THE NEW YORK HERALD.

WHOLE NO. 6686. MORNING EDITION—FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1854. PRICE TWO CENTS.

AFFAIRS IN WASHINGTON.

Debate on the Nebraska Bill in the House.

OPINIONS OF THE RECENT STATE ELECTIONS.

Proposed Rewards and Punishments in the Navy.

HIGHLY INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE.

Views on Public Matters Generally, &c., &c., &c.

THIRTY-THIRD CONGRESS.
SECOND SESSION.

Senate.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 14, 1854.

RELIEF FOR DR. KANE.

Mr. Fish, (whig) of N. Y., presented the memorial of the Chamber of Commerce, New York, praying for an expedition for the relief of Dr. Kane and his party in the Northern seas. Referred.

BILLS PASSED.

Mr. Stuart, (dem.) of Mich., reported a bill increasing the commission of Registers and Receivers of Public Lands under the Graduation act of last session. Passed.

Mr. Dodge, (dem.) of Iowa, reported the House bill allowing further time to those holding Virginia military lands in Ohio to have the same surveyed and patented. Passed.

MARINE HOSPITAL AT GALENA, ILL.

Mr. Shields, (dem.) of Ill., introduced a bill providing for a marine hospital at Galena, Ill.

THE NEW ORLEANS CUSTOM HOUSE.

The House joint resolution modifying the original plan of the custom house at New Orleans, was agreed to.

A few unimportant bills were passed.

ADJOURNMENT TILL MONDAY.

It was ordered that when the Senate adjourn it be till Monday.

THE HOSPITAL TAX ON MERCHANT SEAMEN.

Mr. Sumner, (free soil) of Mass., offered a resolution directing that inquiry be made as to the expediency of abolishing the tax on merchant seamen, known as "hospital money," and of allowing them the use of hospitals free of all tax. Adopted.

After some unimportant business the Senate adjourned.

House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 14, 1854.

EXPEDITION IN SEARCH OF DR. KANE.

Mr. Wheeler, (dem.) of N. Y., presented a memorial from the New York Chamber of Commerce, asking Congress to send an expedition in search of Dr Cane to the Arctic regions. Read, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

LIGHTHOUSE AT CAPE RACE.

Mr. Cutting, (dem.) of N. Y., introduced a joint resolution, authorizing the President to adopt measures to procure the erection of a first class lighthouse at Cape Race.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, and took up

THE INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL—SPIRITED DEBATE ON THE KANSAS NEBRASKA QUESTION.

Mr. Stephens, (whig) of Ga., said it was not his purpose to re open discussion on the merits of the Nebraska-Kansas bill, but as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Mace,) yesterday came forward and formally denounced what he supposed to be the objects of those who supported that measure, he deemed it his duty to reply to him. He considered the question settled then and now Revolutionists never move backwards. The passage o that bill was a grand step in progress. He did not agree with Mr. Mace that the result of the late elections in the North demand repeal. True, those results astonished him, and were surprising to men both in and out of power; but he asked the gentleman from Indiana how he had drawn his inference that they had set the seal of condemnation on the friends of the great popular movement of last session. Those elections had nothing to do with the Nebraska bill. In proof of this he referred to the fact that from Pennsylvania men who voted for and against it, were returned to the next Congress, and others of the latter class, including Mr. Chandler, were defeated. The anti-Nebraska candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania was elected by 37,000 majority, while the candidate for Canal Commissioner, entertaining a contrary view, received a majority of 100,000. Look, too, at Massachusetts, where gentlemen who voted against the bill were left at home, falling by the Destroying Angel, who was not seen in the night. He took Illinois as the test where the issue was distinctly made. There were but three members of Congress who voted for the bill, but the people have returned four. This shows that the measure is popular there.

Mr. Washburne, (whig,) of Ill., inquired what was the popular vote for Congressmen?

Mr. Stephens said the Nebraska candidate for State Treasurer was elected by a majority of 3,000.

Mr. Washburne corrected his friend, saying that Mr. Moore's majority was 1,800, and that Mr. Miller, who ran against him, was not known as a candidate in the southern part of the State, and was not voted for there. (Laughter.) If Mr. Miller had received his party vote in that section he would have been elected by five or six thousand majority.

Mr. Stephens—Am I to understand that the anti-Nebraska candidate would have received that majority if he had only been known? (Laughter.)

Mr. Washburne—A candidate was regularly nominated, but declined, and another was brought out just before the election.

Mr. Stephens—It shows he ran before the popular demonstration got hold of him. He must have seen the "handwriting on the wall." (Laughter.)

Mr. Richardson, (dem.) of Ill.—My colleague speaks of his candidate being defeated because he was not known. The facts are against my colleague. True, he got but a few votes, but was voted for in all the counties; and this shows it was known he was a candidate. The first candidate, who declined, was nominated as a republican and fusion candidate; and I hesitate not to declare it he had remained such he would have been defeated by ten thousand votes. The last candidate was a sound radical whig, voted for by his own party, and sought to be run by the fusionists.

Mr. Stephens resumed—The popular vote in Illinois was for sustaining the bill, and that was his point. Take New York—and if any State was particularly unsound it was this—and after all the meetings at the Tabernacle and Syracuse, and efforts of the emigration societies organized to rule the freemen of Kansas, Clark did not receive more than one-third of the popular vote. Take New Jersey, Indiana and other States, and, either separately or together, the election went for nothing, so far as this Nebraska question is concerned. Some said the Know Nothings had effected the wonderful results others the anti-Nebraskaites. He was inclined to think with the North Carolina men, who gave the best explanation. He said those malcontents who had been disappointed in obtaining office, and others who thought it was improper to send Soule and Belmont abroad, had made the elections go as they did; and, further, if any party was entitled to the credit, it was the "ramshackles," who seem to be carrying the country. (Excessive laughter.) He continued, further replying to Mr. Mace, by saying that the first question which addressed itself to his mind was, Was it right? No Southern measure has ever been vetoed, for the reason that the South has never asked for anything calling for a veto. They ask for nothing but what is right, and they submitted to nothing that was wrong. They had never asked that slavery should be extended, but they insist that the people in every community and Territory, when they form their own institutions, shall do as they please. This is republican, national, and American doctrine. He defended Southern institutions, showing the prosperity, especially, of Georgia.

Mr. Campbell, (free soil) of Ohio, noticed the remark of Mr. Stephens that the South never asked anything in the way of appropriations from government. He would remind the gentleman that in 1803 we gave twenty millions of dollars for Louisiana, in 1819 fifteen millions for Florida, and it was not merely money given from the common treasury for the purchase of the territory, but to extend the area of slavery. After the annexation of Texas war broke out, and the North poured forth on the battle fields of Mexico her purest and best blood. Had the gentleman forgotten so soon that, but a few months ago, a bill was hurried through the House, in the dark, as it were, appropriating ten millions for the purchase of the Mesilla Valley? Nothing obtained for the South, forsooth! Was it not known that the South is still grasping after ten millions more, with the view of acquiring Cuba? The gentleman of Georgia did not see in the recent elections any demonstrations against the principles of the Nebraska bill. But was not an opponent of that measure elected in the place of Mr. Chandler and the gentleman representing the Lancaster district of Pennsylvania? He might allude to all the States where elections have been held. As to New York, thirty-two of the thirty-three members elected are opposed to the repeal of the Missouri compromise—the views of the other are not yet known. He could speak of Michigan from personal knowledge. People there rose in their majesty and elected a Governor opposed to the repeal of the Missouri compromise. He inquired of Mr. Stephens if he believed there was a constitutional power to exclude slavery from the Territories; in other words, had Congress the power to pass the eighth section of the Missouri compromise?

Mr. Stephens replied—The gentleman must know this was a question he had never argued here or before his constituents. In his opinion the government of the Territory was not derived from the constitution, but it devolves on the general government as a sort of revolving power. But while the government of a Territory devolves on Congress, any such exercise of power as that to which the gentleman alluded was an abuse of power tantamount to usurpation.

Mr. Campbell wished the gentleman to answer "yes" or "no" Has Congress the power to exclude slavery everywhere?

Mr. Stephens—If Congress pass such a bill it would be usurpation, just as much as was the taking of these colonies, and as Lord Chatham said, he "would resist it."

Mr. Campbell—That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. Stephens—It is my answer to the gentleman.

Mr. Campbell said that he should assume for the gentleman that Congress has the power, and that it resolves, in the gentleman's judgment, into mere matter of expediency. He proceeded to review Mr. Stephens' course on the bill for the admission of California, and other matters, and asked several question of the gentleman.

Mr. Stephens—I will reply, as I understand the gentleman is a candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. Campbell—The gentleman mistakes; I am a candidate for no office, and I was sent here against my personal desires for the purpose of exposing the inconsistencies of that gentleman and others.

Mr. Stephens—The gentleman will find the labor will not pay, if he undertakes to expose inconsistencies.

Mr. Campbell referred to Mr. Stephens' vote in 1845 on the Texas annexation resolutions, which excluded slavery from some portion of the Territory hereafter to "sworn to support the constitution of the country." be formed into States. Why did he vote to take away from the people in that Territory the right to establish their own institutions in their own way? He declared the people of a sovereign State shall not do it.

Mr. Stephens—Did I ever say it was in violation of the constitution to give such a vote?

Mr. Campbell—The gentleman does not say anything on that point. I tried to get him to put himself on the record. I ask him whether Congress has power to exclude slavery from the Territories?

Mr. Stephens (in a feigned voice, contemptuously)—If the gentleman has not got me to say so, where are my inconsistencies? (Laughter)

Mr. Campbell (in like manner)—His inconsistencies are marked by his declaration here to-day. He is for letting the people regulate their own affairs for themselves, but in 1845 he voted against it in the Texas annexation resolutions.

Mr. Stephens—The gentleman said that in 1845 I was against permitting the people to act for themselves everywhere. I could not then get the North to agree to the line of 36 30. I voted for the measure, not because I thought it right, but for the sake of union and harmony. I consented to it as a compromise, but I thought the line ought to have been extended North as well as South.

Mr. Campbell—I regret the gentleman has not given a better explanation. If I believe that under the constitution the people have this right, and that no Congress should take it from them, no compromise, to save ten thousand Unions, should induce me to violate my oath.

Mr. Stephens—Does the gentleman mean to say, or intimate, that I hold Congress has the power to deprive the people of that right?

Mr. Campbell—No. But I have sought for two or three years to get the opinion of the gentleman on this constitutional point put upon record. He continued his remarks upon the subject of the repeal in the Nebraska bill of the Missouri compromise, regarding it as a great wrong, and to be resisted to the bitter end.

Mr. Washburn, (whig) of Illinois, wished to disabuse the gentleman from Georgia, who asserted there had been a Nebraska triumph in Illinois. He was right in stating that the issue was fairly made in that State on the Nebraska Kansas bill, and that Mr Douglas had spoken on the merits of the bill over the whole State with a zeal worthy of a better cause; but, instead of the bill being endorsed by the people of the State, it was, in fact, repudiated by a popular majority of from 14,000 to 16,000 votes—taking the votes on members of Congress—and by a large anti-Nebraska majority in the Legislature. The anti-Nebraska majority in his own district was seven thousand.

The debate here closed by limitation. The Committee rose, and the House adjourned.

Our Washington Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 14, 1854.

Scene in Congress—Increasing the Pay of Members—New Minister to Bogota—The Wheeling Bridge Case.

The dull monotony of the House proceedings yesterday was broken by a spicy little flare up between Messrs. Hunt, of La., and Jones, of Tenn.

There was not exactly a call for "coffee and pistols for two," but Mr. Jones declared that he was no bully, nor was he a duellist, and therefore he should notice no one that was. This brought Mr. Hunt to his feet, very much excited; but after an effort he controlled his feelings, and rejoined that he could not believe Mr. J. so false to truth and honor as to apply to him the term "bully" in its common acceptation. But if by bully the gentleman meant the courage to repel an insult, then he properly appreciated his character as a gentleman. He wished not to test the courage of the gentleman from Tennessee, nor would he trample upon him if a coward. This kind consideration on the part of Mr. Hunt seemed to satisfy Mr. J., who ventured no reply.

Mr. Badger's effort in the Senate yesterday, on his proposition to increase the pay of the Supreme Judges and members of Congress, was one worthy his high character as a statesman. But little doubt exists as to the success of his bill, particularly as we have a Congress pre-disposed to be liberal in everything relating to the appropriation of money. A large surplus is on hand, and it is to be disposed of before the 4th of March next. The next Congress will be opposed to the administration, and opposed to the present majority, and it would never do to bequeath them a full treasury, upon which to fatten. I then say, that the present session of Congress will be most liberal in appropriations, and with the tremendous outside pressure which will be brought to bear "after the holidays," Uncle Sam will be made to bleed at every pore. Parties failing to get bills passed during the present session of Congress, had better surrender all idea of Congressional relief, for their cases must be truly deplorable.

An interesting debate is now progressing before the United States Supreme Court, relative to the Wheeling bridge. It will be remembered that, in 1852, the court decided that the State of Virginia could not lawfully erect, or cause to be erected, such a bridge over the Ohio river. An act of Congress was immediately procured making the Wheeling bridge a post route, and this, it was supposed, would settle the question of legality. Not so, however; for the motion now before the court puts in issue the constitutionality of the act of Congress itself, and we have now, for the first time in the history of our government, that clause of the constitution granting to Congress the power to establish post offices and post roads, before the Court for judicial consideration. Mr. Stanton, of Pittsburg, appeared for the State of Pennsylvania, and Messrs Reverdy Johnston, of Maryland, and Russel, of Wheeling, for the city of Wheeling. The arguments in the case have been marked by great power and eloquence.

Judge Bowlin, of Missouri, has been nominated and confirmed as Charge to Bogota, vice Hon. Jas. S. Green, resigned. Few men could be selected better suited to this office than Judge B., although no man has been more vilified at home and abroad.

There is a screw loose somewhere in the mail arrangements between this city and New York. My letters, though regularly mailed, frequently fail to reach you in proper time. The office here disclaims being at fault, and say the whole mail is regularly forwarded. Can it not be ascertained whose fault it is? Others are complaining of the same thing. E.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 13, 1854.

Symptoms of a Fight in Congress—An Interesting Talk Upon the Floor, between Hunt, of Louisiana, and Jones, of Tennessee—The Learned Professions—Effort to Increase the Salary of Congressmen—The Russian Minister upon the European War.

Another day of this session of Congress has been wasted away in Buncombe small talk and log rolling. Important matters are before Congress for their consideration and decision; but it seems to be a fashion among these legislators to do nothing till after New Year's. The House of Representatives to-day went into Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, to give a little further reflection to the President's message. The members love prodigiously to be in Committee of the Whole, for then, being relieved from the restraint of the rules of the House, they have a wide field for the display of their various talents, and have the opportunity of delivering all sorts of speeches, upon all sorts of subjects. A fire-eater branches off on State rights and Southern sentiments, and the abolitionists on free negroes and Northern powers, with a looseness that is a relish to those who go farthest for the liberty of speech. An exhibition of this liberty was had to-day in the House. Almost everything was discussed—all sorts of doctrines were advanced—negroes were handled with and without gloves; but nothing of any importance to the country resulted from the session of the entire day. It is very strange that this custom should exist of fooling and trifling away one-third of a session of Congress. Why cannot representatives work as well now as after the holidays? They are now paid as well as then, and the weather is as propitious as it will probably be after the beginning of the year 1855. For a while in the House there was a little excitement, growing out of a set-to, in words only, between Hon. George W. Jones, of Tennessee, and Hon. Theodore G Hunt, of Louisiana. For a few moments there were symptoms of a fight, which would have been rather pleasing than otherwise to some of the members, inasmuch as this would have varied the monotony of the session. It seems a resolution was offered recommending a publication of the statistics of mortality, collected in taking the census of the United States in 1850. Upon this resolution Mr. Jones made a few remarks, saying "he thought the publication of these statistics would be a useless expenditure of money, the public not caring how many had died during a certain term of years, or whether they had died scientifically under the hands of a physician or from incurable disease." Mr. Hunt immediately arose, "to refute," as he said, "these slanderous remarks upon an honorable profession in our country. The insinuation that the physicians of this Union were a class of murderers, was false and unworthy of the floor of Congress." The manner and not the words of Mr Hunt, who is reputed to be a fighting man, again called Mr Jones to the floor, who said "he intended no insult to the gentleman from Louisiana, and was surprised to hear him speak as he did. He (Mr. Jones) was not a bully, a fighting man or a duellist, and repudiated them all as not being registered upon his catalogue of virtues."

Mr Hunt again arose, apparently with "his soul in arms and eager for a fray." After looking first this way and then that, with defiance in his eyes, much like Forrest when he strikes terror into the supes around him, by the roll of his eyes and his frothing at the mouth just as he is about to make Rome howl." Mr Hunt, in substance, spoke—"This house knows I would not willingly insult any man (Laying his hand pathetically upon his heart.) What does the gentleman mean by saying he is no bully or duellist? (Sensation among the members.) Does fear sway him, and is he afraid that I am a duellist and intend him any harm? If so, he can quiet all his apprehensions and dissipate all his terrors (Evident relief among the men of peace) I came here, not to insult any member or to take an insult. (Those who approve change their position in their seats.) An honorable and enlightened profession was slandered by the gentleman from Tennessee (All the doctors present become deeply interested) I have spoken my opinion of the remarks, and repudiate the insinuation that I did so as a bully, or with the desire to browbeat any member of this body."

Mr. Hunt here took his seat—observers breathed freely again, and the dove came back to its seat over the chamber.

This little "arrangement" was the talk for the rest of the day, and perhaps is only the initiative of many more of the same sort during the session. Congress is a great place for men who act as if their honor was pinned upon their sleeve, and every breath offended it

After the above affair of Jones and Hunt, the Nebraska bill came up in all its magnitude, on a notice that a resolution would be introduced prohibiting slavery north of the line of the Missouri compromise Several long winded speeches were got off upon this intimation, which consumed the remainder of the day's session. It is hardly worth while to allude to any of them, as they all have been published over and over again, under the name of almost all the representatives in Congress The same arguments have again and again gone the rounds of the House and fallen from the lips of all who do any thing in the way of speaking

In the Senate the most important act was the introduction of a resolution increasing the salary of members of Congress. Mr. Badger ably spoke for half an hour upon his resolution, which was appropriately referred. He said that clerks in the departments and messengers in the House were better paid than the representatives of States and Congressional constituencies, who brought weight and influence into the nation's councils.

The Russian Minister here has expressed an opinion that unless Sebastopol was taken by the first of December, the armies of the allies would be annihilated. The reinforcements of Prince Menschikoff constantly pouring down from the north would overwhelm the invaders, unless by the first of winter fortified within Sebastopol. NELLÆ.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12, 1854.

The Coal Duties—Speech of Hiram Walbridge—Doings in the Senate—Chance of a Difficulty with Russia—Question of our Obligations and Duties as a Neutral—The Case Considered.

In the House to-day General Hiram Walbridge introduced his resolution relieving imported coal from duties, and sustained his measure by an able speech. The General was listened to with much attention, and evidently produced upon the members who heard him a good impression, which will be felt when the final vote is taken upon this subject. The resolution is now in the hands of the appropriate committee. Amongst the bills of some importance which passed the House to-day was one providing means for the better preservation of life from wrecks along the Jersey coast. Mr. Chandler, of Pennsylvania, addressed the House at some length upon this measure. The great loss of life during the past year on the Jersey seaboard has naturally enough awakened in the public mind a desire that no pains or expense should be spared on the part of our legislators to prevent a recurrence of these sad disasters. It is cheering to humanity that Congress has gone to work upon this subject.

In the Senate, Senator Jones, of Tennessee, gave notice that to-morrow, or as soon thereafter as expedient, he would introduce a bill granting railroad companies three years for the payment of duties on railroad iron. It is extremely doubtful whether this bill will pass the House. Railroad companies, in our country, have generally become so odious to the community as moneyed monopolies which have resorted to every means for their own interests and the accomplishment of their own ends, even to the corruption of State Legislatures, that there is but little disposition to grant them any favor. Senator Seward presented a resolution, which was referred to a committee, claiming the right of conscience for American citizens abroad. This was, no doubt, done to tickle the Know Nothings, and will probably be received, with this new party, with some favor. When this resolution comes up for discussion we may have upon it the Native American arguments which were expected upon the naturalization bill of Senator Adams, of Mississippi The above were about the only topics of interest or importance broached in Congress to-day. Congressmen are taking matters easily just now, and probably will move along at a very slow pace till after New Years, when, it is anticipated here, the excitement of the session will commence.

It may be remembered that the Russian merchant ship Sitka, captured some time since by the French and English squadron at Petropauloski, Kamschatka, was brought into the harbor of San Francisco to be condemned. The question arises as to the right of the allies to make an asylum of a neutral port in our Territory for the safety of their captures. I learn that the Russian minister will probably make this a point before our government and enter a protest, claiming that we have no right to permit our ports to become the asylum for captured property, and that under the strict laws of neutrality that the captured have a right to demand our protection. A decision will consequently have to be made on this question under the law of nations arising out of the rights and duties of neutrals and their responsibility to belligerent powers. If the recognized principle of international law, so well established, relative to the obligation of neutrals, affords protection to the property of a belligerent in a neutral port, does not the act of the allies, in bringing a prize within the jurisdiction of neutrality, release the prize from the captors, and cannot the captured under such circumstances claim the protection of such neutral port?

It is true, by a treaty with France, made, I think, in 1798, we gave her the right to use our ports as an asylum for her prizes. But that treaty has since become abrogated, and no power has the right to use our ports for that purpose without our consent first had and obtained. It is our policy to preserve a strict observance of the laws of neutrality, and a belligerent power has no right to force an asylum in one of our ports without our consent. If she does so, she commits a *quasi* violation of the laws of neutrality, which, if we permit, must cause a rupture with the one or force us to become the ally of the other. Thus, if we permit the allies to make our ports an asylum for captured property, we must either extend the same privilege to Russia, or else break our neutrality by siding with one or the other of the belligerents. No such privilege has been extended to either party, however, and therefore a prize cannot be condemned or prisoners held in a neutral port, without a violation of these laws. The moment that captured property is brought within the jurisdiction of neutrality, without the consent of the neutral, it becomes released, and no right or control over it can be exercised by the captors without a violation of the laws of neutrality.

The case is precisely the same as that of a foreign power arresting a fugitive or prisoner within its own jurisdiction. So long as the prisoner is kept within the limits of that jurisdiction, the right to hold attaches; but the moment the prisoner is carried or escapes beyond it to the territory of another power with whom there exists no treaty of extradition, that prisoner is free, and has a right to demand the protection of the neutral power.

The allies certainly committed a violation of our territory in bringing a prize into one of our ports, where they could exercise no control, and where they lost all right to adjudicate without a breach of our neutrality. A strict observance of the laws of neutrality on our part would, consequently compel us to afford protection to the Russian ship and crew, under the circumstances, or at least not permit the vessel to be condemned, or the crew held as prisoners, without our liability to Russia.

It is well that our government should at once define its position in this regard, for we ourselves have been great sticklers on this very point of neutrality. The policy of England has always been never to respect the rights of neutrals only where she thought it her interest. An instance of the grossest violation of neutrality on the part of England, which is suggested by this case, is that of attacking the private armed brig General Armstrong in the neutral port of Fayal, belonging to Portugal. In that case it is true that the British fleet attacked the brig while lying in the neutral port. For this outrage England was never made to atone, except by an apology to the Portuguese authorities. Portugal was called on to indemnify for having permitted the violation, and although she was held responsible for years, yet to our disgrace she was let off, by a treaty permitting Louis Napoleon to perjure himself by deciding in favor of Portugal—that the Americans first violated the neutrality of her port!

This question of neutrality, such as is now presented to our government, is one of great importance, and we cannot observe with too much jealousy a strict adherence of our neutrality by all foreign belligerents. Russia has always been our friend and ally, and if there are any favors to be shown by this government they should be extended to her, and not to faithless England or the perjured government of France. There is no use in concealing the fact that all the sympathies of the American people are with Russia. NELLÆ.

OTHER NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENCE.

[Correspondence of the Courier and Enquirer.]

WASHINGTON, Dec. 11, 1854.

Our Relations with England.

The despatches received this morning by the Union are represented to be of little consequence. Some solicitude prevails to hear of the reception given to Mr. Soulé at Madrid. Despatches from him are expected by the Pacific, due to-morrow.

Private advices from London state that Lord Clarendon had made very singular and inconsistent informal and unofficial explanations respecting British naval movements in the West Indies. Upon one occasion, the Foreign Secretary said they had no harbor room for the ships which it was necessary to recall from the Baltic, and that some of them were sent to the West Indies as the most convenient winter quarters available for them. But he afterwards intimated that the increased force was required, both as a fleet of observation and action, for that the Americans had become such a harum scarum and extraordinary people that it was necessary to take unusual precautions against them. "Why," his lordship is reported to have said—"why, after the escapade of Greytown, and the petticoat mission to Dominica, who can tell but they will next undertake to bombard London, sack Liverpool, and annex Jamaica?"

[Correspondence of the North American.]

WASHINGTON, Dec. 11, 1854.

The Tariff Question—Cases before the Supreme Court—The Florida and Georgia Boundary Line.

There are indications that the party screws are to be applied in the House and Senate in behalf of the Executive plan for the reduction of the tariff. The chief reason of the solicitude of the administration in the case is the well founded apprehension that it will have no power to enforce its recommendations over the next House of Representatives on this or any other subject. The President and his Cabinet, and their co-operative democratic leaders in both Houses, are ambitious of the honor of settling the tariff question on entirely new and original principles, just as they settled the slavery question by the infamous repeal of the Missouri Compromise. I cannot speak confidently of the prospects of this undertaking, but I can state, upon sufficient authority, that the Committee of Ways and Means have not yet determined to report any bill on the subject. The matter will probably not be taken up in the committee until after the holidays. In the meantime, the House will be diligently canvassed, to ascertain whether a majority can be depended upon to carry through, under the whip and spur of the previous question, and in obedience to party drill, anything that may be resolved upon in the purlieus of the Treasury department and the council chamber at the White House.

The bona fide free traders in the House will oppose with all their power any settlement of this vexed question of national and party policy upon the basis of Guthrie's report. They have two reasons for their opposition. In the first place they say, under the disguise of a plan for reducing the tariff and diminishing revenue, it really panders to the prejudices and fallacies of the protectionists, by retaining the high duties on those articles upon which the mass of the duties are collected. Furthermore, they are not particularly anxious for any reduction of the revenue at this time. Nearly all the genuine free traders are traditional democrats. They are, therefore, anxious to secure Cuba by any and every means at the disposal of the government. They well know that the objections to that acquisition would be insurmountable and irremovable with a meagerly supplied treasury. If it can be accomplished at all, they are sensible that it can only be done under the stimulus of a financial plethora. Now they perceive that there has been a reduction of the surplus four millions from the highest point some months ago, and it requires no extraordinary acuteness to discover that before the termination of the fiscal year the revenue will fall considerably below the average current expenditure.

There is yet another reason with a powerful section of the democratic party assumed to be favorable to free trade in opposing the Secretary's plan. Sugar growing is a very important interest in Louisiana, Texas and Florida. The duties on that article are more onerous than any others imposed by the tariff, and less defensible, because it is contended that no possible degree of protection could raise the capacity of production to the level of consumption within the United States; so that a protective duty on this necessary of life must remain a permanent tax on the people.

But one thing is manifest. The end of the free trade imposture has nearly come. All parties are agreed that, except in the one point of revenue, the Walker ad valorem affair is a dead failure. The country demands legislative protection to its industry against excessive competition from foreign industry. When and how this result is to be obtained, are merely questions of convenience and arrangement. The probability is that the whole subject will go over to the next session, and that the tariff of 1842—the old whig protective tariff—will be substantially re-enacted.

Mr. Dallas was in the Supreme Court to-day, defending a patent case. Years sit lightly on the veteran speculator in constitutional figments, and the probability is that he will glide quietly into the dusty vale of death with a shadowy consciousness that the constitution will soon follow him, its last and best defender. Personally, Mr. Dallas is a most respectable gentleman; but no one can resist the inclination to laugh in reflecting upon the constitutional idyosyncrasies of the late Vice President.

The business of the Supreme Court attracts less attention this year than last. One of the most important cases to be acted upon at this time is the Wheeling Bridge suit. I am not aware of the precise condition of the action, but I believe that a motion is to be made to morrow to enter the judgment and proceed to the execution of the decree. The Court is said to be unanimously of opinion that the act of Congress, passed with the object of arresting the decree, is void and unconstitutional.

The State of Florida and the United States are parties in a case of disputed boundary which Florida has with Georgia. Florida contends that the true line separating her on the north from Georgia, is one established by British Commissioners in 1763, immediately after the treaty of peace. This line begins at the junction of the Apalachicola and Ogeechee rivers, and extends to the head of the St. Mary's The point in dispute is, where is the head of the St. Mary's. Georgia claims a line thirty miles south of that asserted to have been established in 1763. The district in dispute, hitherto held by the United States and Florida, contains 1,200,000 acres, part of which has been sold, and part of which is now in market, as public lands. If the claims of Georgia shall be sustained, the land unsold will be passed to Georgia, and the general government will be obliged to reimburse the purchasers for that which it has heretofore disposed of.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12, 1854.

The Homestead Bill.

The position of Hunter's bill for the distribution of the public lands is not well understood. It was fabricated in the Senate as a means for evading direct action upon General Dawson's homestead bill. It is a well contrived scheme for such a purpose, being made to pass the Senate, but not to become a law, like the razors which were a shave, though not to be shaved with, and were made to sell and not to be used. It was admitted by the most warm supporters of Hunter's scheme that it was a weak invention to kill the homestead, and quite indefensible as an affirmative and independent measure. It is called the homestead bill, though it contains no single leading provision of the bill which it supersedes, and might as well be called the Speculation bill, or the Speculator's bill, or Hunter's proposals for the Presidency.

This scheme now lies on the table of the House, as the Senate's substitute for the Homestead. The persons chiefly concerned in Western land speculations before Congress would probably agree to let it remain there, and all friends of a real homestead plan would rather throw additional clods upon its head, and bury it forever from sight, than aid in reviving it, if they were not confident of crushing all vitality out of the project as soon as taken from the Speaker's table.

Mr. Dawson, therefore, will allow no opportunity to call up the bill to pass unimproved, and will probably succeed in getting it before the House on Tuesday, the 19th instant. He will propose an amendment or substitute, embodying all the distinguishing features of the original bill rejected by the Senate, except that section which excludes colored persons from the benefits of homestead grants. The other amendment proposed by Mr. Dawson is important. He will move to affix the nominal price of fourteen and a half cents per acre to the lands assigned as a homestead. This will answer, and remove the serious constitutional objection against absolute donations. I think that, with these modifications, the homestead bill will pass, and in this shape it will, of course, completely supplant and supersede Hunter's scheme, in which it was merged by the clever intriguers who are responsible for that curious medley of craft, ingenuity and deception.

Hunter's invention was for some time held up by the Virginia democracy as a sort of Hercules club with which to beat the brains out of Know Nothingism, but it has been found too light for the purpose, and has been dropped. After having been the gathering cry of the anti-Wise faction for some six months, it was not even named in the convention. The Know Nothings laughed at the attempt to divert them from their purpose by so insignificant a side issue.

[Correspondence of the Philadelphia Ledger.]

WASHINGTON, Dec. 11, 1854.

More in Behalf of the Tariff.

A very earnest move is now making by the Committee of Ways and Means to remodel the tariff of 1846, and a bill will be introduced for that purpose. It is, however, a dangerous experiment at this period. The importations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1855, will not be equal to those of 1854, and the revenue from customs may fall off from 40 to 50 per cent, whilst the expenditures—if additions be made to our navy and army, and the pay of officers increased—may reach seventy millions of dollars, which would leave a small surplus in the Treasury. While war is going on in Europe, while we are contemplating the acquisition of distant islands—while commerce and navigation are on the point of undergoing an entire revolution, it is, to say the least, exceedingly hazardous to make experiments on the revenue laws. It is proposed to bring the tariff within the revenue standard. Very well; give us another year, and the country will see what that standard is. It cannot be the standard of over trading on the basis of railroad bonds of all the roads projected or commenced within the last six or ten years. The revenue standard must be the standard of healthy trade based on the actual production and earnings of the country.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12, 1854.

No Indices yet of a Working Session, though the Committees are at Work.—Passage of the New Jersey Bill introduced by Mr. Skelton—Mr. Chandler's Speech—Anti-tariff Feeling in the House—Mr. Houston's Bill and the Secretary of the Treasury's Bill at Variance.

There are not many indices yet of a working session. The committees are undoubtedly at work, and the Committee of Ways and Means has actually reported three of the regular appropriation bills; still, there is not as yet any appreciable disposition in either house to go to work on the unfinished business of the last session. If members will not leave off their feuds and isms, little will be done beyond the passage of the regular appropriation bills.

In the House to-day, the so-called Jersey bill, introduced by Mr. Skelton, to empower the Secretary of the Treasury to make additional provisions for saving the lives of shipwrecked persons on our coast, was taken up and passed, after a most eloquent and able appeal to the House by Mr. Chandler, who on this occasion very happily blended satire with argument and persuasion. The bill passed by a very large majority, in spite of the constitutional objections raised to it in a certain quarter.

The members from Pennsylvania, and all others opposed to special legislation, will have to keep wide awake to prevent some snap judgment of the House in regard to our revenue laws The Committee of Ways and Means is opposed to this species of legislation, but there is some danger of Mr. Houston's bill being pressed on the consideration of this House, and perhaps passed. Mr. Houston's bill differs materially from the bill recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury. It classifies all dutiable articles—the highest class paying twenty per cent ad valorem, and the lowest five. That plan is popular with Southern members, but will meet with serious opposition in the manufacturing States of the Union The movement, as I have already observed, is premature. We do not know what may be the actual revenue from customs, in a healthy condition of trade, nor the minimum revenue that may result from a sudden contraction after an unlimited expansion. We require at least another year's experience to judge what may be a revenue duty, and what duty may act in the way of protection to the home manufacturer. The probability is that there will be an immense falling off in the revenue from customs during the present fiscal year, and that the next estimate of revenue duties will have very little in common with the one now taken as the standard of legislation.

The correspondence on the subject of the arrest of the French Consul, Mr. Dillon, at San Francisco, having been called for in the Senate, the President will, no doubt, send it in. It will be highly creditable to this country, and, at the same time, entirely respectful to our old and cherished ally, France. No disrespect was intended—the question being merely whether the constitution, which allows a compulsory process in criminal prosecutions to compel testimony in favor of defendant, overrides a treaty stipulation subsequently enter into, or not. Gov. Marcy has decided that it does; hence, the Consular Convention between this country and France is, as far as that is concerned, superseded by the constitution. I have already explained that point in one of my letters, before the meeting of Congress.

A message has gone into the Senate to-day in regard to the claim of the executors of Prioleau, amounting to $8,000, which was passed at the last session. Vouchers have since been found to show that the whole claim has already been once paid by the United States. This is another instance showing the necessity of the establishment of a Board of Claims, that shall be at the same time a court of record.

[Correspondence of the Baltimore Sun.]

WASHINGTON, Dec. 13, 1854.

Difficulties of Our Consul in Paraguay—Evils of the Consular Office being Associated with Commerce or Trade.

The difficulties into which Consul Hopkins to Paraguay has been involved, seem to have originated in the jealousy of the natives, Mr. Hopkins being at the head of a segar manufactory in that country. Without entering on the merits of the question, the occurrence is a new proof of the evil consequences attending the participation of our consuls in industrial and commercial pursuits. These are always viewed with a jealous eye by the citizens of other countries, who very generally, and perhaps justly, believe that the consular title and position give to the incumbent advantages in trade of which ordinary merchants and traders are deprived.

It is natural enough, for instance, that foreign manufacturers dislike exhibiting their invoices to a United States Consul, if they believe or suspect him to be an agent for the purchase or manufacture of the same goods; and an exequator withdrawn under such circumstances is hardly a just cause of complaint.

The diplomatic and consular bill introduced by Mr. Perkins very properly prohibits our consuls from entering into commercial pursuits; while it remedies many deficiencies in our consular system, which require the pruning hand of legislation.

In France and Germany, and partly, also, in England, consular appointments are looked upon as introductions to diplomatic offices promotions of that sort being quite frequent. Baron Gerolt, the present Minister from Prussia to the United States, was Prussian Consul in Mexico previous to his promotion to a Minister Plenipotentiary. Between having a reasonable knowledge of commercial relations and carrying on commerce as an active merchant there is a wide difference. Even the British East India Company did not flourish till the governors of India were prohibited from taking a share in commercial pursuits.

Important Naval Bill.

The following is the document drawn up by Hon. Thos. S. Bocock, of Virginia, and now in possession of the Committee on Naval Affairs. It will be presented to the House of Representatives in a day or two:—

An Act for the Encouragement of Enlistment, and for the better Government of Petty Officers and Persons of Inferior Ratings in the Naval Service.

Section 1. Be it enacted, that from and after the passage of this act, it shall be the duty of every commanding officer of any of the vessels of the navy on returning from a cruise, to forward immediately on his arrival in port to the Secretary of the Navy a list of the names of such of the crew who enlisted for three years, as in his opinion, on being discharged, are entitled to an "honorable discharge," as a testimonial of fidelity and obedience; and that he shall grant the same to such, according to the form to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

Sec. 2. Be it further enacted, that if any seaman, ordinary seaman, landsman or boy shall re enlist for three years, within three months after his discharge, he shall, on presenting his honorable discharge, or in accounting in a satisfactory manner for its loss, be entitled to pay during the said three months equal to that which he would have been entitled to if he had been employed in actual service.

Sec. 3. Be it further enacted, that it shall be the duty of commanders of any vessel in the navy, in granting temporary leave of absence and liberty on shore, to exercise carefully a discrimination in favor of the faithful and obedient.

Sec. 4. Summary courts martial may be ordered upon petty officers and persons of inferior ratings by the commanders of any vessel in the navy to which such persons belong, for the trial of offences which he may deem deserving of greater punishment than the commander of any vessel himself is by law authorized to inflict of his own authority, but not sufficient to require trial by general court martial.

Sec. 5. Summary courts martial shall consist of three officers not below the rank of passed midshipman, and of some competent person to act as recorder. Before proceeding to trial, the members shall take the following oath or affirmation, which the Recorder is hereby authorized to administer: "You, A B, do solemnly swear [or affirm] that you will well and truly try, without prejudice or partiality, the case now depending, according to the evidence which shall be adduced, the laws for the government of the navy, and your own conscience, so help you God."

After which the Recorder of the Court shall take the following oath or affirmation, which the senior member of the court shall administer:—"You, A B, do solemnly swear, [or affirm,] that you will keep a true record of the evidence which may be given before this court, and of the proceedings thereof, so help you God."

Sec. 6. The commander of a ship shall have authority to order any officer under his command to act as the recorder of a summary court martial.

Sec. 7. All testimony given before such court shall be given orally on oath or affirmation, which the senior member of the court shall administer.

That summary courts martial may sentence petty officers and persons of inferior ratings to the following punishment, viz.:—

1. Discharge from the service with bad conduct discharge.
2. Solitary confinement in irons, single or double, on bread and water, or diminished rations, provided no such confinement shall exceed thirty days.
3. Solitary confinement in irons, single or double, not exceeding thirty days.
4. Solitary confinement not exceeding thirty days.
5. Confinement not exceeding two months.
6. Reduction to next inferior rating.
7. Deprivation of liberty on shore on foreign station.
8. Extra police duties, and loss of pay not to exceed three months, may be added to any of the above-mentioned punishments.

Sec. 8. No sentence of a summary court martial shall be carried into effect without the approval of the officer ordering the court; who shall have power to remit in part or altogether, but not to commute any such sentence; and it shall be the duty of any such commanding officer to remit any part or the whole of any sentence by a summary court martial, the execution of which would, in the opinion of the surgeon or senior medical officer on board, given in writing, produce serious injuries to the health of the person sentenced, or, in case he shall refuse to do so, it shall be his duty to submit the case again to the same or to another summary court martial, which shall have power to remit the former punishment, and to assign some other in the place thereof.

Sec. 9. The proceedings of summary courts martial shall be conducted with as much conciseness and precision as may be consistent with the ends of justice, and under such forms and rules as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy with the approval of the President of the United States; and all such proceedings shall be transmitted in the usual mode to the Navy Department.

Sec. 10. Any punishment authorized by this act to be inflicted by a summary court martial may likewise be inflicted by any general court martial.

The New Naturalization Bill in Congress.

The following is the bill introduced into the United States Senate by Mr. Adams, of Mississippi, in reference to the naturalization laws:—

Be it enacted, &c., That from and after the passage of this act no alien shall be admitted to become a citizen of the United States unless he shall, at the time of his application to be admitted, declare and prove to the satisfaction of the court having jurisdiction of the case, that he has resided in the United States twenty-one years at least; provided that any alien who may be a resident of the United States at the date of this act shall be entitled to all the third condition specified in the first section of the act approved April 24, 1802, of which this act is amendatory.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That so much of the third condition specified in the first section of the act approved April 24, 1802, entitled "An act to establish a uniform rule of naturalization and to repeal the acts heretofore passed on that subject," as conflicts with the first section of this act be and the same is hereby repealed.

Legal Intelligence.

Supreme Court of the United States, Dec. 12.—James Hughes, Esq., of Wisconsin, was admitted as an attorney and counsellor of this Court. Nos. 11, 12 and 13—Joseph Battin, patentee, and Samuel Battin, assignee, plaintiffs in error, vs. James Taggert, Robert Ratcliffe, John Johnson and John G. Hewes. The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. Dallas for the plaintiffs in error. Adjourned.

Dec. 13.—Hale Kingsley and T. S. Van Hoevenbergh Esqrs., of Albany, New York, were admitted attorneys and counsellors of this Court. Nos. 2 and 7. The State of Pennsylvania, complainant, vs. the Wheeling and Belmont Bridge Company. The argument of the several motions in these cases for a writ of sequestration against the corporation, for an attachment against its officers, for a writ of assistance to exact the decree of this Court, and for a taxation of costs, was commenced by Mr. Edwin M. Stanton in support thereof, and continued by Messrs. Russell and Reverdy Johnson in opposition thereto. Adjourned.

Com. Stockton and the Know Nothings.

PRINCETON, Dec. 6, 1854.

Allen McLane Bobbinett, Esq., Wilmington, Del.:—

Dear Sir—I have received your letter of November 23, and I thank you for the sentiments of friendly commendation which it expresses.

Though withdrawn from public life, nevertheless I am not insensible to emotions of gratification when I find my principles or my past conduct the subject of just and generous appreciation. Yet it is with unfeigned reluctance that I comply with the duty of answering your letter, lest it should be construed into a desire on my part to re-appear on the political arena I have no such desire. The turbulence of political strife has no charms for me; my tastes, inclinations and happiness lead me to prefer the tranquillity of private life.

But as I approved of the principles of the American party when in its infancy, I am unwilling that it should be believed now, when it exists in the vigor of manhood, that I have become derelict to those principles, or that I can refuse on any proper occasion to avow myself to be an American democrat, or shrink from the fraternal recognition of those who espouse my principles, no matter under what designation they may have formerly acted. No sir, the history of our country, since I first approved your principles, has only strengthened and confirmed the opinions which I entertained at the period to which you refer.

To your first interrogatory, therefore, I answer and say:—I am in favor of confining all executive and administrative functions of office to American born.

In relation to your second interrogatory, I answer that I am in favor of "an extension of the period of residence previous to naturalization, to at least twenty-one years, or a total repeal of the naturalization laws, as in the wisdom of the people may seem fit."

Demagogues should no longer be permitted to manufacture hordes of freshly imported aliens into voters to nullify the voice of Americans in the ballot box. The corrupt rivalship of parties for the purchase of foreign born voters must cease. It never will cease, however, until the swarms of emigrants who monthly land on our shores shall cease to be offered in the political market to the highest bidder.

In avowing the principle that "Americans alone should rule America," I do not understand you to approve the disfranchisement of the foreign born who already possess the right of voting. The larger proportion of our adopted fellow-citizens, at least the most intelligent among them, I believe are perfectly satisfied that the time has arrived when our naturalization laws should be altered or repealed. That portion of them which does not constitute the staple of political traffic, fully appreciate the dignity and high prerogative of sovereignty which they enjoy as American citizens. True to the country of their adoption, they are unwilling to jeopard its institutions to benefit future emigrants, even from the land of their own nativity.

To your third interrogatory I answer: Being a Christian people, it seems to me that to preserve our posterity in the faith of their fathers, we can do no less than to secure to our children always perfect freedom of access to the Holy Scriptures, without "note or comment."

While frankly expressing this opinion, I must say, also, that I agree with you, that any connection between sectarianism and politics, or between church and State, whether Protestant or Papist, would be dangerous to liberty, and hostile to the spirit and genius of the American constitution.

You allude to my presentation of petitions, (whilst in the Senate of the United States), in favor of the exclusion of foreign paupers and convicts. On that subject I will only say, that had I deemed the period propitious, such was my sense of the dangers and evils of the importation of that class of foreigners, I should have felt it my duty to propose a capitation import tax upon such emigrants, which would have effectually excluded them from our ports. That such a measure of precaution has not more earnestly been urged upon Congress by the municipal authorities of our great cities, which are the chief sufferers from the influx of foreign paupers and felons, shows to what extent subservience to the foreign element has influenced the action of those entrusted with the public safety. Faithfully your ob't serv't and friend,

R. F. STOCKTON.

The Ocean Bank Embezzlement Case.

EXAMINATION BEFORE JUDGE BEEBE.

The preliminary examination in the case of William B. McGuckin, late teller of the Ocean Bank, who is at present in custody on a charge of embezzling the funds of that institution to the amount of between $50,000 and $60,000, was commenced yesterday afternoon before Judge Beebe, Mr. Whiting acting as counsel for the bank, and Messrs. John R. and James T. Brady for the accused. The following is the result of the brief examination held yesterday:—

David R. Martin, of 193 Fourth street, was examined by Mr. Whiting, and testified as follows:—Q. Are you the President of the Ocean Bank of the city of New York? A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been President of that bank? A. Four years, within a very few days.

Q. Was Wm. B. McGuckin at any time employed in that bank? and if so, in what capacity? A. He was for the last three or four years; he has been the paying teller.

Q. In that capacity what funds belonging to the bank came into his possession? A. All the circulating notes, all the coin and the daily exchanges.

Q. Did all that was generally termed cash items of the bank come into his possession? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he of his own accord, at any time, and if so, when, leave his situation as such teller? A. On the evening of the 14th of October, 1854, he left of his own accord.

Q. When did you next see him? A. On the evening of the 17th of October last.

Q. Please to state in narrative order what occurred after McGuckin left the bank on the evening of the 14th, up to the time you saw him.

A. When I left him on Saturday evening about five o'clock, at the bank, I asked him if he had been instructed to put up $25,000 of our circulation, by the cashier, to send to Albany for redemption; his reply was, that he had, and that he was to meet the cashier on Monday morning at 8 o'clock, to give him the bills. Knowing that fact myself, I went to the bank at half-past 8 on Monday morning, and waited till about ten, or five minutes past, when Mr. Freeman Loomis came into the directors' room, and said he had some very painful news to communicate; I asked him what it was, his reply was, (holding out the keys of Mr. McGuckin's trunk in which he kept his money items,) that Mr. McGuckin could not come to the bank, as his cash was short $75,000 or $80,000; I asked Mr. Loomis how he knew this; his reply was, that McGuckin told him to say that his bills were short of his balance on Saturday some $40,000; I took the keys that he gave me, and handed them to the cashier, and told him to put Mr. Platt, our second teller, at Mr. McGuckin's desk, as he would probably not be there that day; Mr. Loomis being very much excited, and crying, I took him up stairs in a private office, where he revealed as far as he said he was able, an account of the defalcation. He there stated that McGuckin had been constantly in the habit for a year or more past of certifying his (McG.'s) checks on the Ocean Bank, and also S & J. S. Dunning's, for large amounts in the aggregate, in Mr. Dunning's office, in the mornings before bank hours, when they had no funds in the bank to meet them, and that had gone on from time to time until the amount that he had used himself was about $50,000, and for the Dunnings over $20,000. The conversation was continued some time, but this was the purport of it; I have it written down, but I have it not now. After this he left, and I saw him two or three times in the course of the day, having requested him to find McGuckin, and bring him to the bank, which he promised he would. The business of the day continued as usual, the second teller performing the duties of the first. Immediately after business hours we went into an examination of the cash account of the first teller. When Mr. McGuckin left on Saturday night, his balance of cash in his own handwriting, called for $59,918 of bank bills of the Ocean and other banks; and we found on hand but $8,733, showing a deficiency of $40,105 in bank bills, and we found his specie short $19,710 96, and we paid that day fraudulent checks certified by him, $37,100. This is as far as we discovered on that evening. I subsequently found, after we saw Mr McGuckin, that he had charged original and duplicate checks to the amount of $5,300 for the house of Drexel & Co., of Philadelphia, and one charged to the Ocean Bank by falsification of figures, $1,000; to Welden & Painter a check and note, both of the same amount—$920 20 to each; Wm. R. Fluy or & Co. a check and note, both $282 50, making the total $7,674 70, and making the total deficiency $104,490 66; I saw McGuckin on the Tuesday evening after he left the bank, at the foot of Cortlandt street; we walked up as far as Greenwich street together, from the foot of Cortlandt street, he having come across the river, and I asked him if he would go into the bank and tell us in what manner this money had been taken; he seemed ill and was very feeble, saying that he had neither eaten nor slept since Saturday, but that if I would excuse him he would positively come down in the morning; he did come, according to promise, and after remaining in the bank an hour or more, and finding that we could do nothing until after business hours, he said he would then return and aid us all he could, and give us all the information he was possessed of as to our loss; he came at the hour he fixed himself—about 4 o'clock—and remained till about 11 o'clock, but was in a situation to give us no kind of information or assistance, except to state that a large part of this money had been had by Mr. Loomis and the Messrs. Dunnings, and he promised to bring me the next morning a full detailed statement of the exact amounts each had had.

Here the examination had to close, as it was getting too dark for the counsel to write their notes, and, as Judge Beebe said, the Comptroller would doubtless refuse to pay for candles. Thus Mr. Flagg, not content with stopping the payment of the salaries of school teachers and the officials about the City Hall, is determined also to stop the wheels of justice.

Notice is again given that an application will be made to the next Legislature for an act to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Hudson river at Albany.