New-York Tribune.

VOL. XXVI.....No. 7,894. NEW-YORK, FRIDAY, JULY 27, 1866. PRICE FOUR CENTS.

WASHINGTON

Unanimous Vote of the House Repealing the Neutrality Law.

Passage of the Modifying Resolutions.

ENTHUSIASM IN CONGRESS OVER THE RESULT.

Disagreement with the Report on the Tariff Bill.

ANOTHER CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ORDERED.

DISTRIBUTION OF ASSASSINATION AWARDS.

Debate in the Senate on Senator Patterson's Credentials.

They are Referred to the Judiciary Committee.

PASSAGE OF THE DEFICIENCY BILL.

WASHINGTON, Thursday, July 26, 1866.

REPEAL OF OLD NEUTRALITY.

The introduction and passage of the bill repealing our neutrality laws by the Republicans, in the House to-day, sorely chagrins the Copperhead politicians.

President Roberts, of the Fenian Brotherhood, was on the floor of the House to-day, during the discussion of the Neutrality bill. He was in earnest conversation with several prominent members during the debate, and after its unanimous passage. Mr. Raymond, who opposed it, left before his name was called. Numerous members congratulated him upon the passage of the bill, and the unmistakable expression of the House of Representatives in favor of Irish independence.

Col. Roberts speaks to morrow night at a Fenian demonstration at the Fair building.

TENNESSEE.

The discussion in the Senate on referring Mr. Patterson's credentials was quite interesting. Immediately after the reading of the credentials Mr. Sumner rose and moved a reference to the Judiciary Committee, quoting as a precedent the action of the Senate in the case of Benjamin Stark, who presented himself as a Senator from Oregon in January, 1862, but whose loyalty was questioned and whose case was referred to the Judiciary Committee for investigation precisely as Mr. Sumner desired Mr. Patterson's to be referred. Messrs. Cowan and Reverdy Johnson quickly took up their cudgels for the Senatorial candidate. Mr. Johnson thought he made a strong point when he said that the resolution admitting Tennessee contained a provision that Senators and Representatives should be admitted provided they could take the oath. He found on investigation that there was nothing of the kind in the resolution. It was there once, but had been stricken out with special reference to the case of men who, though they held office under the Confederacy, claim that they can take the oath because they took the Rebel oath under duress. Mr. Doolittle, in attempting to defend Mr. Patterson, admitted the truth of the charge that he was Judge of a Rebel court. Mr. Fessenden then rose and said that until he heard this admission from an avowed friend of Patterson's he was inclined to vote against Sumner's resolution, because he would not base his action on mere rumor; but Doolittle's speech convinced him that there was truth in the report, and he should vote to have the Committee on the Judiciary inquire whether the office of Rebel Judge was held by Mr. Patterson in a sense to disqualify him for a seat in the Senate. Mr. Fowler, by whose side Mr. Patterson sat during the debate, rose and said that his colleague was not only willing but anxious for the investigation. It is worthy of remark, however, that Mr. Fowler did not vote against Sumner's motion. He declined to answer when his name was called.

SENATOR PATTERSON.

The Senate debate on the credentials of Senator Patterson of Tennessee does not give an over-encouraging prospect for the admission of the President's son-in-law before the adjournment.

THE ASSASSINATION REWARDS.

The radical change in the awards to the captors of Booth in the House to-day excites very lively, though generally approving debate.

In the general confusion this afternoon attendant upon the rush of business in the House, Mr. Delano of Ohio got the report of the Committee on Claims on the awards for the capture of Booth, &c., so amended as to kill the carefully-prepared provision the Committee had made to prevent the claim agents from preying upon the allotted portions of soldiers and others; and notwithstanding the undisputed fact that is now history, that Gen. L. C. Baker originated, planned and directed throughout the capture of Booth and Harrold, so great was the prejudice against him, that the House cut his share down to $2,000, out of $75,000.

THE CAMANCHE.

A joint resolution to pay $180,000 to the builders of the iron-clad Camanche, to make good their losses in a Government contract, was passed. The Camanche was constructed in New-York, and sent *in disjecta membra* to San Francisco on board the ship Aquilla, which sunk at the wharf on the day she arrived at her destination. The relief for the contractors is not claimed on this ground, but because of alterations in her machinery made by order of the Government after she was finished. Her parts were recovered from the wreck of the Aquilla, and she is now doing duty on the Pacific.

DEFICIENCY BILL.

The Deficiency bill was taken up at 2 o'clock and discussed until the recess, at 4. Mr. Sumner made another attempt to get an amendment adopted to increase the pay of State Department clerks, but failed. The bill was finally passed at the evening session.

CONFIRMATIONS.

The Senate to-day confirmed the nomination of Major-Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman to be Lieutenant-General of the Army of the United States, vice Lieut.-Gen. Grant, promoted to be General of the Army; and that of Rear-Admiral David D. Porter to be Vice-Admiral of the Navy, in place of Vice-Admiral Farragut, promoted to be Admiral of the Navy.

The President also appointed Gen. Hancock to the Major Generalship in the Regular Army vacated by the promotion of Gen. Sherman, and Gen. Ord to the Brigade Generalship vice Hancock.

The confirmation of Gen. Wm. T. Sherman as Lieutenant-General and Admiral Porter as Vice-Admiral, seems to have been what everybody expected.

GEN. GRANT SERENADED.

Gen. Grant was serenaded to-night by the band of the Fifth Cavalry, in honor of his recent military proclamation.

GEN. DIX'S NOMINATION.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to-day agreed to report favorably upon the nomination of Gen. Dix as Minister to the Hague. Some of his friends say he will not accept of it, as he is entitled to something better than a third-rate mission.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR.

Gen. T. T. Eckert has been nominated as Assistant Secretary of War.

PARDONS.

The President to-day directed warrants of pardon to be made out and transmitted to him for his signature, in favor of twelve persons resident within the limits of the late Confederacy, for their criminality in supporting and defending the same. Most of the pardons were for those coming under the 1st and 13th exceptions.

RUSH OF VISITORS.

The Capitol to-night was in full blaze of gaslight. Thousands of spectators crowded the galleries, while many persons of both sexes thronged the rotunda and the passageways. The closing scenes of Congress are generally attractive, but there was nothing to-night in either branch particularly interesting, the proceedings being of a mere business character, devoid even of lively debate.

REGULATING SENATORIAL ELECTIONS.

There is very general satisfaction expressed at the signing of the bill defining the modes of electing United States Senators. By many it was expected that it would be vetoed.

THE CONVENTION OF SOUTHERN UNIONISTS.

Capt. Bingham, a member of the Committee who issued the call for a Convention of Radical Southern Unionists, to be held in Philadelphia in September, has received letters from the following prominent citizens of Louisiana, requesting that their names be attached to the call: Michael Hahn, A. P. Dostil, J. Hankins, W. P. Judd, Eugene Stats, G. Duplantier, R. K. Cutler, Henry Dibble, A. P. Field, Rufus Waple, E. Heisland. Gov. Hahn states in his letter that a call for a Convention to select delegates to the Philadelphia Radical Union Convention has been issued.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

The Internal Revenue receipts to-day were $853,662.

INCOME RETURNS.

The income tax returns for the district show the following among the largest incomes: Henry D. Cooke, $169,355; W. W. Corcoran, $20,990; George W. Riggs, $55,281; A. Chadwick, Willard's Hotel, $28,905.

THE SECRETARY'S DINNER.

Secretary Seward gave one of his complimentary dinners to the Tennessee Congressional delegation to-night.

ARREST FOR TREASON.

Col. Ashby was arrested to-day, while passing through the city, for the crime of treason, but was bailed out in the sum of $1,000.

THE MISSISSIPPI LEVEES.

There is a delegation of prominent Louisianians here, urging Congress to pass the $1,500,000 appropriation to repair Levees along the banks of the Mississippi River. They show that the above sum expended now will save many millions another year, and if the work is neglected, the city of New-Orleans will eventually be destroyed.

THE EXTRA PAY TO ARMY OFFICERS.

The question of the three months' extra pay, recently voted by Congress, has given rise to many baseless hopes and much trouble at the Pay Department, from a general misapprehension of the law. The act of July 13, 1866, to extend the benefits of section 4, Army Appropriation bill, approved March 3, 1865, does not give three months' full pay to any officer of volunteers on honorable discharge. It only gives three months' pay proper to such as have been honorably discharged by acceptance of resignation, or by muster out at their own request, or otherwise mustered out after April 9, 1865, and who were in service on March 3, 1865. This simply places these classes of discharged officers upon the same footing as those who, on being discharged under General Order No. 79, 1865, on account of their services being no longer required by the Government, have already received the three months' pay proper.

The following is a correct abstract of the amount that officers will receive under the act of Congress approved July 13, 1866, which provides three months' extra pay to all volunteer officers below the rank of Brigadier-General who were in service March 31, 1865, as officers, and whose resignations were offered and accepted, or who were otherwise honorably discharged after April 9, 1865: Colonel of Cavalry, $313 50; Lieutenant-Colonel of Cavalry, $271 75; Major of Cavalry, $199 50; Adjutant of Cavalry, $199 50; Lieutenant of Cavalry, $152; Colonel of Infantry, $271 75; Lieutenant-Colonel of Infantry, $228; Major of Infantry, $199 50; Captain of Infantry, $171; First Lieutenant of Infantry, $142 50; Second Lieutenant of Infantry, $128 25; Surgeon, $228; Assistant-Surgeon, $152.

THE STORM.

The rain and hail storm here last night was very severe, and the bursting of electricity reminded one of a fierce artillery battle. The telegraph could not be worked till after midnight.

PERSONAL.

The President refused audience to most callers today, except to the Lieutenant-General and members of his Cabinet.

Major-Gen. Meade and Bishop Quintard of Tennessee arrived at Willard's to-day.

THE FREEDMEN.

The Board of Officers appointed by the Commissioner of Freedmen's Affairs for the purpose of revising the regulations for the government of the Bureau to meet the requirement of the recent act of Congress extending the duration of the Bureau two years, convened to-day, and is composed of the following-named officers.

Brevet Major-Gen. Davis Tillson, Assistant Commissioner for the State of Georgia; President, Brig.-Gen. E. M. Gregory, formerly Assistant Commissioner for the State of Texas; Brevet Maj.-Gen. J. W. Sprague, Assistant Commissioner for Missouri, Arkansas and the Indian Territory; Chaplain M. French and Capt. J. W. De Forrest, Veteran Reserve Corps, Secretaries.

All the members of the Board have arrived except Gen. S——.

CONDITION OF THE SEA ISLANDS.

Several teachers from the Sea Islands, South Carolina, passed through the city to-day, en route North. They represent the islands as very healthy, and the crops of cotton and corn to far exceed any season for the last four years. The schools have all done well, and the freedmen were never in better spirits in the Port Royal Islands, or worked better. The new Bureau bill has put new heart into them. Gen. Howard is infusing fresh activity into all departments of the Bureau, in order to make the provisions of the new bill as beneficent to whites and blacks as possible, and at the earliest date. The opposition in certain quarters is "toning down" since it is manifest that the Bureau is to be a fixed fact.

REORGANIZATION.

The Treasury and Navy Departments are actively engaged in preparations for a general reorganization of their respective departments under the provisions of the new bill.

A HINT TO VALLANDIGHAM.

At a meeting of the National Democratic Union Club a vote was carried requesting Vallandigham not to present himself at the Philadelphia Convention. It is stated that the Ohio patriot resents the proposition with indignation, claiming that the people who sent him here are entitled to representation in the person of their choice.

INDEMNITY TO UNION MEN.

Mr. Leftwich, one of the Tennessee delegates who was to-day sworn into office, had scarcely finished shaking hands with the Speaker when his name was called to vote on the bill to indemnify loyal citizens of Tennessee for property destroyed during the Rebellion, and he voted "No." It caused much comment among Union members.

CHANGE OF BASE.

Mr. Thomas Harland has resigned the position of Chief Clerk of the Patent Office, and entered upon his duties as Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue to-day.

GEN. FRY.

The commission of Gen. Fry as Brevet Major-General has been recalled by the Senate, reconsidered, and rejected.

XXXIXTH CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

SENATE....WASHINGTON, July 26, 1866.

TENNESSEE SENATOR—THE TEST OATH.

The credentials of Mr. Patterson, Senator elect from Tennessee, were taken from the table and read.

Mr. SUMNER (Rep., Mass.)—I move that these credentials be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, with a view to inquire whether Mr. Patterson can take the oath required by the act of Congress and the rule of the Senate.

Mr. COWAN (Johnson Dem., Pa.)—Mr. President, I suppose that Mr. Patterson will be the best judge of whether he can take the oath or not. The Senate can hardly inquire whether a man can take an oath or not.

Mr. SUMNER—In support of the motion, I beg to call attention to the precedent of the Thirty-seventh Congress, second session, in the case of Benjamin Stark, Senator elect from Oregon. I have a memorandum here, as follows:

"When his credentials were presented on January 6, 1862, Mr. Fessenden moved that the oath be not administered to him, but that his credentials be referred to the Committee of the Judiciary.

"It will be remembered that the occasion of that motion was that there was reason to believe that Mr. Stark had expressed disloyal sentiments. The reference to the Judiciary Committee was for an inquiry into the facts. It appears that at a subsequent day, date not given, this motion was agreed to, and on the 7th of February, more than a month after the presentation of the credentials, Mr. Harris, from the Committee, made a report, with the following resolution:

Resolved, That Benjamin Stark of Oregon, appointed Senator by the Governor thereof, is entitled to take the constitutional oath.

This resolution was amended by adding thereto, "without prejudice to any subsequent proceedings in the case," and so amended it was agreed to on the 27th of February, 1862. The oath was then taken and Mr. Stark took his seat. Now Sir, I have been assured, and other Senators have been assured, by more than one gentleman from Tennessee, that Mr. Patterson has acted as a Judge under the Rebel authorities, and that in that capacity he took the oath of allegiance or some equivalent oath to the Rebel Government. In holding office under the Rebel Government he has disqualified himself of course from holding a seat in this Chamber, at least until the existing law of the land has been changed. Under these circumstances, Sir, and following the precedent of the Senate, I have submitted the motion which is now before the body.

Mr. JOHNSON (Dem., Md.)—What is the motion?

THE CHAIR (Mr. Foster)—The motion is that these credentials be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary to make the inquiries named by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. JOHNSON—I was not fortunate enough to hear what the inquiry was.

Mr. SUMNER—To inquire whether or not he can take the oath required by law.

Mr. JOHNSON—I do not see how the Judiciary Committee can make the inquiry or decide that question. It must be decided by the gentleman for himself, subject to the responsibilities of committing perjury.

Mr. SHERMAN (Rep., Ohio)—I would inquire if, in the language of the resolution admitting Tennessee, it is not declared that her Senators and Representatives shall be admitted when they take the oath required by law?

Mr. JOHNSON—I was about to ask that same question of the Chair, whether the resolution admitting Tennessee has not that clause in it. My recollection is that it has. It is not denied that Mr. Fowler and Mr. Patterson were duly elected Senators from Tennessee. I consider that question settled.

Mr. HENDERSON (Rep., Mo.) handed to Mr. Johnson a copy of the Tennessee resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON having read it, said the concluding words "on their taking the oath of office," which were in the resolution as it came from the House, were stricken out because they were supposed to be altogether superfluous; they were stricken out under the impression that they were in no way to change the meaning the resolution. I then supposed the resolution to say that Tennessee is entitled to representation as well as any other State in the Union—they of course taking the oath prescribed by the Constitution and the laws. I cannot see what the Judiciary Committee have to do with deciding whether Mr. Patterson can take the oath or not. He certainly has the right to take the oath, subject to the responsibility of situing against the law and the Constitution by taking a false oath. If he takes a false oath he can be proceeded against.

Mr. SUMNER—I have already quoted the precedent in the case of Benjamin Stark. I think the Senator did not hear it.

Mr. JOHNSON—I recollect it.

Mr. SUMNER—It seems to me to be peculiarly applicable. I take it that the facts are as open as day in the whole case. I suppose there can be no doubt about it. I might appeal to the Senator from Tennessee now on the floor (Mr. Fowler), whom we have all been so happy to welcome to his seat, to state the simple facts of the case. They must be unquestionably within his knowledge. On those facts I should like to have the judgment of the Senate. It seems to me the Senate ought to act intelligently, with its eyes open and knowing what has occurred. If, knowing what has occurred, the Senate thinks the oath of office can be administered at that desk to this gentleman (Mr. Patterson), it will be so administered; but if, when the facts are all stated to the Senate, it shall be of a contrary opinion, then I presume the Senate will declare in some way that the oath shall not be administered.

Mr. COWAN—This is a motion to refer the credentials of a Senator to the Judiciary Committee to inquire whether he can take a particular oath. Why, Mr. President, if the Judiciary Committee of the Senate can inquire or determine beforehand whether a man can take an oath or not, then what is the use of the oath? An official oath usually looks forward to swearing the incumbent that he will do a certain thing—for instance, support the Constitution. This oath is retrospective, and requires a man to swear that he has not done certain things. Now, if we are to inquire beforehand whether he can take this latter oath, then why not inquire whether he can take the former; and in that spect it becomes apparent to everybody that such a motion and such a reference is to do away entirely with the efficiency of the oath of office itself. I hope that these credentials will not be referred for any such purpose, but that the Senator from Tennessee will be allowed to take his seat on taking the customary oath. As to the precedent in the Stark case, there is no analogy. That was a reference not to inquire whether Mr Stark should take the oath or not, but whether he was guilty of certain conduct said to be treasonable, and the Judiciary Committee were instructed to inquire as to that fact. It is entirely different from this case. I trust the motion will not prevail.

Mr. FOWLER (Un. Tenn.), here rose and said: My colleague (Mr. Patterson) authorizes me to say that he is perfectly willing that the course moved by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner) shall be taken to satisfy the Senate in regard to the charges made against him.

Mr. HOWARD (Rep., Mich.)—I wish simply to say that I understand the applicant (Mr. Patterson) to be willing that this investigation shall be made.

Mr. FOWLER—That is the fact. He is not only willing, but he will be perfectly happy to have such an investigation.

Mr. HOWARD—Now that I am up I would like to say one word. The act of 1862 provides that every person appointed to any civil office or elected to the Senate or House of Representatives shall before entering on the discharge of his duties take the oath prescribed in that act, and among other facts which the applicant is required to attest in that solemn form is this—"that he has never sought or attempted to exercise the functions of any office whatever under any authority or pretended authority in hostility to the United States." not only that he has not exercised the functions of such office, but that he has not sought or exercised it, so stringent in the act of 1862. Now, Sir, I infer from this statute that the applicant in such case is not subjected to the taking of this oath as a mere nonsensing formality. I do not understand that Congress refer to the consciousness of the applicant whether he would or could take this oath. I understand the statute to require, then, in each case the facts required to be sworn to by the applicant shall be true in point of fact. It would be a very idle ceremony, Sir, to require the applicant for an office to take this oath if he alone were to be the judge of the truth of the facts required by the oath. In short, I hold that under the terms of this oath every individual is in point of law prohibited as plainly as if the prohibition were communicated in the oath from holding any office unless the facts stated in the oath are in point of fact true. I hope, therefore, that the Judiciary Committee, when this case shall come before them, will make full and complete inquiry into all the facts of the case, for the information of the Senate, showing as whether or not this applicant has ever exercised any office under the Confederate Government, or whether he has ever sought to exercise any office, because if he has done one thing or the other it is plain to my mind that he is prohibited by this statute from taking a seat in this Chamber. I understand, Sir—I do not, of course, vouch for the truth of the information—that this gentleman has not only sought a judicial office in the State of Tennessee under the so called Confederate Government, but he has actually proceeded to exercise the functions of that office, and has acted as a judge under the authority of the Rebel Confederacy. If that should turn out to be the fact, however much I should esteem the personal character of the applicant, I should feel constrained to vote against his taking a seat in this Chamber.

Mr. FESSENDEN (Rep., Vt.) said that the best form for the motion of Mr. Sumner was to put it so that the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to inquire into the qualifications of the Senator elect from Tennessee. He moved to amend the motion in that way.

Mr. SUMNER accepted the motion.

Mr. GRIMES (Rep., Iowa)—It seems to me that this is a very important precedent which we are about to establish, and I call the attention of the Senate specially to it. Two gentlemen appear before us purporting to be Senators from a State which we all recognize as being entitled to representation in this Chamber. A member of this body (Sumner) rises, and without any written declaration on the part of anybody, without making any charges himself or becoming responsible for any, or introducing the name of a single individual who is willing to become responsible for what is charged, he proposes that the introduction of one of the Senators from Tennessee (Patterson) shall be postponed until the question can be determined whether he is qualified for his seat. Heretofore the case has always been that, prima facie, a man presenting credentials was entitled to his seat. If it was afterward discovered that he was not entitled to occupy a seat, it was the duty of the Senate to investigate that question through the Judiciary Committee. If they found that he was not qualified they could so report and reject him. Now, Mr. President, if my colleague or myself should show credentials on the 4th of March next as Senators from Iowa, would it be competent for a gentleman to rise and say that he did not believe I was able to take that oath conscientiously, and, without presenting any charges against me, to require my credentials to be sent to the Committee on Judiciary, my State to be deprived of its representation until the Judiciary Committee should make a report and the Senate should act upon it? There is no analogy between the Oregon case and this. In that case there was very responsible parties who made declarations to a member of this body charging the Senator from Oregon applying for a seat with the expression of certain treasonable sentiments.

Mr. FESSENDEN (Rep., Me.)—They sent affidavits.

Mr. GRIMES—The Senator says there were affidavits in that case. They were produced here and read in the presence of the Senate; but in this case there does not seem to be anything upon which to base any charges. Now, I have but a very slight acquaintance with Mr Patterson, who is sent here to represent Tennessee. I am not influenced in the slightest degree by personal considerations in this matter, but it seems to me a very grave matter to set such a precedent when it may come home to our own cases in the course of a few years. The State of Tennessee is entitled to representation. If we discover that she is presented by a man who ought not to be allowed to sit here, or to take the oath of office, let some gentleman make charges against him, and let those charges be referred to the Committee.

Mr. TRUMBULL (Rep. Ill.) took the floor, and in the course of a speech reviewing the case under consideration, took the ground that the circumstances attending it justified the reference of the credentials to the Committee on the Judiciary, to ascertain what there was in the charges made against the applicant.

Mr. HENDRICKS (Dem., Ind.) quoted from the speech of the late Senator Collamer to prove that it was the opinion of that gentleman that the holding an office under a *de facto* government did not constitute an act of treason; especially was this the case with judicial offices, which gave neither aid nor comfort to the enemies of the country.

Mr. HOWARD (Rep., Mich.) asked if the enforcement of confiscation laws against Southern Union men was not giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. HENDRICKS said there was no evidence that Mr. Patterson had enforced the Rebel confiscation laws. He would ask Mr. Howard whether Mr. Patterson was a State Judge or a Confederate Judge in Tennessee.

Mr. HOWARD said his information was not ample on that point. He submitted to Mr. Hendricks that there could be no distinction between the two cases. The State of Tennessee was as much an enemy of the United States as all the insurrectionary States combined and acting under the authority of the Confederate Government.

Mr. HENDRICKS contended that it was not treason in Mr. Patterson to hold an office under the State of Tennessee, and spoke at length in favor of that position.

Mr. DOOLITTLE (Johnson Dem., Wis.) said he had but very few words to say on this question. He believed that it was the loyalty of East Tennessee which saved us in the struggle. He believed further, that of all men in East Tennessee there was none who, in his whole course, during the rebellion did more to sustain the loyalty of East Tennessee than the present applicant for a seat. It was true that he held office under the Rebel Government, and took the oath of allegiance to it, but he said, when he took the oath, that he spat upon and scorned it.

Mr. FESSENDEN said that when this question first presented itself he was inclined to vote against Mr. Sumner's motion. The discussion had, however, given him reason to believe what he had only heard before as a rumor, that Mr. Patterson did at one time take an oath to support the Confederacy. He did not know but there were such circumstances under which this might have been done without disqualifying a man from holding office; but the mere fact that Mr. Patterson had taken that oath was sufficient to justify the reference asked by Mr. Sumner.

After further discussion by Messrs. CONNESS (Rep., Cal.) and DAVIS (Dem., Ky.), the former favoring and the latter opposing a reference the vote was taken with the following result, Mr. Sumner having demanded the Yeas and Nays:

YEAS—Messrs. Brown, Chandler, Conness, Creswell, Edmunds, Fessenden, Foster, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Howe, Kirkwood, Morgan, Morrill, Nye, Poland, Pomeroy, Ramsey, Riddle, Sprague, Stewart, Sumner, Trumbull, Wade, Willey and Wilson—26.

NAYS—Messrs. Buckalew, COWAN, Davis, DOOLITTLE, Guthrie, Hendricks, Johnson, Lane, McDougall, Nesmith, NORTON, Sherman, VAN WINKLE and WILEY—14.

Absent or not Voting—Messrs. Anthony, Clark, Cragin, DIXON, Fowler, Grimes, Sauisbury, Wright and Yates—9.

Republicans, Roman; Democrats, italic; Johnson Democrats, small caps.

So the motion was agreed to, and the credentials of Mr. Patterson were referred to the Judiciary Committee, with instructions to inquire into his qualifications for the office of Senator.

PORT OF CALAIS, ME.

Mr. MORGAN (Rep., N. Y.), from the Committee on Commerce, reported the House bill to authorize the entry and clearance of vessels at the port of Calais, in the State of Maine, which was passed, and goes to the President.

CASES IN STATE COURTS.

Mr. HARRIS (Rep., N. Y.) called up the bill for the removal of causes in certain cases from the State courts, recently reported from the Judiciary Committee, which was passed without amendment, and goes to the House.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

At 2 o'clock, on motion of Mr. GRIMES (Rep., Iowa), the Senate went into Executive Session, and shortly after the doors were reopened.

THE MONITOR COMANCHE.

Mr. NYE (Rep., Nev.) called up the joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Donahue, Ryan & Secor, $180,000 to make good their loss in the contract for building the ironclad Comanche.

It was passed.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FESSENDEN (Rep., Me.) called up the bill to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1866.

Mr. SUMNER moved an amendment similar to that offered to the Miscellaneous bill yesterday and defeated, to increase the compensation of the Clerks of the State Department 20 per cent.

OFFICIAL HISTORY OF THE REBELLION.

Pending the consideration of the above.

Mr. WILSON (Rep., Mass.) called up the joint resolution for the printing of the Official History of the Rebellion.

On motion of Mr. WILSON the House amendment thereto was concurred in.

It goes to the President.

RECESS.

On motion of Mr. WILSON the Senate, at 4:30 p. m. took a recess until 7 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

APPRAISEMENT OF MERCHANDISE.

Mr. MORGAN (Rep., N. Y.), from the Committee on Conference on the bill relative to appraisement of merchandise in the port of New-York, made a report which was agreed to. The House recedes from its amendment, which was to fix the salary of the appraisers at $5,000, and the assistant appraisers at $4,000; and the salaries stand as by the Senate proposition at $4,000 and $3,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NEBRASKA.

Mr. WADE (Rep., Ohio) reported from the Committee on Territories the House bill to reimburse the Territory of Nebraska for expenses incurred in repelling Indian invasions in 1864. It was passed, and goes to the President.

DEFICIENCY BILL.

Consideration of the Deficiency bill was resumed. The question was on Mr. Sumner's amendment to increase the pay of State Department clerks 20 per cent.

Mr. MCDOUGALL (Dem., Cal.) moved to amend by including also the clerks of the Interior and War Departments, and in the office of the Attorney-General; which was disagreed to.

Mr. Sumner's amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. WILSON (Rep. Mass.) offered an amendment requesting the Secretary of War to furnish estimates of the cost of a fire-proof building for the War Department, which was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS (Dem. Ky.) offered an amendment appropriating $230,300 to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for taking the last census.

Mr. SHERMAN (Rep. Ohio) moved to amend with a proviso that no money should be paid out of this sum to any person who took part in the Rebellion. Agreed to.

The amendment as amended was adopted.

Mr. DOOLITTLE (Johnson Dem., Wis.) offered an amendment appropriating $25,000 to defray the expenses of the delegates from the Southern Cherokee Indians in coming to and returning from Washington to perfect a treaty. Adopted.

Mr. WILSON offered an amendment to substitute for the bill for the payment for horses lost in the army a provision that officers having such claims against the Government shall forward them to the Second Controller's office to be settled under the provisions of the act of 1783. Adopted.

Mr. SUMNER (Rep., Mass.) reported in the Senate his amendment to increase the pay of the State Department clerk, rejected in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SPRAGUE (Rep., R. I.) moved to amend the amendment by including the War and Navy Department clerks. Disagreed to.

Mr. Sumner's amendment was again rejected—Yeas, 19; Nays, 18.

The Deficiency bill was then read three times and passed.

THE ARMY.

Mr. WILSON introduced the following, which was ordered to be printed:

Joint resolution respecting the Army of the United States.

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all laws and parts of laws enacted since the 4th day of July, 1861, increasing, reorganizing, or creating regiments, staff, corps or other organizations of the Regular Army, or in any way affecting the number, rank, pay or emoluments of the general, field, staff and line officers, and enlisted men of the same, be and the same are hereby declared to be in full force and effect, and so to remain until otherwise provided by law.

ADJOURNED.

The Senate, at 9 o'clock p. m., went into Executive session, and, at 11 o'clock p. m., adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THE INCREASE OF PAY.

The House met at 11 o'clock this morning.

Several motions to dispense with the reading of the journal were made, but Mr. WENTWORTH (Rep., Ill.) objected, and said he would insist on his objection so long as the proposition was pending to vote $5,000 a year to members. He wanted to consume time and defeat that project.

TUGS AND TOW BOATS.

Mr. O'NEILL (Rep., Pa.), from the Committee on Commerce, reported a joint resolution to construe the act to provide for the safety of passengers on steam vessels so as not to apply to boats used exclusively as tugs or tow boats.

The bill was read three times and passed.

HALF-BREED AND INDIAN SETTLERS.

Mr. FERRY (Rep., Mich.), on leave, introduced a bill amendatory of the preemption and homestead laws, so as not to exclude from their benefits half-breed and other Indians in Michigan who are disconnected with tribal relations.

The bill was read three times and passed.

STATUE OF LINCOLN.

Mr. RICE (Rep., Me.), on a suspension of the rules, introduced a joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to contract with Miss Minnie Ream for a life-size model and statue of the late President Lincoln, to be executed by her, the price not to exceed $10,000.

The bill was read three times and passed.

RELIEF.

Mr. MOORHEAD (Rep., Pa.), from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported back the Senate bill for the relief of John Hastings, late Surveyor and depository of public moneys at Pittsburgh.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. HOGAN (Dem., Mo.), the Committee of the Whole was discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill to authorize the refunding of taxes overpaid on estimates of previous years' business, and the bill was brought before the House and passed.

WESTERN RAILROAD AND TELEGRAPH.

The House resumed the consideration of the Senate bill pending at the adjournment last night, granting lands to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the States of Missouri and Arkansas to the Pacific coast, the corporation to be designated the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad Company.

Mr. PRICE (Rep., Iowa), from the Committee of the Pacific Railroad, reported several amendments changing names of corporators and making other changes in the bill agreed to.

Mr. WENTWORTH (Rep., Ill.) moved to amend by striking out the names of all Members of Congress as corporators, which was agreed to.

Mr. LAWRENCE (Rep., Ohio) wished to offer an amendment, reserving to Congress the power to fix the rates of charge for freight and passengers, but Mr. Price refused to allow it to be offered.

Mr. WILSON (Rep., Iowa) inquired how much land this bill granted per mile, and in the aggregate.

Mr. PRICE could give no definite answer, but said the grant would be about the same as that of the Northern Pacific Railroad. He added that the Northern Pacific Railroad was not allowed to go further South than the 45th parallel, and as this road would run on the 35th parallel there would be a width of 300 or 400 miles between each of the three lines—Northern, Central and Southern, so that they would not be competing lines.

The bill was passed—Yeas, 60; Nays, 44.

SUSPENSION OF RULES.

The joint rules prohibiting bills from being sent by either House to the other within the last three days of the session, were, on motion of Mr. KUYKENDALL (War Democrat), suspended for the rest of the session.

PAYMENT OF THE ASSASSINATION REWARDS.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the bill reported last Tuesday from the Committee, authorizing the payment of the rewards for the capture of Jefferson Davis, and of the assassins of President Lincoln.

Mr. DELANO (Rep., Ohio) offered a substitute following the award of Judge Holt.

Mr. DRIGGS (Rep., Mich.) offered an amendment following the award of the War Department in regard to the captors of Booth and Harold, giving $3,750 to Col. Baker, $7,500 to Lieut. Doherty, and $4,000 to each of the detectives; to Sergeant Corbett and the other sergeants of the party, $2,545; to the corporals $2,291 09, and to privates $2,036.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) protested against $17,500 being paid to Col. Baker, a man who, he said, was not out of this city at the time, and who made more money out of the war than any other man.

Mr. DRIGGS added that Baker was building a large hotel in Lansing, Mich., as he was informed, out of the money he made in the war.

Mr. HOTCHKISS (Rep., N. Y.) scoffed at the idea that because Col. Baker was building a hotel that was an argument against his getting a proper share of the rewards.

Mr. STEVENS remarked that the evidence furnished by the War Department showed that Col. Baker had done no service at all.

Mr. HOTCHKISS contradicted that, asserting that the evidence furnished by the War Department gave Col. Baker the entire credit for having planned, originated and executed the enterprise. He gave equal credit to Lieut.-Col. Conger for his efforts at the time Booth was shot, and said that as Booth was dragging himself to the door of the barn, with his arms trailing, and evidently intending to surrender, Corbett, who was then an insane man, and who had since died in a lunatic asylum, thrust his pistol through a crevice of the barn and fired at random, the ball striking Booth near the very spot where the murderous ball hit President Lincoln. Corbett's version of the transaction was that he fired the shot because Providence directed him, and Conger came to the conclusion that the best thing to be done was to let the matter pass.

Mr. SCHENCK (Rep., Ohio) inquired upon what principle the Committee gave $17,500 to Col. Baker.

Mr. HOTCHKISS replied that they had to give him the same as Conger.

Mr. SCHENCK inquired how the Committee arrived at $17,500 for Conger.

Mr. HOTCHKISS replied that it was by comparing his services with those of the others of the party.

Mr. SCHENCK inquired whether in the only kindred application of a principle, the distribution of prize money, there was not a law which gave the commander of an expedition, not being with the expedition, an Admiral commanding a squadron, one-twentieth of the whole prize-money, and whether instead of giving one twentieth to Baker ... did not better recommend his getting nearly one-fourth, namely, $17,500.

Mr HOTCHKISS replied that he was not a sailor, nor a Judge of a Prize Court, and did not know anything about the rules of prize distribution. The Committee had gone into this matter by the rule of merit, the same as if they had been jurors' referees. He went on to say that a telegram had been shown him from Lieut. Doherty, saying that a great fraud was being perpetrated, and that he wanted the American Congress to stop the wheels of legislation, and wait till he was heard. Lieut. Doherty had been before him time and again on the matter, and he had large rolls of documents from him. He wished to avoid saying anything about Lieut. Doherty, but he would say now, since Doherty had the impudence to say what he did say, that he believed this Lieut. Doherty was a downright coward in that expedition. He believed the evidence established that, while five men were guarding the tobacco-house where Booth and Harrold were, and while Conger was getting a guard around them, this Lieut. Doherty was lying under a shed, and no power of Conger's could drive him out of it; and now Lieut. Doherty came in and claimed that he did the whole work. Referring to the allusion to Baker's wealth, he said that to-day Baker was a bankrupt, and that he had never received compensation in proportion to his services.

Mr. DRIGGS denounced the report of the Committee as a great outrage. He admitted that Conger should get at least $10,000, but he could not understand what influenced the Committee to give nearly one-fourth of the whole amount to Col. Baker.

Mr. HOTCHKISS wanted the House to take notice that improper influences were charged upon the Committee by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DRIGGS disclaimed any personal allusion.

Mr. HOTCHKISS remarked that that was like wringing a man's nose and then telling him he meant no personal offense. [Laughter.] He repeated his statement about Lieut. Doherty being under the shed.

Mr. DAWES (Rep., Mass.) inquired why they proposed to give Doherty so much.

Mr. HOTCHKISS replied that he did so in deference to popular clamor.

Mr. FARNSWORTH (Rep., Ill.) remarked that he supposed the Committee was superior to any such influence.

Mr. TROWBRIDGE (Rep., Mich.) expressed the hope that his colleague's (Mr. Driggs) amendment would not be adopted, as it did not do justice to Lieut.-Col. Conger, who had command of the expedition, but whose muster-out of the service was a few days before, and was not known to him then.

After some further discussion the House proceeded to vote. The question was first taken on the amendment offered by Mr. Driggs, and it was rejected.

The question recurred on the amendment offered by Mr. Delano, and it was adopted by a large majority.

It gives to Conger $15,000; L. C. Baker, $3,750; L. B. Baker, $3,000; Lieut. Doherty, $5,250; Major O'Beirne, $4,000; the Detectives $1,000, and Boston Corbett and each man of the party of the 16th New-York Cavalry $1,633.

The bill as amended was passed.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES.

The House proceeded in the business of the morning hour, to the call of Committees for reports.