenced by the summing up of counsel.

The prosecution directed their case principally to impeach the iron contracts, and most of the testimony taken, therefore, was on that point of the work.

No witness who gave was produced to substantiate the charge of collusion among the bidders, and in fact the witnesses for the prosecution disclosed it.

A brief yet comprehensive statement of the facts elicited upon this branch of the inquiry by your Committee, as to the iron contract, may be stated as follows:

That Mr. Kellum, the architect, was directed to invite proposals for iron work in the Court-House, and to receive bids for the work, which he opened several times, was put in bids in September, 1863, and that the contract was awarded to the lowest bidder.

The award of contract was made as follows: The bids were submitted to the Board of Supervisors for action September 23, 1863, and the Board then authorized the Special Committee to contract with A. B. & W. W. Cornell & Co. for the iron, they being the lowest bidders—every member of the Board being present, and voting in the affirmative. The Special Committee subsequently, on the 12th of November, presented a report to the Board of Supervisors, embodying the form of contract, which was approved by the Board.

Two days in the intervening time between September 23 and November 12, that, before the contract was signed, some objections were raised, on the ground that the parties to be paid were the members of the firm of contractors, Messrs. Cornell & Co. There was no excitement or public clamor against it.

That the bids from the contract was first made by Mr. Reed, of the Architectural Iron Works, in the Spring of 1863, nearly six months after its approval, when Mayor Gunther influenced by the representations of Mr. Reed, wrote to the firms from whom Mr. Reed was furnished by Mr. Reed, to ascertain what iron was worth at the time the contract was made for building the Court House, and transmitted to the Board of Supervisors a communication on the subject, April 4, 1864.

That the communications of the firms were made without seeing the work. A number of one of them testified that they made their offer to the building and based at the iron work that was done, and had no conversation with the architect, and made their estimate as near as they could from what they could see. (Int. No.—.)

These firms admitted that the manner in which they made up their estimates for Mayor Gunther were contrary to their usual custom, and were not a safe or correct way to make an estimate.

Their estimates were based upon the prices of labor and materials in September, 1863, without taking into consideration the advance in prices. (Int. No. —.)

That, not having the plans, they had no idea of the aggregate amount of iron that would be put on the building, or the aggregate field of the contract. (Int. No. —.)

That they knew when they made the estimate they could not receive the work, and that their figures were to be used by Mr. Reed to assist the contract.

And that, had they taken the work at the prices their estimates, they would have lost heavily, one of them testifying that his bids would have lost on every item, although on some items its estimate was as high as the contract price.

That none of these firms had never furnished the iron for any large or important building in this city. (Int. No. —.)

That another of these firms had furnished the iron for the dome of the Capitol at Washington, on a contract, at seven (7) cents per lb., and that it now has a claim before Congress for an extra allowance of seven (7) cents additional per pound, supported by proof that the work has cost them this sum, without any margin for profit. (Int. No.—.)

That the Architectural Iron Works (of which Mr. Reed was the Treasurer, and who originated the attack upon the iron contract of the New Court-House) has supplied the iron for the Kings County Court-House, and that it has made a claim for an extra allowance of fifty cents per cent similarly supported, and covering cost only.

The senior partner of one of these firms was one of a committee which fixed a price of twenty-one and one-half (21½) cents a pound for the wrought iron work on the Harlem Bridge, nearly double the cost to the contractor on the New Court-House.

It was also in evidence that a person neither an architect nor a builder, of any reputable without seeing the plans might get out of the way of any reasonable without seeing the plans might get out of the way of bids to one hundred per cent. (Int. No.—.)

That there was no competition in the market at the time the contract was made. That contracts for large quantities of iron for future delivery could not be obtained, and that no same firm for the trade could or would have placed estimates for a work of the magnitude of the Court-House, and covering the range of the iron to build, at the current prices of labor and materials in September, 1863.

This will be clearly apparent by the following extract from the testimony of Mr. George H. Jackson, one of the bidders for the iron work:

"Interrogatory 120.—Was your bid based upon the market price of iron at the time it was made? No.

"Supplementary Int.—Upon what was it based? I added the market low long a period it would be to the time the contract would be done. This was a little if not the first contract of the kind in the iron market about that time. I had advised from the other side that there would be a more durable rise in iron, and the market was in an unsettled state. I wished to know when the work would be done, and he told me it would probably take a period of two years. Upon the state of the trade and the prospect I made my bid.

Mr. Green, another of the bidders, testified (Int. 136) that he based his estimate upon an advance of forty per cent, and that if he had advanced less than one-half he would not have made greater—not one than one-half advance.

That about two months after the contract was made, the prices of labor and materials for iron trade began to advance, and continued to do so through the year 1864.

That the rise in prices commenced in 1861. From September, 1861, to September, 1863, the advance was sixty per cent; up to January, 1864, about one per cent; and to July, 1864, the advance was two hundred and eighty-two and a half. (Int. No.—.)

There was not a difference in cutting orders dated at a fixed price. Neither the manufacturers nor dealers would sell for future delivery, except at market prices at the time of the delivery.

That pig iron alone had advanced in price to September, 1863, about fifty per cent., and by July, 1864, went up to two hundred and fifty per cent. (Int. No. —.)

That the price of labor also steadily advanced with the rise in the price of materials, until twice about that date.

That the contractors for the iron work for the New Court-House are men of high personal integrity and social position, and have formerly, during the last four years, the iron work for the new buildings of the Board of Brokers, Mutual Life Insurance Company, A. T. Stewart, Claflin & Mellin, and for other large edifices, or public buildings, amounting to forty per cent higher than those bids of the County, and in the aggregate amounting to several millions. (Int. No.—.)

Your Committee have thus stated the facts in this case, that the Board of Supervisors may be thoroughly acquainted with the line of evidence produced before them.

Your Committee do not deem it necessary to comment at length upon these facts.

The charge as to the iron contract not only was not substantiated, but the witnesses for the prosecution explained the most important evidence showing the fairness of the prices.

Taking all the circumstances, considered with reference to the evidence, amounts to this: That certain parties in the iron trade, influenced by Mr. Reed, of the Architectural Iron Works, sent to Mayor Gunther, in April, 1864, in answer to his letter, that they would have been willing in September, 1863, to take contracts for the iron at prices ranging from twelve to twelve per cent higher than the contract of Messrs. Cornell & Co., and that the prices of labor and materials in September, 1863, and this, without seeing the plans or ascertaining the extent of the work, and therefore without taking into account the enormous advance in the prices of labor and materials.

They omitted to state to Mayor Gunther that they were compelled to admit before your Committee that in fact they obtained the contract at such prices.

It is certain that if your Committee, in extra allowance, as was the case in the case of those firms in their public work, would have been the result of the Board of Supervisors, we might have obtained the benefits of the bidding for years.

Your Committee find that the action of the Board in the first that the iron work, even although it shows that the price paid by the County under the contract was excessive, yet that other parties interested in the work, and the architect, and other of the parties interested in the work, and the contractors, and the great of the parties interested in the work, and the contractors, and the great of the work, and the contractors, and the great of the work, and the contractors, and the great of