THE NEW FRENCH SENATE.

THE MONARCHIST SCHEMES DEFEATED.

THE COMPLICATED MODE OF ELECTION—STRATEGY OF THE MONARCHISTS—COMPLETE FAILURE OF THE ORLEANIST SCHEME—THE ALLIANCE OF REPUBLICANS AND LEGITIMISTS.

[FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.]

PARIS, Dec. 16.—Of all the concessions made by the Lefts for the sake of obtaining some sort of constitution for the Republic, the gravest and most unwilling was the acceptance of the Senate. This institution was devised by the most ingenious craftsmen of the Right Center, which was supposed not only by its own members but by a "large and respectable" portion of the rest of the world to embrace about all of the skillful, sagacious politicians in France. The attributes of the Senate were so combined with reference to the powers of the President of the Republic and to that article of the Constitution providing for its revision, as to render it quite possible under certain hoped for circumstances to revise the Republic into a monarchy, or into an interarchy, with the Duke d'Aumale, say, for its Stadtholder. Being devised to further as far as possible the interests of Orleanism, complex machinery was invented to secure the choice of its high select members from the danger and degradation of unintelligent, universal suffrage. Two-thirds of them are to mount to the Upper Chamber through tortuous passages cunningly arranged as follows: The municipal councils of all France number about half a million members. Each of these councils becomes, for the occasion, a primary electoral college that sends delegates from its own body to the capital of its department for the composition of a secondary electoral college, which is then completed by adjunction of the departmental councilors. The whole number of these electors for two-thirds of the French National Senate should be less than 60,000. It is quite important to note here two other complications of this machinery. These secondary electoral colleges are not to exercise their functions till 15 days after their own election; and the municipalities are not to name their delegate electors until one month after the conclusion of the choice of 75 Senators by a still more exquisitely select, refined, and diminutive electoral college—to wit, the Assembly, called National, sitting at Versailles, reduced now, by 29 deaths and other accidents, to about 700 voters.

A week ago to-day the Monarchists felt certain of success. The united Lefts, from center to extreme, from Casimir-Périer to Louis Blanc, could not count more than 314 at the utmost. The combined Rights, omitting a few irreconcilable Chambordist light horse on the outmost wing, and the Bonapartists, could count at least as many. There remained an intermediate group, styled the Group Lavergne, numbering between 40 and 50, originally and still in with royalists, but that had for the most part, and after a fashion, accepted the constitution of the Republic. The numerically strongest one of all these groups was that of the Right Center, numbering about 110 members. It is the Orleanist group, embraces the clever political managers who hold the essence of policy to be management, the able statesmen who never conducted the State, the fine flower of the directing classes, who are steadily driving in a direction contrary to the one the nation is taking, always liberal when out of power under the Empire, reactionary when they have intrigued themselves transiently into power under the Republic, theoretical parliamentarians, practically defiant and distrustful of the elementary laws and principles of parliamentary polity. They are a class of persons of whom De Broglie is leader and type—of refined tastes and cultivated intellects in narrow natures; men of class and caste, and of a supreme conceit which no unlucky experience can lower, that they alone are peculiarly gifted and set apart as competent conductors of men: to whom applies with sad aptness that scripture to be read in Taine's admirable book on the *Ancien Régime*, "Never did conductors of men so misapprehend the art of guiding men—an art that consists in marching on the same road, but at the head, and in guiding their work by taking part in it."

Thanks to quite exceptionally "able" negotiations, management, intriguings of the leaders of this leading Orleanist group with the other groups of the Right, a general ticket was made out of candidates for the Senate of the Republic, on which not one name of an undoubtedly sincere Republican was inscribed. In course of the long drawn negotiations that preceded the final composition of this list, the Center Right negotiators had indeed proposed to the Left Center to insert a small proportion of the members of that group in the Conservative list, but on the sole condition that the Left Center should desert its old allies, the old Republicans of the two more advanced Republican conditional groups. This dishonorable condition was honorably rejected, and the uncommonly smart attempt of the peculiarly able reactionary politicians proved an utter failure. Meantime, they had brought most of the whilling Lavergne group into their coalition, and so late as the morning of last Thursday, when the balloting was to begin, a large if not complete success seemed extremely probable, well nigh assured.

The immediate result of that day's balloting was the choice of but two of the 75. Of these two, d'Audriffet-Pasquier, formerly Monarchist but long since frankly pronounced Constitutional Republican, being withal Speaker of the House, being on both tickets, ran in by a large majority; Mr. Martel, a quiet Conservative Republican, by a bare majority. Quite astonished was the "able" and sagacious political craftsman of the Right Center at this blow, yet he lost none of his conceit. But worse was to come. The Lefts, refusing to break their unity, had at first offered to the Center Right more than 30 names on their ticket. "All we ask," they said, "is that you do not demand of a part of us to desert and hostilely oppose a part of our Constitutional Republican own, and do not ask us to vote into seats in the Conservative Republican Senate such of our fellow deputies as not only resisted the passage of the Constitutional laws, but since the voting of the Constitution, remain undisguisedly if not openly its permanent enemies." This modest proposition, as I may have already said, was rejected by the combined Rights.

And now, after this first balloting on Thursday, the Lefts, always strong in unity, took new ground, not, mind you, for aggression, but in defense of a position, which De Broglian Buffetonian maneuverings had made narrower and less tenable than they, on taking it, had wished or meant it to be. Between Thursday afternoon and Saturday, the united Lefts crowded to the wall, in a hand-to-hand fight where the Orleanists had not so much as pretended to fight fairly, bargained for aid from a common enemy, *à la guerre comme à la guerre*. A bargain was struck with the extremists of the Extreme Right.

Whether this action of the pure, irreconcilable Legitimists was ordered or has since been sanctioned from Frohsdorff is an open question. That it has met with no disapprobation from that quarter seems certain. That the primary elementary provocation to it on the part of these pure Legitimists was the personal greed of a seat in the Senate than the gratification of an excusable spite against the Orleanists, is indisputable. That the consequences of the bargain thus far are of great practical benefit to Republicans, of intense chagrin to Orleanists, and consequently of great malicious pleasure to all other parties and the honest world at large, is exuberantly patent. Among the first notable consequences of this curious bargain of Republicans with a frankly royalist enemy against concealed, shuffling Orleanism, that has not the courage to wear its name on its cap, are these: Up to last night, when we had returns of the fifth day's balloting, 42 of the 75 immovables are seated in their future curule chairs. Of these not two are Orleanists, of these not one is Minister, and yet the De Broglian Orleanist ticket bore four of them on its list, Minister Buffet at the head of the list.

The central, high value to the student of current French history of the Assembly Senatorial electoral campaign is definitely and thus far this: It illustrates foreseen and now visible damnation of Orleanism, elimination of that weak, mischievous element from the conditions of the final solution of the French governmental question. This week's quarrel makes clearer and clearer than ever what has been for long years patent to all non-partisan, thoughtful observers of current French history, that the only question worth an honest Frenchman's serious consideration is whether he and his are to share in a democratic republican or be owned and administered by a democratic Imperial government.

W. H. H.

THE STATE OF TURKEY.

NATURE OF THE NEW DECREE.

DISTRUST OF THE CHRISTIANS—EXTENT OF THE CONCESSIONS MADE THEM—FINANCIAL EMBARRASSMENTS—THE NEW POSTAL SYSTEM.

CONSTANTINOPLE, Dec. 15.—The new "Hatti Hamayoun" or Imperial decree of reforms, intended to save the Empire from financial ruin and internal dissension, appeared to-day. The newsboys are apparently the only part of the population thoroughly convinced of the value of the document. For the rest, those who are not skeptical of any real intention on the part of the Government to reform, are bitterly hostile to any such purpose. The higher officers of Government regard the measure as one of policy, to be carried into effect just so far as outside pressure makes its execution needful, and to become a dead letter so soon as a lull abroad allows reform to be again safely deferred. The lower officials and educated middle class make no concealment of their amusement at the decree. They regard it as an idle tale. One said to me, "It is a new romance by the Sultan—doesn't it read well?" The common people, led by the priests, see in it, if carried out, the death-knell of Mussulman power. One of the latter class spoke of the new decree to a friend on the bridge yesterday and mournfully said, "This is the time spoken of by John in Revelations as the time when the Prophet's power shall be taken from him." This priest's view is certainly justified if the decree is carried into effect. The terror of it is absolutely revolutionary. The traditional policy of the Government is overturned by it, and the Christians are rescued from the hands of their Moslem persecutors completely. It promises that judges shall be required to decide according to law, and not according to the will of the Governor, and that Christians shall have the right to bequeath their property as they choose, without fear of seizure by the Government. It further states that Christians shall no longer be compelled to accept the Koran as law in suits with Moslems, nor shall they be expected to pay the military exemption tax except at the age of manhood. It is likewise ordered that they shall be allowed to construct churches and schools. In fact, if this decree means what it says, the Christians of Turkey are from to-day to be accounted as men and not as dogs by their rulers. One would expect under such circumstances great rejoicing and boundless gratitude to the Sultan for his liberality. But the most pitiable thing in the condition of Christians is that they have no faith in any real intention of justice on the part of their rulers. They have seen many proclamations of reform issued in the past 30 years, and they have seen these proclamations become of no account almost immediately. Hence they ridicule the glittering promises with which the Sultan seeks to please the European public. In a short time they will think no more of the decree, and will be surprised if any one of its promises is carried into effect.

Meantime the Government, by collecting taxes in advance, has accumulated sufficient money to pay the January coupons, and announces the fact with the feeling that the country is safe until July at least. But stocks do not recover buoyancy. The long silence of the three Emperors gives rise to a suspicion that they have not been able to agree upon the immediate partition of Turkey and will somehow keep her unbroken a few months longer. The knowledge, however, that the rule of the Sultans is near its limit kills rash speculation in favorite stocks.

The Sultan has lately seen fit, in spite of his poverty, to order another iron-clad. The fleet is a hobby with him, an expensive toy. He has splendid ships, but the crews are inefficient, and the commanders timid and incompetent.

Editors have a hard life here just now. A new edict makes each editor personally responsible for the truth of every item he prints. If he cannot prove the correctness of what he publishes his paper is suspended for three months.

Mr. Sendamore, the noticed ex-Assistant Postmaster-General of England, is laboring hard in the same capacity here to organize a Post-Office Department which shall be able to conduct business efficiently from the 1st of January, 1876. So far as the local postal system of Constantinople is concerned he has done well.

THE TWEED JURY.

CAN TALESMEN BE SUMMONED?—ARGUMENT BEFORE JUDGE WESTBROOK—MR. FIELD'S OFFER.

The argument of the question whether the ten jurors obtained from the struck jury panel in the smaller Tweed suit can be supplemented by jurors obtained from talesmen summoned by the Sheriff, or a substitute for the Sheriff directed by the Court, was argued at length yesterday before Judge Westbrook, in Supreme Court, Circuit, and took the whole working day. Mr. Peckham said he understood the defense to concede that the talesmen, if ordered, should be summoned by a Coroner. Mr. Field answered that he had not conceded this. Mr. Peckham said that he would include that in his motion, and would present an affidavit to the effect that the Sheriff, by reason of the defendant's escape, was so interested as to disqualify him.

Mr. Peckham then presented his argument for the ordering of talesmen, claiming that he had consulted other lawyers who had approved his course; that the English practice was entirely in favor of such a course, and that the New-York statutes were in its favor. The Revised Statutes bearing on the question were as follows:

Whenever a sufficient number of jurors duly drawn and summoned do not appear or cannot be obtained to form a jury, the Court may order the Sheriff to summon from the bystanders or from the county at large so many persons qualified to serve as jurors as shall be sufficient. If by reason * * * or for any other reason there shall not remain ballots undrawn, or if in consequence of jurors being set aside no juror can be obtained from the list of those returned by the Sheriff for the trial of any issue, the Court may, as in other cases, order the Sheriff or * * * some other person, to be appointed by the Court, to summon jurors from the bystanders or other persons, who * * *, shall be a competent jury for the trial of such issue, notwithstanding there may be none of the panel of jurors returned by the Sheriff upon such jury.

A statute of 1870, Mr. Peckham said, had been held to deprive the courts outside of New-York County of the right of summoning talesmen, but that expressly excepted the County of New-York. The question therefore was simply whether the act of 1847, relating expressly to New-York, and the act of 1861, and some other acts, had the same effect in relation to a special jury in New-York. Mr. Peckham argued at length that this was not their effect.

Mr. Field said:

The learned counsel in making this motion has thought it necessary to fortify himself with the opinions of other counsel. I think in that respect he has made a mistake. I don't think it necessary to fortify one's self with the opinion of other counsel, nor to look abroad for impulse to influence him in the discharge of his duties. I think we have altogether too much interference from outside with the administration of justice. I mean to do my duty as I regard it, and am bound to do it without dictation from any quarter, newspapers or anybody else, and I shall not call in the aid of any person upon that subject. And, while speaking upon that subject, let me say one of the newspapers—THE NEW-YORK TRIBUNE—is very solicitous where I get my fees. I will tell on one condition—that it shall tell me for what purpose one of its editors called on Tweed when he came from Blackwell's Island; and further, tell me whether that paper, by the bounty or indulgence of a gentleman whom it for years charged most grossly—and as I trust falsely—with having robbed a great public corporation of vast sums of money is not now sustained. Now, here is a fair offer. If they fully answer me these questions, I will answer them, and will be also prepared to give them at the same time information which my associate counsel have in their possession. If the Court shall come to the conclusion that it cannot add to this truncated jury, there is another struck jury to be got on Thursday. I say here that if the learned counsel will meet us half way we will agree on a struck jury, and that there shall be no challenge at all, except our peremptory challenges; in fact, that case should be the only one tried, as that involves all the issues in this case. Perhaps that can be done, at least I will give my efforts to have it done. I can imagine that if we sit down together we can get an impartial jury, not partisans on one side or the other—impartial citizens who will do justice. Mr. Field then argued that there could be no addition to the ten special jurymen, by talesmen or in any other manner whatever; that the English precedents did not apply, and that the American precedents were all against such a course. The course of the laws of this State was against it, and the reasoning which forbade a summons of talesmen in the rest of the State was cogent in reference to the laws affecting the city.

Judge Westbrook reserved his decision.

XLIVTH CONGRESS—1ST SESSION.

REGULAR REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS.

BILLS IN THE SENATE TO RECOVER OVER-ISSUES OF PACIFIC RAILROAD BONDS—MR. BOUTWELL PROPOSES THAT CONGRESSMEN MAY BE RECALLED AT ANY TIME—THE HOUSE REFUSES TO TAKE UP THE AMNESTY OR RESUMPTION REPEAL MEASURES—NO ACTION ON THE CENTENNIAL BILL.

SENATE....WASHINGTON, Jan. 17, 1876.

The CHAIR laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, inclosing the report of C. P. Patterson, Superintendent of the Coast Survey, showing the progress of work during the year ending June 30, 1875, accompanied by an engraved map, showing the condition of the work on the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts of the United States. Ordered printed.

Mr. MORTON (Rep., Ind.) gave notice that he would ask the Senate on Wednesday next to proceed to the consideration of the resolutions recently submitted by him in regard to the Mississippi election.

Mr. SHERMAN (Rep., Ohio), from the Committee on Finance, reported with amendments the Senate bill to amend the act granting a charter to the Freedman's Bank, and gave notice that he would call it up to-morrow. Placed on the calendar.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Rep., Vt.), from the Judiciary Committee, reported adversely on the Senate bill concerning the competency of witnesses in the Federal courts. Placed on the calendar at the request of Mr. INGALLS (Rep., Kan.) who introduced the bill.

Bills were offered and referred as follows:

By Mr. CONOVER (Rep., Fla.)—A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase the building known as the Freedman's Savings Bank, in Jacksonville, Fla., and to use the same for a Custom-house.

By Mr. BOOTH (Ind., Cal.)—A bill in relation to land heretofore granted to railroad companies.

By Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.)—A bill to amend the laws relating to the legal tender of silver coin.

Also, a bill to authorize San Francisco to use the Presidio Reservation as a park and highway.

By Mr. WEST (Rep., La.)—A bill to amend the acts to aid in the construction of a railroad and a telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, approved July 1, 1862, and July 2, 1874. Mr. West referred to the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Pacific Railroad case and the liability of the Government to lose not only the interest on the bonds issued to those companies, but the bonds also. Congress should step in and prevent such loss. It is evident that the loss involved will be $180,000,000, according to the companies' own estimate, and according to the basis of the Attorney-General. Computing interest, the amount will be $300,000,000. The companies admit their inability to pay the lesser amount. Mr. West asked that the bill be referred to the Committee on Railroads. It has nothing to do with the Southern Pacific.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said the Judiciary Committee has already been instructed to inquire into this subject.

Mr. WEST accepted the suggestion, and the bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. WEST also introduced a bill to recover from the Central and Union Pacific Railroad Companies the bonds and coupons issued to them in excess of the amount prescribed by law. There have been issued to the Central Pacific and Union Pacific Companies over $55,000,000, when the act of Congress specifically provided that no more than $50,000,000 should be given them. Not only have bonds been issued in excess of the amount authorized, but the Government has been paying interest on them.

Mr. MORRILL (Rep., Vt.) said he favored the bill, but did not desire to be committed to the idea to the effect that any amount recovered from these roads should be given to aid the Southern Pacific road. Referred.

By Mr. WEST (Rep., La.)—For the relief of the registry of the Circuit Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

By Mr. HITCHCOCK (Rep., Neb.)—To amend the charter of the Capitol, North Street and South Washington Railroad Company.

By Mr. SPENCER (Rep., Ala.)—To incorporate the Suburban Railroad Company of the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KELLY (Dem., Oregon), from the Committee on Railroads—The bill to extend the time for the completion of the Northern Pacific Railroad, with amendment. Ordered printed and recommitted.

By Mr. CAMERON (Rep., Penn.)—Petitions of citizens of Pennsylvania for aid to the Southern Pacific Railroad.

He also presented resolutions of the Pennsylvania Legislature instructing Representatives from that State to vote for an appropriation of $1,500,000 for the Centennial Exhibition.

Mr. HITCHCOCK (Rep., Neb.) introduced a bill to confirm certain school and bounty selections of public lands by the State of Nebraska.

Mr. STEVENSON (Ind., Ky.) introduced a bill authorizing the Harrison Harbor Company to excavate a channel and harbor in the Mississippi Sound, and to construct docks and breakwaters in connection therewith.

Mr. WRIGHT (Rep., Iowa) introduced a bill to amend the act granting pensions to the officers of the War of 1812.

Mr. BOUTWELL (Rep., Mass.) gave notice that on Friday next he would submit resolutions in regard to the life and services of the late Vice-President Wilson.

Mr. THURMAN (Dem., Ohio) introduced a bill to amend certain sections of title 48 and 52, for the regulation of commerce and navigation and the regulation of steam vessels, Revised Statutes, pages 809 and 857.

Petitions and bills were offered for improvements at Smyrna Dover Creek, N. Y.; Fox and Wisconsin Rivers, and St. John's River.

Mr. BOUTWELL (Rep., Mass.) presented the petition of citizens of Massachusetts, asking the passage of a law making every member of Congress directly responsible to the voters in his district, the majority of whom, if he does not meet their expectations or justify their confidence may at any time release him and appoint a successor.

Personal bills were presented by various Senators to remove the disability of Gen. P. T. Beauregard, and Daniel T. Chandler of Baltimore, and for the relief of Jacob A. Conover of Maryland, Jas. L. Dunning (late postmaster at Atlanta), John A. Torrey of Arkansas, Louisville Baptist Orphans' Home, Mary A. Thayer of Washington, John B. Barrett, James L. Porter, L. G. Mason, Robert Thompson, and Lewis D. Aiken.

Mr. WEST (Rep., La.) presented the petition of Wallerstein & Simonson, praying for the payment of $10,861 in gold, the claim for the expenses of the sale of the cars (opposed), seized by order of the United States, and converted into the Treasury by Gen. E. R. Baker. Referred.

Mr. SHERMAN (Rep., Ohio) submitted a concurrent resolution, proposing a common unit of money and accounts for the United States and Great Britain. Referred. The resolution requests the President to propose a treaty convention between the two countries, to establish the dollar as the money of account in both of them. It is to be represented by a coin inclosed or stamped gold, nine-tenths pure metal and one-tenth copper and silver alloy. Five of these new dollars are to be the equivalent of one pound sterling. Gold coins of various denominations conforming to this standard are to be issued, and be a legal tender within each country.

Mr. HAMLIN (Rep., Me.) called up the resolution of Mr. Edmunds, which provides that the joint rules of the last session shall be the joint rules for the present session, the question being on the amendment of Mr. Morton, to exclude the 22d joint rule, in relation to counting the vote for President and Vice-President.

Mr. BAYARD (Dem., Del.) said he did not see why a rule could not be prepared by a joint committee of the two houses of Congress.

The morning hour having expired, the Chair announced that the resolution would be laid over.

Mr. BOUTWELL (Rep., Mass.) said the officers of the Treasury are preparing a statement, in answer to the points made by the Senator Davis, on Thursday last, and it would not be ready for use until to-morrow. He hoped that the joint rules would be discussed to-day, and the resolution of Mr. Davis could be resumed to-morrow.

The joint rules resolutions were then taken up again, and were discussed by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (Rep., N. J.), Mr. THURMAN (Dem., Ohio), Mr. SHERMAN (Rep., Ohio), Mr. MORTON (Rep., Ind.), Mr. SAULSBURY (Dem., Del.), Mr. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.), Mr. MAXEY (Dem., Texas), and others.

Without action, the Senate, at 5:30 p. m., went into Executive session. At 4 o'clock the doors were reopened, and the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The SPEAKER proceeded to the call of States for bills for reference. The following were presented and referred:

By Mr. JOYCE (Rep., Vt.)—To repeal the stamp duties on medicines.

Also, to prevent the traffic in intoxicating liquors in the Centennial buildings.

By Mr. BANKS (Lib., Mass.)—For the removal of all political disabilities.

By Mr. STARKWEATHER (Rep., Conn.)—Prescribing a form of oath for members of Congress.

By Mr. WOOD (Dem., N. Y.)—To provide for the entry of single packages from bids of lading.

By Mr. COX (Dem., N. Y.)—Relating to the jurisdiction of United States District Courts.

By Mr. HEWITT (Dem., N. Y.)—For the protection and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States.

By Mr. CUTLER (Dem., N. J.)—Applying the proceeds of public lands to the support of free schools.

By Mr. O'NEIL (Rep., Penn.)—For an outfit and yearly allowance of clothing to the enlisted men and boys in the navy.

By Mr. PACKER (Rep., Penn.)—Resolutions of the Pennsylvania Legislature in reference to an appropriation of $1,500,000 for the centennial celebration.

By Mr. TOWNSEND (Rep., Penn.)—To repeal the act providing for the redistribution of national bank currency.

By Mr. JENKS (Dem., Penn.)—To reduce the salaries of all executive and legislative officers of the Government, except the army and navy, under $1,500, 20 per cent, and to fix the salary of the President at $25,000.

By Mr. RANDALL (Dem., Penn.)—Directing the discontinuance of the work on the streets in Washington, and to prevent the further use of certificates by the Board of Audit.

By Mr. HARRIS (Dem., Va.)—To repeal the act prohibiting the payment of debts due by the United States before the war except on proof of loyalty.

By Mr. SCALES (Dem., N. C.)—Granting pension to the soldiers of the Mexican war.

Also, to reduce the President's salary to $25,000.

AN ANTI-SECTARIAN AMENDMENT.

By Mr. O'BRIEN (Dem., Md.)—Proposing the following amendment to the Constitution, as an amendment to Mr. Blaine's proposition:

SECTION 1. No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and no minister or preacher of the Gospel, or of any religious creed or denomination, shall hold any office of trust or emolument under the United States, or under any State; nor shall any religious test be required as a qualification for any office or public trust in any State or under the United States.

SEC. 2. No money received by taxation in any State for the support of public schools, or derived from any public lands devoted thereto, shall ever be under the control of any religious sect. Nor shall any money be raised, nor lands so devoted, be divided between religious sects or denominations. Nor shall any minister or preacher of the Gospel, or of any religious creed or denomination, hold any office in connection with the public schools in any State, nor be eligible to any position of trust and emolument in connection with any institution, public or private, in any State, or under the United States, which shall be supported in whole or in part from any public fund.

By Mr. GIBSON (Dem., La.)—For an assay office in the New-Orleans Mint.

Also, for a commission to ascertain on what terms a mutually beneficial treaty of commerce with the Central American States can be arranged.

By Mr. MOREY (Rep., La.)—Appropriating $3,000,000 to repair and rebuild the levees of the Mississippi.

By Mr. WOODWORTH (Rep., Ohio)—To establish a bureau of transportation.

By Mr. HURD (Dem., Ohio)—To restore to gold and silver their monetary use in the United States from and after January, 1877, and to repeal the act for the resumption of specie payments.

A REFUSAL TO TAKE UP AMNESTY.

Mr. WHITE (Dem. Ky.) moved to suspend the rules and bring the House to a vote on the Amnesty bill introduced by him, and from the benefits of which Jefferson Davis is excluded, and also to vote on an amendment striking out that exception.

Mr. RANDALL made the point of order that the motion could not be put in that form. The question of order was discussed by Messrs. GARFIELD (Rep. Ohio), HALE (Rep. Me.), KASSON (Rep. Ia.), and BANKS (Lib. Mass.) against the point made by Mr. Randall; and by Messrs. WOOD (Dem. N. Y.) and by RANDALL in support of it. The decision of the Speaker was made in these words:

In the judgment of the Chair (without making any criticism on the form in which the motion is put) it is not competent for the Chair to exclude any part of the proposition from the consideration of the House. The desire and purpose of the gentleman from Kentucky is to introduce this bill for two purposes; first, that there shall be a vote on the proposed amendment; and second, that there shall be a vote on the bill itself. It is suggested that it is not competent for the gentleman to do that under a suspension of the rules; but in reply to that the Chair will state that the very purpose of a suspension of the rules is to get rid of all rules, and let the House run as freely as it pleases. The Chair overrules the point of order and holds the motion in order.

Mr. WHITE asked unanimous consent to make a statement before the vote should be taken, but objection was made by several Democratic members.

The House then proceeded to vote on the motion to suspend the rules, and the motion was lost by Yeas, 105; Nays, 110; so, two-thirds not voting in the affirmative, the rules were not suspended. A large number of Democrats voted with the Republicans in favor of the motion, but the more prominent of them voted against it.

Mr. HOLMAN (Dem., Ind.) moved to suspend the rules and adopt a resolution declaring it unwise and inexpedient at this time that a specific and arbitrary period should be prescribed by law at which the legal-tender notes of the United States should be paid in coin by the Secretary of the Treasury; and that therefore the act to provide for the resumption of specic payments should be repealed, and that the Committee on Banking and Currency, at as early a period as practicable, report to the House a bill for that purpose.

The rules were not suspended—Yeas, 112; Nays, 153. The following is the vote in detail:

YEAS.

Ainsworth,	Dobbins,	Hone,	Robinson,
ANDERSON,	Douglass,	Hunton,	Sawyer,
Ashe,	Durham,	Jorkey,	Shapley,
Atkins,	Eldridge,	Jones (Ky.),	Scales,
Bagby, Jr.,	Egbert,	Kelley,	Shakkley,
Blackburn,	Faulkner,	Knott,	Siemons,
Bland,	Felton,	Landers (Ind.),	Smith (Ga.),
Blount,	Finney,	Leake,	Southard,
Bonne,	Franklin,	Mackey (Penn.),	Speer,
Bradford,	Fuller,	McArthur,	Springer,
Bright,	Gunter,	McDonald,	Stenger,
Brown (Ky.),	Harris,	McJunkin,	STEVENSON,
Buckner,	Goode,	Milliken,	Stone,
Cassidy,	Goodin,	Morgan,	Terry,
Caldwell (Ala.),	Gunter,	Neece,	Tucker,
Caldwell (Tenn.),	Hamilton (Ind.),	Neer,	Turney,
CAMPBELL,	Harris (Va.),	Oliver,	Wilson (Ohio),
Carson,	Harris (Va.),	Phelps,	Fain (N. C.),
Cate,	Harrison,	Phillips (Mo.),	Waddell,
Clark (Ky.),	Hatcher,	Phillips (Kan.),	Walker (Va.),
Clark (Mo.),	Hatcher,	Piper,	Walling,
Clymer,	Hubbard,	Pappleton,	Waithorne,
Cochrane,	Hagans,	Rice,	Williams (Ind.),
Collins,	Hereford,	Reagan,	Williams (Ala.),
Cook,	Herndon (Ala.),	Reed,	Wilson (W. Va.),
Crounse,	Hill,	Robbins (N. C.),	Yeates,
Davis,	Hallman,	Roberts,	Young—112.
Dibrell,	Hopkins,		

NAYS.

Adams,	Foster,	Maxson,	Smith (Penn.),
BAILEY,	Freeman,	Mash,	Strait,
Bagby, G. A.,	Frost,	MacDougall,	Starkweather,
Baker (Ind.),	Fort,	McCrary,	Stowell,
Baker (N. Y.),	Garfield,	McBill,	Turner,
Bolen,	Gibson,	Mead,	Thompson,
BANKS,	Hale,	Merrill,	Thomas,
Bass,	Hamilton (N. J.),	Miller,	Thornburgh,
Beebe,	Hancock,	Mills,	Tarbuckneed,
Bell,	Hamilton,	Money,	Townsend (N. Y.)
Blaine,	Hartridge,	Monroe,	Townsend (Pa),
Blair,	Harris (Mass.)	Morrison,	Tufts,
BLISS,	Hutson,	Mutzler,	Van Voorhes,
Bradley,	Headoe,	Norton,	Waldron,
Brown (Kan.),	Henderson,	O'Brien,	Walker (N. Y.)
Burchard (Ill.),	Hooker,	O'Neill,	Wilkes (N. C.)
Buckner (Wis.),	Hewitt (N. Y.),	O'Neill,	Wallace (Penn.)
Burleigh,	Hoar,	Parker,	Walls,
Cameron,	Hays,	Page,	Welch,
Cushman,	Hooker,	Parsons,	Ward,
Cassidy,	Hoskins,	Pages,	Warren,
Conwell,	Hazelton,	Pierce,	Rob (Mo.)
CHITTENDEN,	Hunter,	Platt,	Wright (Miss.),
Congdon,	Harris,	Plaisted,	Wheeler,
Cooper,	Herman,	Potter,	WHITEHOUSE,
Cox,	Jones (N. H.),	Powell,	Whiting,
Crapo,	Joyce,	Pratt,	White,
Cannon,	Kasson,	Ramey,	Wiggington,
Conger,	Kerr,	Randall,	Willard,
Darrall,	Ketcham,	Rogers,	Williams (Mass.),
Banford,	Kelly,	Robbins (Pa.),	Williams (Mich.),
Davis,	Lamar,	Rice (N. J.),	Williams (Wis.)
Denison,	Landers (Ct.),	Ross (Penn.),	Williams (Del.)
Donnell,	Lowe,	Rusk,	Williams (M'h.),
Durand,	Lapham,	Sampson,	Wilson (Ia.),
Eames,	Lawrence,	Scofield,	Wood (Penn.),
Kelso,	Leavenworth,	Sapp,	Wood (N. Y.),
Ely,	Lee,	Sheppard,	Woolborn,
Farwell,	Luttrell,	Sonnelson,	Woodworth,
Ferri,	Lynch,	Swann,	—158.

Mr. COX (Dem., N. Y.), from the Committee on Rules, reported back the proposition (introduced some weeks since by Mr. Holman) of Indiana to amend the rule governing the offering of amendments to general appropriation bills, so as to make the rule read: "No appropriation shall be reported in such general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, except in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress; and any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto, changing existing laws, to be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditure."

A long discussion ensued upon the proposed change, which was opposed on the Republican side by Messrs. Banks, Garfield, Hale, and Kasson, on the plea that it would enable the Committee on Appropriations to control practically all the departments of the Government, and was defended on the Democratic side by Messrs. Cox, Holman, and Randall on the plea that it was in the interest of economy, that it only placed propositions for retrenchment and reform in the same footing as propositions to increase, and that it gave no additional power to the Committee on Appropriations, inasmuch as its action would be only recommendatory. In the course of the discussion, Mr. Randall, having spoken of the desire of the Committee on Appropriations to place into the way of retrenchment, was told by Mr. Banks that "we (the Republicans) will push you into it, even to the extent of cutting down the salaries of members," to which Mr. Randall replied that "we (the Democrats) will come to that at the proper time."

The new rule was adopted—Yeas, 156; Nays, 102, nearly a party vote.

Bills were introduced by various members for the improvement of Yorgumes Creek, Oliver Creek, certain rivers and harbors in the 1st Congressional District of Virginia, Fremont Broad River, North Carolina, and Bayou La Fourche, Louisiana.

Bills were also offered for improvements to the public property at Sackett's Harbor, N. Y.; a bridge over the Potomac at the Falls of Seneca; public buildings at Jersey City, N. J.; Danville, Va.; Beaufort, S. C., and at Baltimore.

THE CENTENNIAL BILL.

The House at 4 o'clock went into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Wood of New-York in the chair, on the bill appropriating $1,500,000 for the Centennial. The bill provides that the amount shall be paid, one-third immediately after the passage of the act, and the remainder in four equal monthly payments, provided that in the distribution of any moneys that may remain in the treasury of the Centennial Board after the payment of its debt, the appropriation shall share equally with the holders of Centennial stock, and a due percentage thereof shall be paid to the United States as to the stockholders, but the United States Government shall under no circumstances be liable to any debt or obligation of the Centennial Commissioners or for any additional payment.

Mr. HARDENBERGH (Dem., N. J.) spoke in favor of the bill. He believed that the Centennial would announce an era of prosperity, give confidence to the people, revive industry, and spread to the winds of every sea the sails of American commerce.

At the close of Mr. Hardenbergh's speech the Committee rose without any action on the bill.

Mr. MORRISON (Dem., Ills.) offered a resolution, calling on the President for copies of all correspondence with Spain in reference to the island of Cuba. Adopted.

Mr. WOOD (Dem., N. Y.) offered a resolution instructing the Committee of Ways and Means to inquire whether the lease from the United States to the Alaska Commercial Company of the right to take fur seals in Alaska was made and executed in pursuance of law and for the best advantage of the United States; also, whether the interests of the United States have been properly protected, and whether the Alaska Commercial Company has complied with its terms and conditions. Adopted.

Mr. WOOD also offered a resolution instructing the Committee on Military Affairs to inquire whether, since the close of the rebellion, any army officer on the active list has held or exercised the functions of a civil officer, either in the diplomatic or consular service, or in carrying on any negotiations or arrangements with any foreign government or people, or as clerk or secretary of the President, or to perform any civil duties. Adopted.

Mr. HENDEE (Rep., Vt.) introduced a bill for the printing of speeches delivered in Congress in the language in which they are delivered. Referred.

Mr. NEW (Dem., Ind.) introduced a constitutional amendment to limit the Presidential term to four years. Referred.

The House then at 4:30 o'clock adjourned.

NOMINATIONS.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 17.—The President sent the following nominations to the Senate to-day:

George S. Bangs of Illinois, to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States at Chicago; Wm. C. Ebert, to be Pension Agent at Hannibal, Mo.; R. G. Mitchell, to be Register of the Land Office at Duluth, Minn.; H. W. Parker, to be Register of the Land Office at Beatrice, Neb.

Postmasters—Miss Lucy White, at Newton Centre, Mass.; C. M. Moore, at New Castle, Ind.; Albert J. West, at Shenandoah, Iowa; Charles M. White, at Evanston, Wyoming.

PREPARATIONS FOR POLICE IMPROVEMENT.

Several of the committees of the Police Board were in private session yesterday at the Police Central Office, laying out the work for the meeting of the Board to-day. The Committee on Rules and Discipline, it is understood, discussed the transfer of five captains. It is reported that the rules are to be amended, so that whenever a captain leaves the Police Station he shall leave information as to where he is going, so that he may be found easily when wanted. It is reported also that there are to be several changes in the clerical force of the department. Commissioners Wheeler and Erhardt, it is said, claim a portion of the patronage. Chief Clerk Hawley has nearly completed the work of revising the Manual, and hopes to have the new rules and regulations issued before the end of February. Commissioner Voorhis has received full reports of the condition of the streets throughout the city. It is also understood that the detective force is to be reorganized.

THE COURTS.

THE COMMISSIONER OF JURORS.

ARGUMENTS OF OAKEY HALL AND WM. M. EVARTS.

The question of the rightful occupancy of the office of Commissioner of Jurors, whether by Douglass Taylor under the law of 1847 and his appointment in 1864, or by Thomas Dunlap under the charter of 1873 and his appointment by Mayor Wickham in the Summer of 1875, was argued at length before the Supreme Court General Term yesterday. A. Oakey Hall appeared for Mr. Taylor, and claimed that the office of summoning jurors was inherently a county office; that it had always belonged to Sheriffs in England, and in this State to Sheriffs or Supervisors, both county officers, though at times in this city certain city officers had been made *ex officio* to do the duties of jury officers. All these local references