New-York Tribune.

VOL. XXVII.....No. 8,411. NEW-YORK, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1868. PRICE FOUR CENTS.

WASHINGTON.

JUDGE BLACK, SECRETARY SEWARD, AND HIS EXCELLENCY — CABINET MEETING — THE VETO — RUMOR OF THE PRESIDENT'S RESIGNATION—NOTHING TO BE DONE UNTIL AFTER THE TRIAL — ALIASKA — THE MANUFACTURE TAX — TREASURY INVESTIGATION —HOWE'S PATENT.

BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.

WASHINGTON, Tuesday, March 24, 1868.

Judge Black denies that he retired from the Impeachment case because he disagreed with the President and his counsel upon the line of defense to be pursued. It seems that he has quarreled with the President in regard to a claim which certain persons have against the Government, and for whom he is counsel. The case is a claim of ownership to the guano on the Island of Alta Vela. Judge Black held that the President could settle the claim in favor of his clients if he felt so inclined, and that this would be simply doing justice to an injured person. The President had promised to settle the dispute, but Mr. Seward interfered and prevented such a settlement. The only hope which Judge Black now has is with Congress, and not wishing to jeopardize his client's claims he withdrew as one of the counsel of the President.

The President held his usual Cabinet session at noon to-day, all the members, including Adjt.-Gen. Thomas, being present. Mr. Johnson submitted several important subjects for consideration, among others his veto of the bill taking from the Supreme Court appellate jurisdiction in cases of habeas corpus. The rumor is again set afloat that the President intends to resign before the conclusion of the trial.

When the Senate retired for deliberation to-day on the extension of time to the President, Vice-President Wade remained behind on the floor, conversing with members of the House and others.

Many of the witnesses who were summoned here to appear in the Impeachment trial are compelled to remain until the trial begins next Monday. Most of them are from distant points, and the interval scarcely gives them time to get home and return in season.

The proceedings in the House, to-day, were unimportant. Nearly the whole of the time from 11 o'clock in the morning until the time of meeting of the Impeachment Court was consumed in debating the replication of the Impeachment Managers. After the Senate, sitting as a Court of Impeachment, had adjourned, the House resumed its session, but sat only half an hour. A few resolutions and bills were introduced. Judge Robertson of the Westchester District of New-York presented the remonstrances of Thomas Reeve and 130 other inventors of sewing-machine improvements, manufacturers, dealers, and users of sewing-machines against the further extension of the patent of Elias Howe, jr., deceased, for improvements in sewing-machines, originally granted Sept. 10, 1846, and once extended seven years. Mr. Van Horn of New-York presented a petition of 57 citizens of Leroy, N. Y., asking for a reduction of the taxes and of the expenses of the army and navy. Also, for a revision of the Revenue laws in the interests of our country.

The Senate amendments to the House bill repealing the tax on manufactures, was considered by the Ways and Means Committee to-day, and they instructed their Chairman to non-concur in the Senate amendment reducing the tax on petroleum, naphtha, and other articles. The other amendments were not regarded as important, and the Committee will probable agree to them. It is understood that in the new bill which the Committee are preparing they will incorporate a provision for the reduction of the tax on petroleum, which will cover the amendment proposed by the Senate.

The Senate Foreign Affairs Committee have decided not to act in any of the treaties before them until after the trial.

The House Military Committee to-day instructed their Chairman to report a bill providing for the sale of the Government buildings and grounds at Harper's Ferry, the proceeds to be applied to the erection, repair, and support of schools in Western Virginia.

A report was in circulation to-day, and telegraphed abroad, that the Committee on Elections had voted to retain Gen. Morgan of the XIIth Ohio District in his seat. This was an error. The Committee by a strict party vote—six Republicans, Mr. Shellabarger being absent, against two Democrats—have resolved to report in favor of giving the seat to Columbus Delano, the contestant. They say that he was elected by 82 majority.

The efforts of the Secretary of State and other persons to induce the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to reverse their action on the question of the Aliaska appropriation, have been so far unsuccessful, and the Committee intend to adhere to their resolution to postpone its further consideration until after the impeachment trial.

Two treaties with Italy have recently been sent to the Senate.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in reply to a resolution of the House concerning the regulations for preventing and discovering frauds in the printing and issue of fractional currency, inclosed to that body a report by Mr. Clarke, Superintendent of the Printing Division. The latter describes the mode of transacting the business, and says that with the delivery of the currency to the Treasury of the United States the responsibility of the division ceases, and that the responsibility is then assumed by the Treasurer. Under the practical operation of the system up to the present time there has been manufactured $83,000,000 of fractional currency, involving the handling many times over of 27,000,000 of sheets, yielding $444,000,000 in notes, without the loss to the Government in that division of a single note of any denomination. Gen. Spinner in his response says: Frauds on and after the delivery of the currency to the office, except by outright stealing, could be perpetrated only by collusion with employés of the Printing Division and the Treasurer's office. As no frauds in this respect have been committed in this office, none have been detected.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office has received from the Surveyor-General of California a return of the survey of the following described private land claims founded on Mexican grants before the acquisition of California by the United States:

Rancho Ornochumnes, confirmed to Catherine Sheldon et al., containing 18,661 36-100 acres, situated in Sacramento County, on the Consumnes River, and contiguous to the Rancho San Juan de los Mogelumnes; Los Ojitos Rancho, confirmed to Mariano Soberanes, containing 8,880 17-100 acres, situated in Monterey County, adjoining the Ranchos Pinos, Milpitas, and Pieyto.

The cases are returned with a view to the obtaining of patents, and will be acted upon in the regular course.

XLth CONGRESS—SECOND SESSION.

SENATE....WASHINGTON, March 24, 1868.

The CHAIR laid before the Senate a memorial of the South Carolina Constitutional Convention, praying for gifts of land for educational purposes. Mr. MORGAN (Rep., N. Y.) reported favorably the bill to abolish drawbacks. Mr. WILSON (Rep., Mass.) reported favorably the joint resolution to place at the disposal of the Lincoln Monument Association certain captured ordnance. Mr. CRAGIN (Rep., N. H.) reported favorably the bill making appropriations for the EXPENSES OF THE TRIAL of Impeachment of Andrew Johnson, and for other contingent expenses for the year ending June 30, 1868.

PRESENTATION OF BILLS TO THE PRESIDENT.

On motion of Mr. EDMUNDS (Rep., Vt.) the Senate took up the bill to regulate the presentation of bills to the President and the return of the same.

Mr. DAVIS (Dem., Ky.) moved to strike out the 2d section, providing that bills presented to the President, and not returned by him with his objections within ten days specified, shall become law; and making it his duty to return the same to the Secretary of State, who is to certify that it has become a law. The amendment was lost.

In reply to a question by Mr. BUCKALEW (Dem. Penn.) how the entry upon the Journal of the President's return of a bill to the Senate could be made as provided by the Constitution, if the Senate was not in actual session,

Mr. EDMUNDS repeated the views heretofore expressed by him, that Congress is in session as contemplated by the Constitution until it declares itself adjourned.

Further debate ensued. Messrs. JOHNSON (Dem. Md.) and HENDRICKS (Dem., Ind.) supported the bill as giving a clear definition to a doubtful provision of the Constitution. Mr. MORTON (Rep., Ind.) opposed it. The bill was passed 29 to 10. Messrs. Davis (Dem., Ky.), Doolittle (Dem., Wis.), Bayard (Dem., Del.), Dixon (Dem., Conn.), McCreery (Dem., Ky.), Morton (Rep., Ind.), Norton (Dem., Minn.), Saulsbury (Dem., Del.), Williams (Rep., Oregon), and Buckalew (Dem., Penn.), voting in the negative.

ORDER IN THE GALLERIES DURING THE TRIAL.

Mr. SHERMAN (Rep., Ohio) moved that the order in regard to admission to the galleries be suspended until further order, and that the Sergeant-at-Arms shall take care that order is observed in the galleries during the trial of impeachment now pending; authorizing him to arrest and take before the Senate any person violating order, and to take care that no person enter the Diplomatic, ladies' and reporters' galleries but those entitled to admission. Laid over.

The Clerk of the House appeared and announced that the House had adopted a replication to the answer of the President of the United States to the articles of impeachment.

One o'clock having arrived, the President *pro tem* vacated the chair.

After the adjournment of the High Court of Impeachment Mr. Wade resumed the chair, and the Senate went into executive session, and soon afterward adjourned.

REORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURTS.

The bill which was introduced yesterday, by Mr. Cole, to reorganize the Circuit Courts of the United States, provides that hereafter each Circuit Court shall consist of one Judge, who shall reside in the circuit, and be called a Circuit Judge, and who shall be appointed in the same manner, hold office by the same tenure, and receive the same compensation as District Judges. All acts authorizing the District Court Judges or Supreme Court Justices to hold the Circuit Court, are repealed.

REORGANIZATION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT.

The bill to reorganize the State Department and to reduce the expenses thereof, which was introduced by Mr. Wilson, provides that the Department shall consist of a Secretary with a salary of $8,000; an Assistant Secretary with a salary of $3,500; a Chief Clerk at $2,200; thence heads of divisions at $2,000 each; thirty Clerks of various classes, and fourteen other employés, all of whose duties are minutely prescribed.

The Passport Clerk is required to administer gratuitously oaths in proof of citizenship. The fee for certified copies of passports and amnesty oaths is fixed at $5. The secret service fund is abolished in time of peace and during its continuance. The President's approval shall not be a sufficient voucher for any money expended from the funds of the Department. It is also provided that it shall not be lawful for the Secretary of State to fill the office of Chief Clerk, or to replace the heads of divisions by new appointments, but only by promotion.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. McCLURG (Rep., Mo.) made a report in the Kentucky election case of Mr. McKerr agt. Mr. Young, that, Mr. Young having given aid and counsel or encouragement to Rebels, is disqualified from sitting as a Representative; that Mr. McKerr did not get enough of votes; and that the Governor of Kentucky shall be informed of a vacancy in the district. The report was laid aside for future action. Mr. McKERR (Dem., Ind.) presented a minority report, that Mr. Young is not disqualified from holding, and is entitled to his seat.

On motion of Mr. BLAINE (Rep., Me.), the POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL was taken from the Speaker's table, and a verbal amendment by the Senate was concurred in. The bill now goes to the President for his signature.

Mr. FARNSWORTH, (Rep., Ill.), presented a memorial from the FLORIDA Legislature, transmitting the two CONSTITUTIONS. Reconstruction Committee. The annual POST ROUTE BILL was taken from the Speaker's table, and the Senate amendments were concurred in. The bill now goes to the President. Mr. POLAND, (Rep., Vt.), from the Committee on Revision of the United States Courts, reported back the Senate bill to amend the act of March 3, 1857, providing for a SETTLEMENT of the PUBLIC ACCOUNT, which was passed. Yeas, 101; Nays, 18.

THE IMPEACHMENT OF ANDREW JOHNSON.

Mr. BOUTWELL (Rep., Mass.) had been directed by the Managers of Impeachment to report the form of replication to the answer of the President, and to submit a resolution.

Mr. CHANLER (Dem., N. Y.) inquired whether it was in order to call for the reading of the answer of the President.

The SPEAKER replied that it was not, but intimated that it was in order to call for the reading of the message from the Senate which accompanied the answer.

The message from the Senate was read, and then the replication was read. [Printed under the head of the Impeachment Trial.]

Mr. SPALDING (Rep., Ohio) asked Mr. Boutwell whether the President had denied that he is guilty under the articles.

Mr. FARNSWORTH replied that the President admits the facts and denies the guilt.

Mr. SPALDING added that legal critics would meet the Managers in the Senate, and that they had better be careful in drawing up their replication.

Mr. BOUTWELL said that the Managers' attention had been drawn to that peculiar form of the answer which had been filed on behalf of the President, but that the answer was in substance that he is not guilty. Therefore the form of the replication is not what has usually been used in similar cases. The answer to some of the articles amounted to a demurrer merely; but, on the whole, the Managers had chosen to treat the answer as a plea of not guilty.

Mr. WOODWARD (Dem., Penn.) wished to call the Managers' attention to the fact that the President's answer to the eleventh article amounts to a demurrer. His own opinion was that the demurrer is very conclusive. He did not think that the eleventh article charged impeachable offences.

Mr. BINGHAM (Rep., Ohio) said that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Woodward) would find that the eleventh article, like every other article exhibited against the President, charged against him a misdemeanor in office, or a high crime in office, so that there was no departure whatever in the replication. He desired to call the attention of the gentleman and of the House to the fact that while the answer does contain much that is argumentative, and much that might be called a demurrer, such a thing was never allowed at all in an impeachment. A demurrer had never been entertained in the Senate or in the Peers of England. A demurrer did not lie in such cases. Special pleading was unknown in the whole proceeding. The President's answer to the eleventh article expressly denied that he committed a crime, and was therefore a plea of not guilty. Here was the clause which contained the general denial:

And this respondent, further answering the said eleventh article, denies that by means or reason of anything in said article alleged, this respondent, as President of the United States, did on the 21st day of February, 1868, or at any other day or time, commit, or that he was guilty of, a high misdemeanor in office.

Mr. BINGHAM claimed that, by the Parliamentary law, that amounted to the same thing as if he had said he was not guilty of the crimes alleged against him in manner and form as charged. Forms were nothing in these matters; substance was everything. The replication was of substance, and was no departure. He would like to see Andrew Johnson go into the Senate of the United States, and by presenting a demurrer confess the averment in the articles. No such rule obtained, because a demurrer admitted everything that is well pleaded.

THE OBJECTIONS TO THE REPLICATION.

Mr. WOOD (Dem., N. Y.) presumed that the objection taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Woodward) had reference to making the replication what it really ought to be. He (Mr. Wood) thought that this was a question which the Court itself might determine. It was desirable, however, that whatever course the House might take it should exercise the utmost care, and the House should reserve to itself the right to instruct and direct the Managers. He would take objection himself to the phraseology of the replication, which declares it to be in the name of the people of the United States. We know, said he, that that is not the fact. Not a man here can rise in his place and seriously and candidly declare that the people of the United States have authorized the House to act on this question, or that any member of the House was ever elected on any such issue. Therefore, it is false in fact that the House of Representatives is acting for all the people of the United States. We have had no representations made to this House from any portion of the people of the United states in favor of this procedure, except by a handful of office-seekers, who expect to derive personal advantages from the result. The Managers represent the House of Representatives, and only the House of Representatives; and in representing this House they are its agents. One of the Managers, the gentleman from Ohio (Bingham) took upon himself to bully the Senate. He told the Senate to say whether it would observe its own rules; and yesterday the same honorable Manager undertook to criticise severely, and, in Mr. Wood's judgment, improperly, the decisions of the Chief-Justice of the United States, sitting as a presiding officer in that Court. It will not do to say that that gentleman alone is responsible for these things. The Managers are acting and speaking in behalf of the House of Representatives, and therefore it is, said Mr. Wood, that I as one member of the House, desire to enter my protest against any conduct on the part of either of these Managers that is not sufficiently decorous and proper and commensurate with the dignity and gravity of such an occasion. Who, for instance, authorized the Managers to say, yesterday, that they would present their replication to the Senate at 1 o'clock to-day? Is this a replication of the Managers or of the House of Representatives? I contend that in the absence of any action on that question by the House of Representatives, it was an assumption of duty, an arrogance of power on the part of the Managers to declare to the Senate that they would, at 1 o'clock to-day, present this replication. And I find in the Baltimore newspapers of to-day this replication. Sir, are we nobody? Do the gentlemen who have been selected by this House to represent it in the Senate constitute themselves the House of Representatives?

Mr. BOUTWELL took the floor to reply. He had understood the opinion of the gentleman of New-York to be that the replication professes to reply in the name of all the people of the United States, and that; and that, as that gentleman does not agree to it, therefore it is not a good replication. If that were so, that would be an end of the whole prosecution.

Mr. BUTLER (Rep., Mass.)—The representatives of the people usually represent them, but the gentleman (Mr. Wood) has not even the merit of originality in his objection. The form is one that has been used 500 years, lacking eight. The objection was made to it once before, and only once, when the people of England, smarting under the usurpation and tyranny of Charles I, not, having any provision in their Constitution as we have, by which that tyrant could be brought to justice outside of their Constitution, and in a perfectly legal manner, as I understand and believe, brought Charles to justice. When proclamation was made that they were proceeding in the name of all the people of England, one of the adherents rose and said, "No; all the people do not consent to it," so that the gentleman has at least a precedent for what he has done; and I wish we could follow out the precedent in this House, because the Court indulged who made that objection, and tried to find the offender for the purpose of punishing him [laughter]; but as no person confessed himself could not be found, and he afterward turned out to be a woman [laughter], the wife of Gen. Fairfax, who ratted on that occasion from the rest of the Commons. It is said by the gentleman from New-York that this replication is in a Baltimore newspaper; I take issue with the fact; this replication was corrected in form at 11½ o'clock this day. It is copied in part from the great precedents so far as they apply, and, therefore, any paper could publish something like it.

Mr. WOOD intimated that the Managers had probably altered it after they had sent it to the newspapers; but he had it here in *The Baltimore American*, with the names of the Managers attached.

Mr. BUTLER—And as the names of the Managers are not attached to the replication, that ends the matter. When we make a replication we do not attach our names to it, but we expect the Speaker of the House and the Clerk of the House, by order of the House, to attach their names to it. All that the President's answer can amount to is "a plea of not guilty," with a stump speech in the belly. [Laughter.] That is all. I am informed that the journal to which the gentleman alludes is *The Baltimore American*, a very respectable newspaper, and I only wonder that my friend from New-York takes it. Now I trust that the House will not receive any lectures or any suggestions upon propriety of language, or propriety of conduct from the gentleman who stands as yet under its censure for a violation of all parliamentary rules.

Mr. ELDRIDGE (Dem., Wis.)—The impeachment of the President, from the beginning of the proceedings up to this hour, has been treated, not only as a mere matter of form, but as a subject for trifling. The gentleman from Massachusetts tells us that when the question was raised in England whether impeachment was in the name of the people, some one exclaimed that it was not, and that person was understood to be a ranting old woman. Well, Sir, it is not necessary for old women to come here and rant, for we have plenty of ranters in the House of Representatives. I said last evening that I did not desire the Managers on the part of the House to answer in my name on their own discretion. Every one of them was convicted the President without known to have evidence, and without regard regard to the evidence, and to his answer when they were appointed as Managers. Why cannot we consider the President's answer section by section, fact by fact, and whenever we find that the President has written the truth, admit that in our replication? Why should we tell the country that all the President has said is a lie?

Mr. WILLIAMS (Rep., Penn.) would like the gentleman to say whether he could point to any case of impeachment that had been tried except on the general issue of not guilty; whether any other issue could be made, and whether, in that case, any other replication could be filed than substantially that which had been prepared today?

Mr. ELDRIDGE repeated that those portions of the President's answer which were true, and which could not be denied by witnesses, should be admitted. By this means the Managers would narrow down the issue, and save expense and time.

Mr. HIGBY (Rep., Cal.) inquired whether the gentleman was in a hurry to have the President convicted.

Mr. ELDRIDGE remarked that the gentleman (Mr. Higby) was continuing the same practice of levity which had prevailed all the way through.

Mr. WILLIAMS (Rep., Penn.), one of the Managers—The gentleman from Wisconsin seems to be of the opinion that this proceeding is to be tried on technical rules of pleading that are applicable to the trial of cases in courts of common law. I beg leave to remind him that it has been already openly confessed by the counsel for the President that it is not to be tried by the rules that prevail in common law courts, but by the law of Parliament. The pleadings are something peculiar. The counsel for the President have put in a series of answers, very much of the character of an answer in Chancery. There is no plea, there is no demurrer in that particular. I think that the answer filed by them is without precedent. What are the Managers under these circumstances to do? It stands confessed by the counsel for the President, that a demurrer in a case of this kind does not appear. The gentleman from Wisconsin admits that there is no such precedent. We come, then, before the House with the hypothesis that there is but one issue to be tried, and that is the general issue of guilty or not guilty.

Mr. ELDRIDGE—My position is that the President, having gone on and stated the facts covering the ground of the charge against him specifically, we ought to meet him fairly, and admit such facts as we cannot disprove, thereby narrowing the issue, saving expense to the country, and saving the expense of calling a large number of witnesses to disprove facts which we cannot deny.

Mr. WILLIAMS—Then the gentleman expects us to follow the President in his answer in the way of special replication, precisely as we should try a case in the civil courts.

Mr. CHANLER (Dem., N. Y.) made the point of order that the House had no official knowledge of the President's answer.

The SPEAKER overruled the point of order on the ground that the House of Representatives was, by its own vote, at the Bar of the Senate yesterday for the specific purpose of hearing the answer, and it was to be presumed that the House had heard it.

Mr. WILLIAMS went on to argue that no other character of replication could be made to the answer of the President; if the House were to enter on a long series of special pleas, it would be playing precisely into the hands of the President and his counsel, whose object appeared to be nothing more nor less than delay. Did the gentleman from Wisconsin want to perpetuate the trial till the close of the President's term? That seems to have been the general feeling, and to have been the expectation of the President himself. He had had some special doubt himself whether the Managers should not have gone back to the Senate and compelled the defendant to put in a confession in form or a plea of "Not guilty;" but he had deferred to the judgment of his colleagues that they should take the whole of the answer as substantially a plea of "not guilty." The gentleman from Wisconsin asseverates here that all the allegations set forth in the Answer of the President are true, or are, to use his identical language "God's truth." I do not think God ever recognized any truths of that sort. [Laughter.] Does the gentleman undertake to say that the speeches charged to have been made by the President at St. Louis and Cleveland and Washington were not made by him?

Mr. ELDRIDGE—The President says that he did not make them in the form in which they are charged.

Mr. WILLIAMS—And the gentleman affirms that the denial is true, and, therefore, that the President never made such speeches. I put it to the gentleman whether he believes that himself. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. LOGAN, in answer to a remark of Mr. Eldridge that Impeachment Managers never before admitted such an answer as that without excepting to it, said that the gentleman would find that in the trial of Lord Hastings a committee was appointed by the Parliament to examine the journal of the Lords, and that the committee reported to the House that from an examination of three centuries no demurrer or exception could be found as having ever been taken to Articles of Impeachment. There was no precedent to be found for anything except that the articles be answered and a general replication filed.

The House agreed to the replication by Yeas 116, Nays 36, as follows:

YEAS.

Allison,	Dringy,	Lincoln,	Robertson,
Ames,	Eckley,	Loan,	Sawyer,
Anderson,	Eggleston,	Logan,	Schenck,
Ashley (Nev.),	Eliot,	Loughridge,	Scofield,
Ashley (Ohio),	Farnsworth,	Lynch,	Selye,
Bailey,	Ferris,	Mallory,	Shanks,
Baldwin,	Ferry,	Maynard,	Smith,
Banks,	Fields,	McClurg,	Spalding,
Beaman,	Garfield,	Mercur,	Stevens (N. H.),
Beatty,	Grassly,	Miller,	Stevens (Pa.),
Benjamin,	Gurley,	Moore,	Taffe,
Benton,	Higby,	Moorehead,	Thomas,
Bingham,	Hill,	Morrell,	Trimble (Tenn.),
Blaine,	Hooper,	Mullins,	Twichell,
Boutwell,	Hopkins,	Myers,	Upson,
Brooks,	Hubbard (W. Va.)	Newcomb,	Van Horn (N. Y.),
Broomall,	Hulburd,	O'Neill,	Van Horn (Mo.),
Buckland,	Hunter,	Orth,	Van Wyck,
Butler,	Ingersoll,	Paine,	Ward,
Cake,	Jenckes,	Perham,	Washburn (Wis.),
Churchill,	Judd,	Peters,	Washburne (Ill.),
Clarke (Ohio),	Julian,	Pike,	Washburn (Mass.),
Clarke (Kansas),	Kelsey,	Pile,	Welker (Ohio),
Coburn,	Ketcham,	Plants,	Williams (Pa.),
Cornell,	Kitchen,	Poland,	Wilson (Iowa),
Cullom,	Koontz,	Paisley,	Wilson (Ohio),
Dawes,	Ladin,	Pomeroy,	Wilson (Pa.),
Dixon,	Lawrence (Pa.),	Price,	Winston,
Dodge,	Lawrence (Ohio),	Raum,	Woodbridge—116.

NAYS.

Adams,	*Golladay,*	*Marshall,*	*Sitgreaves,*
Barnes,	*Grover,*	*McCormick,*	*Stewart,*
Beck,	*Haight,*	*McCullough,*	*Stone,*
Burr,	*Holman,*	*Munger,*	*Taber,*
Chanler,	*Hotchkiss,*	*Niblack,*	*Trimble (Ky.),*
Eldridge,	*Hubbard (Conn.),*	*Phelps,*	*Van Aken,*
Fox,	*Johnson,*	*Pregin,*	*Van Trump,*
Getz,	*Kerr,*	*Randall,*	*Wood,*
Glossbrenner,	*Knott,*	*Ross,*	*Woodward—36.*

Democrats in italics.

Mr. BOUTWELL offered the following resolution, which was agreed to:

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate by the Clerk of the House, informing the Senate that the House of Representatives have adopted a replication to the answer of the President of the United States, on the articles of impeachment exhibited against him, and that the same will be presented to the Senate by the Managers of this House.

REFUNDING DUTY ERRONEOUSLY COLLECTED.

Mr. SCHENCK (Rep., Ohio) from the Committee of Ways and Means, reported a bill to refund the duties paid under protest on the importation from France of a bell given to St. Mary's Institute at Notre Dame, incorporated by the State of Indiana for philosophical and literary purposes. He explained that the bell was manufactured from American copper from Lake Superior, or about 80 or 90 per cent of it was of that metal. It was presented from a foreign religious body to the sisters of a Catholic institution of learning. The Secretary of the Treasury had decided that, under a strict construction of the law the bell could not come in free of duty, but Mr. Schenck proceeded to show that the bell could be imported free of duty. In answer to a question he said that the amount of duty was about $2,000. The bill was passed.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION.

The Committee of Ways and Means reported back this morning the House bill "to exempt certain manufactures from internal tax," with the amendments of the Senate and recommend non-concurrence in the first and second amendments of the Senate, and concurred in the third with an amendment as follows:

Strike out after "enacting," in the first line of said Senate amendment, and insert in lieu thereof "That after the 1st day of July, 1868, no allowance for drawback, on account of internal taxes paid on manufactures, shall be made on the exportation of any articles of domestic manufacture which is relieved from tax by the provisions of this act, but from that date all such articles shall be held to have been manufactured after the 1st day of April, 1868, and no claim for such allowance on any such article shall be paid unless presented to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue prior to the 1st day of August, 1868. They recommend concurrence in the fourth amendment of the Senate, with an amendment as follows: Strike out after the word "Corporation," in line 2 of said amendment, and insert in lieu of the following: "Whose manufactures of any kind or articles produced by them are exempt from taxation by the provisions of the act, and whose annual sales exceed $5,000, shall pay for every additional $1,000 in excess of $5,000, $2; and the amount of sales within the year, in excess of $5,000, shall be returned monthly to the Assistant Assessor, and the tax on sales in excess of $5,000 shall be assessed by the Assessor and paid monthly, as other monthly taxes are assessed and paid; and the assessment for April, 1868, shall be made on the excess of sales above the rate of $5,000 per annum, and thereafter the annual period for the assessment of such tax shall commence on the 1st day of May in each year.

SEC. — And be it further enacted that every person who shall engage in or carry on the business of a distiller with intent to defraud the United States of the tax on the spirits distilled by him, or any part thereof, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not less than $500, nor more than $5,000, and be imprisoned not less than six months nor more than three years. If any distiller shall carry on such business in any place or locality for a period of 20 days, during which the market value in such place or locality of the kind of spirits produced by him is less by more than ten per centum than the tax and the cost of producing, and spirits, it shall be prima facie evidence that the business is being carried on with intent to defraud the United States, and if it shall at any time come to the knowledge of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that distilled spirits are being sold directly or indirectly in any collection district at a market price less than the tax on such spirits, he shall forthwith institute a strict examination into the business and conduct of all the Revenue officers both in the district in which such sales are being made, and in the district in which such spirits have been manufactured; and the selling below the amount of the tax shall be held to be prima facie evidence that the Collectors and Assessors of the districts in which said spirits were produced and were sold have severally neglected their duties, and such Collectors and Assessors shall thereupon be suspended from office, and the powers and duties of their several offices shall devolve upon such subordinate officers as may now be designated by law, of which suspension notice shall be immediately given to said Collectors and Assessors by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and all pay and compensation shall be withheld from them until they shall respectively show to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, that on the spirits so sold for less than the tax thereon the tax has been regularly paid, or that if the tax has not been paid, the failure to pay has not been on account of negligence or due want of vigilance on the part of the officers so suspended.

The Committee recommend concurrence in the fifth amendment by the Senate.

The House, at the instance of Mr. Schenck, ordered the bill to be printed.

THE IMPEACHMENT.

The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole and, in company with the Chairman (Mr. Washburne) and their Clerk, proceeded to the Senate Chamber.

The members of the House returned from the Senate at 3:35, and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. WASHBURNE of Illinois, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, reported that the House had attended the Senate sitting on the impeachment of the President of the United States, and that the replication of the Managers to the answer of the President had been read in their presence.

DESULTORY BUSINESS.

The communication from the Secretary of the Treasury giving the reasons why Edmund Cooper continues to act as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury was read.

On motion of Mr. SCHENCK it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. He expressed the hope that a speedy report might be made.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury in relation to the regulations for the detection of frauds of fractional currency.

Mr. GARFIELD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, asked to report a bill providing for the sale of the lands, tenements, and water privileges at Harper's Ferry, West Virginia, belonging to the United States. The sale is to be at public auction, on a credit of one and ten years, the proceeds to be disposed of as follows: To defray the expenses of sale, to reimburse the United States for the amount of money expended on the property, and the residue to West Virginia for educational purposes. Objection was made to the reporting of the bill, but it was ordered to be printed.

Mr. HIGBY (Rep., Cal.) asked, but failed to obtain, leave to report, from the Committee on Ordnance, a resolution directing an examination to be made as to the merits of the Ryan & Hitchcock revolving fort for harbor defenses.

Mr. ELIOT (Rep., Mass.) reported a resolution directing the Secretary of State to cause to be procured and presented to George Wright, master of the British vessel J. & G. Wright, a gold chronometer, as a recognition of his humane efforts in rescuing three seamen from an American vessel, the Lizzie F. Chate. After a brief explanation the resolution was passed.

On motion of Mr. GARFIELD (Rep., Ohio) the Committee on the Judiciary was directed to inquire into the expediency of providing by law for the settlement of contested elections for electors of President and Vice-President of the United States, the Committee to report by bill or otherwise.

EUROPE.

FRANCE.

RIOTS AND SEDITIOUS PLACARDS.

BY ATLANTIC TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.

LONDON, March 24—Evening.—Emeutes are reported to have occurred at Bordeaux, and seditious placards have made their appearance at Paris, Lyons, Marseilles, and Rennes. The reforming of the Guard Mobile is the assigned cause of these disturbances.

GREAT BRITAIN.

TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION WITH ASIA AND AUSTRALIA.

LONDON, March 24.—An influential meeting was held at the Mansion House yesterday afternoon, which was presided over by the Lord Mayor. A committee was appointed to urge forward telegraphic communication to India, China, and Australia by submarine cables. The English Government will be asked to assist this important enterprise.

THE IRISH QUESTION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

On the 10th of March, Mr. Maguire proceeded to bring forward the case of Ireland. He entreated the House to view the question, not from a party or sectarian point, but in a broad, liberal, wise, generous, and patriotic spirit. It was, he said, idle to deny that the condition of Ireland was such as to fill the thoughtful mind with anxiety and alarm. The country was now occupied by an army, men-of-war were in her harbors, and gunboats on her inland waters, while armed cruisers guarded her shores from trans-Atlantic invaders. The boasted Constitution of the British subject was suspended, and the liberty of individuals depended upon the whisper of a spy, the suspicion of a policeman, the swearing of a perjurer, or the folly or stupidity of an official of the Crown. The recollection of the penal laws embittered the spirit of men whose fathers suffered from them. Wise legislation should be directed toward effacing those sad pages of a nation's history, and happy would be the statesman who could succeed in accomplishing that object. He held that England was bound either to pursue a just and enlightened policy toward Ireland, or to allow her to govern herself. The act of union with England was carried against the declared wishes of the Irish people; and the fact that but 5,000 persons petitioned the Imperial Parliament for union, and that 700,000 petitioned against it, was of itself strong corroboration of the fraud, violence and corruption by which that measure was carried. The chief causes of discontent in Ireland were the land grievance and the existence of the Established Church. Until the tenant got security for his improvements, and was protected from the rapacity or caprice of his landlord, it would be vain to hope for tranquillity. He asked the Government to declare what measure they had in contemplation to remedy this crying evil, and he warned them that the country would not be put off or satisfied with another Royal Commission. Having referred to the Irish exodus, and to the consequences of planting across the Atlantic millions of implacable enemies to British rule and power, Mr. Maguire went on to refer to the Irish Church, which he described as a scandal and a monstrous anomaly, which English men, if applied to themselves, would not tolerate for a single hour. In advocating, as a Catholic, the disendowment and disestablishment of that Church, he repudiated on the part of his co-religionists any desire to participate in the spoil of the Establishment. The Catholic bishops and clergy had declared over and over again that they would not touch a farthing of the funds of the Established Church, although derived from lands once the property of Catholic owners. The objection of the majority of the people of Ireland to the State Church was that it offended the religious sentiment of the country. It was the badge of conquest and degradation. The Catholic manhood of the nation was arrayed against it, and the whole population demanded its abolition on the broad ground of justice and common sense. The Catholic clergy of Ireland would not accept any payment from the State, for they well knew that if they were once to accept it they would lose all spiritual influence over their flocks, and eventually become either the spies or the stipendiaries of the State. Among the panaceas proposed for Ireland was a royal residence and the purchase of the railways. He would be glad to see a palace for the Sovereign raised in Ireland; but that would not be sufficient to remove discontent, nor would cheap locomotion effect that object. But, if the State could buy up the railways, why, he asked, could it not deal with the much larger question involved in the settlement of the relations between landlords and tenants. He called upon those who were responsible for the integrity of the United Kingdom to deal with the Irish difficulty in a comprehensive and patriotic spirit. If they would do this they would conciliate all classes of the people, extirpate Fenianism, and lay the foundation of a state of things which would redeem a nation and save an empire. In conclusion, he moved that the House should at once resolve itself into a committee with the view of taking into immediate consideration the condition of Ireland.

Some other speakers followed, and the Earl of Mayo, Chief Secretary for Ireland, rose to reply. Lord Mayo was not prepared to deny that much dissatisfaction, disloyalty, and dislike to British rule existed in Ireland, but he contended that it was of foreign growth, and that the upper and middle classes, both Catholic and Protestant, were well disposed toward the British Crown, and were prepared to defend the institutions of their native country. Adverting to the charge that Ireland was governed on an English systym, and that its people were downtrodden and oppressed, he appealed to the character of the Executive Government, to the judges, to the constabulary, and to the municipal authorities, to show that the country was practically governed by Irishmen, and in accordance with the feelings of the great majority of the people. He also contended that, notwithstanding the disturbing political element, the country had gone on materially improving. This was proved by the value of the live stock, which had risen from $19,000,000 in 1841 to £50,000,000 in 1866. The rate of wages had also risen about 100 per cent., while the consumption of beer and spirits had largely increased of late years, notwithstanding the high duty on the latter. Crime had decreased in Ireland by 50 per cent. of late years, which might, perhaps, be accounted for by the increased means of education afforded to the people. Having enumerated at some length the various remedial measures suggested by Mr. Bright, Mr. Mill, Sir John Gray and others, and commented upon them, the noble lord referred to the great diminution of agrarian crime in Ireland, to show that the occupiers of land were not so much dissatisfied as was alleged in further proof of which he remarked upon the fact that very few indeed of the tenant farmer class had joined the Fenian conspiracy. Referring next to the past policy of the Government, he maintained that they had adhered to the moderate and impartial course laid down by Lord Derby when he took office in 1866, and he claimed for the Administration the credit of having kept the peace in a period of great difficulty and danger. With regard to the future, he proposed next week to bring in a Land bill very similar to that of last year, which, however, should contain provisions to enable limited owners to charge their estates for improvements, and to encourage written contracts between landlords and tenants, instead of the present parol agreements. In addition to this, it was proposed at the earliest possible moment to institute a solemn inquiry by commission into the relations between landlord and tenant. [This announcement was received with loud laughter by the Opposition benches.] Until that inquiry was instituted Parliament and the country could never arrive at the truth, and England would continue to suffer in the estimation of foreign countries. The Reform bill would be introduced in a few days, and steps would be taken to increase the efficiency of the Irish railways. The question of education was already under consideration by a Royal Commission, but the inquiry had been delayed by the death of the Earl of Rosse. With regard to university education, he believed that nothing could be more impolitic than to interfere either with Trinity College or with the Queen's University. They had both effected much good, and enjoyed the confidence of the sections of the people who adhered to them. Many Roman Catholics, however, objected to send their sons to any college where religious instruction in their own faith was not a leading element. It was desirable, therefore, to establish a third institution, and with that view it was proposed to advise her Majesty to grant a char