

Published every morning, except on Sundays and public holidays, at the office of the proprietor, No. 111 Broadway, New York.

THE DAILY HERALD.—Three editions, 2 cents per copy—27 per annum. The Morning Edition is published at 3 o'clock, P. M., and distributed before breakfast; the First Edition is published at 6 o'clock, P. M., and distributed at 10 o'clock, P. M.; the Second Edition is published at 10 o'clock, P. M., and distributed at 12 o'clock, P. M.

THE MORALS OF OFFICE BIDDING.—Colonel Webb as a Christian and a Lover.—Our friend and colleague, Webb, who is still in the gall of bitterness at the city of Washington, has been endeavoring to relieve the tedium of his sojourn here by writing a very amusing and characteristic account of the interview between the President and General Scott. We give this morning a place on the first page of our journal to-day, together with another account of the same exciting occurrence by another penname, as we have described by the Courier, in contradiction to Colonel Webb, as being a "perfectly reliable and responsible person."

It will be perceived that these two narratives differ considerably, and are in fact quite contradictory. The public, however, have had abundant opportunities of obtaining that knowledge which will qualify them to decide on the relative degree of credit which should be given to Colonel Webb and any "perfectly responsible and reliable person." Whatever may be the veracity of the "perfectly responsible and reliable person," there can be no doubt at all that in point of graphic power and dramatic effect, the narrative of Colonel Webb is infinitely superior. Webb is emphatic, piquant, eloquent, pathetic. The "perfectly responsible and reliable person" is dry, circumstantial, curt, peevish. Webb brings up the whole scene vividly before us, and describes it with a touch of classic enthusiasm. In sooth, he waxes poetical. He almost equals old Homer in the grandeur of his account of the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon. Very dull and tame, in comparison, is the prosaic account given by the "perfectly responsible and reliable person." Besides, our interest in Colonel Webb's narrative is heightened by the fact that our devout friend was himself at church on this memorable occasion! There is something extremely affecting in this spectacle of pious office-bearers reciting in unison the solemn ritual of the church! How delightful, after the anxious labors of the week, thus to meet together, and breathe the pure atmosphere of the house of prayer! What an edifying scene! We almost fancy we hear the deep, sonorous voice of the devout Colonel, as he makes his responses; while at a little distance the stalwart form of General Scott is meekly bent in humble adoration. Beggars, of every rank and degree of voracity, stand around; and, with one eye fixed on the book and the other on Zachary Taylor, all sing out "Amen!"

While extremely gratified by this discovery of the pious habits of our ancient friend, the Colonel, we must say, that we have been somewhat surprised and grieved, to find him manifest a spirit so evidently unkind and hostile towards the distinguished man, for whom he formerly expressed the sincerest admiration and esteem. It is well known that General Scott was not very long since, the great political idol of the redoubtable Colonel Webb. We all recollect with what zeal and warmth the Colonel was accustomed to press the claims of Winfield Scott to the highest political station in the country. A change, however, has come over the spirit of the devout Colonel's dream. His love has waxed cold, and with all the faithfulness of an inconstant village swain, he abuses where he formerly adored. But the Colonel is too susceptible and too tender to be without an object for his fond heart's affection. His sighs are now wafted in another direction; and so ardent is this new flame, that our enamoured Colonel finds himself even at the holy altar, the victim of a struggle, almost as fierce as that which rent the heart of the sainted Eloise. Even in the temple, Colonel Webb cannot repress his love for General Taylor; and hurries from his sacred portals to offer up fresh incense to his earthly shrine! Can such enthusiastic and consuming devotion go unrewarded?

WHY NEWSPAPERS AT WASHINGTON.—A desperate and quite amusing struggle has of course taken place at Washington, among the whig printers and editors, in order to secure the organization. Thus far, the National Intelligencer appears to be successful in this scramble for provender. Its years and necessities certainly presented a strong case for the exercise of executive charity. Gales and Seaton have probably received, from first to last, one million and a half of dollars, in the shape of profits out of the public printing, and the other "pickings and stealings" which fall to the lot of Washington "organs." Yet, somehow or other, these dollars have taken unto themselves wings; and now, in the autumn of life, the venerable editors have been obliged once more to appear in the character of humble supplicants for executive bounty. They deserve it. The whigs in Congress owe them a heavy debt of gratitude—that is, if excellent suppers and tolerable wines utility benevolent human emotions. Gales and Seaton have been casting their canvass-back ducks and devilled turkey on the waters, for several years past; and it would be devilish hard if they did not now realize the practical fruits of their faith, hope, and charity. Last session they made a good many desirable thousands by publishing the dull speeches of Senators at the rate of "fifteen dollars a column"; and by a resolution passed near the adjournment, they will be able to clear at least one hundred thousand dollars. Who would't give suppers to members of Congress? Thus graciously doth grateful whiggery gild the declining years of its ancient friends of the Intelligencer—so waggishly entitled, as if to render still more marked the folly of looking for any news in its heavy columns of dulness and decency.

Another newspaper candidate for the drippings of executive favor, is about to make its appearance from the press of a Mr. Gideon, an old job printer at Washington, who, after much prayerful cogitation and anxious inquiries, has at length determined to put in his oar, and trust to Providence and General Taylor. A York lawyer, named Sargent, and Mr. Bullitt, late of New Orleans, are to be the editors of this new sheet. Mr. Gideon has secured a share of the government advertising, and hopes by strict economy and the most tractable disposition, to merit a due share of patronage. We fear, however, that his ancient rivals of the Intelligencer, from their superior knowledge of Congressmen and cooking, will reduce him to the condition of Lazarus, and leave him nothing but 'the crumbs that fall from the table. Peradventure, with that, the job printer will fare as content.

Then there is the National Flag, which has maintained a versatile existence, in some mysterious manner, for nearly a twelvemonth, and still lingers between life and death. This print appears to be quite overlooked by the administration. We commend it to their mercy. It gave, the other day, an excellent evidence of its qualifications for organship, by representing one of our graphic despatches from Washington as a gross fabrication. We hope it has not taken a leaf from the book of old Father Richie, whose truth and reliability were so notorious in the days of Polk, that his most solemn asseverations were always interpreted according to the rule of Rory O'More—

"Dhrames always go by contraries, my dear."

Alas! alas! however, for all Washington "organs." Their day is gone. Miserable dependents on the patronage of the government—without energy, enterprise or talent—not even used judiciously by those who lead them—without circulation or influence at home or abroad, they are, so far as public opinion is concerned, merely so much waste paper, predestined, like the pamphlet speeches of members, with which the mails are loaded, to the appropriate immortality of the grocers' shops. Who ever reads a Washington newspaper?

BARBUBENERS' MAJORITY CONVENTION.—By reference to the column of local intelligence, it will be seen that the manufacturers met in convention last evening, and nominated Myndert Van Schaick as their candidate for Mayor.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THEATICAL AND MUSICAL. BOWERY THEATRE.—The house was crowded in every part last evening, at a very early hour, by one of the most brilliant and fashionable audiences every collected together in this house and the utmost enthusiasm prevailed among them, as the performance was of that interesting nature which always characterizes the dramas of the Bowery Theatre. The tragedy of "Evadne" was the first piece—Miss Wemyss playing Evadne in a most admirable style, and Miss Clark, as the Queen, in a most admirable way. The performance was for the benefit of Miss Wemyss, and we were glad to see such a large audience. The admirable adaptation of "Jane Eyre" has long been celebrated for the splendid style in which such pieces are got up at the Bowery Theatre, and when Bulwer was at his zenith as an author, his magnificent adaptations of his novels used to be produced here—Rosalind and The Days of Pompeii! These are the two pieces which, in the instance, what immense success they all met with! Now, at the present date, we find the Bowery still foremost in the field, and last night, "Jane Eyre" shows that the manager is as ready as ever to give his audience the most liberal entertainment. We have already expressed our opinion as to what points of the story; and the very excellent manner in which the play was acted, and the very fine costumes, give it all the color which it deserves. We have never seen a piece go off more successfully than it did last night, and we think it will be a most successful performance, and it will not doubt retain possession of its stage, and be seen by the thousands of readers of the paper, nor many nights to come. It will be played this evening, at the Bowery Theatre, and the "Last Days of Pompeii." We see an engagement with Mr. Van Amburgh, the famous lion tamer, has been effected. He will appear for the first time at the Bowery Theatre.

THEATICAL AND MUSICAL. BOWERY THEATRE.—The "Enchantress" was again performed last night, for the third time, and before a large audience. The superb magnificence of scenery, dresses, properties, and decorations, (far superior to those of the splendid "Monte Cristo") and will be, for a long time, a great attraction to the noble temple of the muse, of Broadway. No doubt the opera of Balfe will have a long and prosperous run, and the "Lionel Lincoln" will be a most successful performance, and it will not doubt retain possession of its stage, and be seen by the thousands of readers of the paper, nor many nights to come. It will be played this evening, at the Bowery Theatre, and the "Last Days of Pompeii." We see an engagement with Mr. Van Amburgh, the famous lion tamer, has been effected. He will appear for the first time at the Bowery Theatre.

FAIR PLAY IS A JEWEL.—This is a true saying; but nevertheless it is a truthful and philosophical one. Complaints have reached us that the serving on petit juries presses with unequal severity upon the humble tradesman and the working man, inasmuch as they are obliged to serve for the whole or the greater part of the term, or to attend the court day after day, in obedience to the fiat of the proper officer, while the richer, and therefore the more favored, are not called upon to perform the duties of jurors in their turn. Now, if this be true, it is a most unjust proceeding. To tax the whole of the time of those who have nothing to depend upon for the support of their families, save their daily labor, and to overlook the "prosperous storekeeper in Broadway," is at variance with every received principle of justice and equity. The office of a juror is a most responsible and solemn one, and, therefore, it should not be subjected to any disregard by unfairness or partiality in selecting those by whom it is to be discharged. If the poor man have reason to believe that he is unjustly obliged to give up his time (and this is his money) to the public service, while those who have large capital and extensive business to fall back upon, are but seldom summoned to the jury box, he will become careless about the mode in which he executes the great trust confided to him by the constitution; the duty becomes irksome and burdensome to him—the governing feeling being a desire to dispense of the case under consideration as expeditiously as possible. In this way, the innocent may be convicted, and the guilty may escape well-merited punishment. We attach no blame to any person; and it will be perceived that we have based these remarks upon an hypothesis. If, however, the complaint in question be well founded, we hope it will be, as indeed it ought to be, redressed.

BATHING.—The salutary effects and wholesome influence upon the public health, of the frequent use of the bath, especially by the inhabitants of crowded cities, such as New York, has been universally acknowledged and frequently inculcated. All nations distinguished for good government and well ordered domestic polity, have been especially careful in making provision for this very important department of sanitary regulation. We believe our city is not far behind the great cities of Europe in every convenience of this kind, and in providing, at a very cheap rate, the means of daily ablation to the inhabitants. There are many establishments in this city, where baths may be had at the low charge of one shilling—that is, about sixpence sterling. At Paris, it costs twice as much for a warm bath; at London nearly four times as much; so that we are highly favored in this respect with such a great accommodation. But while there is no lack on all sides of water and soap, and the means of applying them; while the rapid streams of the North and East rivers wash the shores of our city, and the healthful tide sweeps around us, affording every desirable means of frequent ablation, we are inclined to the belief that our people and citizens generally are not sufficiently awake to the importance of the practice of frequent bathing, and that the public baths, cheaply as their valuable accommodation is afforded, are not sufficiently patronized nor resorted to. In this respect, perhaps, we are in the situation of the shoemaker's wife, who, as the proverb has it, is generally worse shod than her neighbors, in the midst of a large stock of shoes. Perhaps, if we could not get at water, and if there were not baths to be had, we should be crying out loudly for a supply, and earnestly longing after what we are disposed to undervalue when within our reach. We wish it were in our power to arouse the community to a proper sense and due appreciation of the value and necessity of frequent bathing. It would save a great deal of physic to families and individuals, if attention to this department of human necessity were more regularly devoted by the public. As the summer will now soon be upon us, this subject will begin to acquire more interest and importance, and we hope to see a reformation in our manners, in this respect, take place more generally and universally. Meantime, all we can do is to recommend earnestly a more frequent attention to a practice on which the health of our citizens and of our city so much depends. Among eastern nations they make frequent bathing an article of religion, and a necessary act of religious duty; and in fact it does appear to us, that if our people were to plunge into the water as often and as regularly as they go to church, it would do them more good, both physically and morally; for no bad doctrine could be imbibed in the water, and many bad things would be washed away which one stands in danger of catching at public meetings.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.

THE CABINET ON PROSCRIPTION.—Several of the whig journals interested in obtaining a wholesale removal of their political opponents from office, have followed the lead of a small whig paper in Washington, in questioning the truth of certain statements that appeared, some days ago, in this paper, in relation to the decision of the cabinet on the subject of proscription. We reiterate the statements, without the smallest reservation. The facts, as given in our correspondent's despatch, took place literally and entirely as he described them, and we venture to say there will be no authorized contradiction of them. However distasteful to Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer it may be, to be known to be in a minority in the cabinet; and however much the wise, mainly, and liberal policy revolved upon by the majority, may grate upon the feelings of office-seekers, yet the facts cannot be changed; and these facts are, that on the night designated in the despatch in question, the subject of proscription was voted on by the cabinet, and that against it were the President, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Prentiss, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Johnson; and in favor of it were Mr. Ewing and Mr. Collamer.