pany for Money, but information of their designs having been communicated to our authorities, a sufficient force was despatched to break up the meeting and capture most of the party. Night before last a small gang of guerillas made a descent near Devereaux Station, capturing two men.

FRESH BEEF CONTRACT.

Yesterday proposals were opened at the Bureau of Provisions and Clothing of the Navy Department for supplying the Washington station with ten thousand pounds of fresh beef. But two bids were made. The contract was awarded at twelve and nine-tenths cents per pound.

THIRTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

Senate.

WASHINGTON, April 12, 1864.

THE COLLECTION OF DIRECT TAXES IN INSURRECTIONARY DISTRICTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury in reply to a call for information as to the amount of money expended and the number of men employed to carry out the act for the collection of direct taxes in the insurrectionary districts. The Secretary submits a tabular statement giving all the information required.

BUREAU OF FREEDMEN.

Mr. SUMNER, (rep.) of Mass., introduced a bill to establish a Bureau of Freedmen. It is placed in the Treasury rather than in the War Department. It provides for a commissioner at a salary of four thousand dollars, a chief clerk and two clerks of each class. It guards very strictly the rights and interests of freedmen against loss or failure from cupidity, cruelty or accidental causes. It looks towards making the bureau self-supporting by applying to its uses the proceeds of leases.

THE ADMISSION OF NEBRASKA INTO THE UNION.

Mr. WADE, (rep.) of Ohio, called up the House bill to enable the people of the Territory of Nebraska to form a constitution preparatory to admission into the Union.

Mr. TRUMBULL, (rep.) of Ill., said he did not think that the population of this Territory was sufficient to justify its erection into a State. It contained only 27,000 inhabitants. He had not heard of any application on the part of people.

Mr. FOSTER, (rep.) of Conn., thought if these people did not really want the Territory changed into a State it ought not to be forced upon them. He could understand how a few men who hoped to be senators, governors, &c., could desire a State government; but he believed that if the question was put to-day to the people there not one-half of them would vote for it. He preferred leaving the people in a territorial condition until they had obtained the requisite population for a State. Though he would not withhold his vote on account of the insignificance of the population, he would desire that it should be established plainly that the people themselves desired the change.

Mr. WADE was astonished that the objection should be made after the gentleman had voted for the enabling acts for other States. The test of population had not heretofore been applied to other Territories. Florida and Texas were admitted the latter having two Representatives in Congress when she had not population enough for one. Our action was based on the fact that the Territory was rapidly filling up and assuming an important position by reason of its immense natural resources. He would be as much opposed to imposing a State government upon the people against their consent as the Senator from Connecticut. This bill was only to enable the people to have a State government, if they met in convention and indicated such desire. He did not think the people of Nebraska would thank the Senator for his advice.

Mr. FOSTER denied that he was attempting to give advice. He had only asked what had not been answered, whether the people had asked for a State government.

Mr. WADE said it was the voice of the people through their delegate in the other House.

Mr. FOSTER replied that the doors of Congress were open to the petition of this or any other people for admission and it was not our place to dictate the forms of State governments.

The subject was then laid over.

THE ARMY.

Mr. WILSON, (rep.) of Mass., introduced a bill relating to the pay and subsistence of the army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LAND GRANT FOR AN IOWA RAILROAD.

On motion of Mr. HARLAN, (rep.) of Iowa, the bill granting lands to the State of Iowa to aid in the construction of a railroad from McGregor to a point on the Missouri river, to connect with certain lateral roads in Minnesota, was taken up, amended and passed.

RESPECT FOR THE MEMORY OF WILLIAM C. RIVES.

On motion of Mr. COLLAMER, (rep.) of Vt., the Senate resolved to adjourn, when it adjourned to-day, until Thursday, out of respect to the memory of William C. Rives.

ASCERTAINING THE VALUE OF LANDS TAKEN FOR THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. DAVIS, (opp.) of Ky., introduced a bill regulating the mode of ascertaining the value of lands and real estate that may be taken for the use of the United States. Referred to the Judiciary Committee.

TRIAL OF CAPITAL OFFENCES.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill to prevent the assembly of and trials by courts martial of capital and other crimes not arising in the land or naval forces of the United States. Referred to the Judiciary Committee.

TRANSATLANTIC TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION.

Mr. GRIMES, (rep.) of Iowa, presented the memorial of Henry O'Reilley for increasing and cheapening telegraphic correspondence among the American people and the nations of the Old World. Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, (rep.) of Wis., presented the memorial of Perry McD. Collins praying for the aid of Congress in establishing an overland telegraph via Behring's Straits. Referred to same committee.

THE NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate then proceeded to the consideration of the Naval Appropriation bill in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment appropriating money for the purchase of land to extend the wharf of the Charlestown Navy Yard was adopted.

An amendment, offered by Mr. HALE, (rep.) of N. H., from the Naval Committee, was adopted. It provides that no part of the appropriation for the Naval Academy shall be paid to midshipmen unless in strict conformity with the law.

An amendment, offered by Mr. ANTHONY, (rep.) of R. I., was adopted, raising the Professors of Ethics, Spanish and Drawing in the Naval Academy to a level with other professors.

Mr. GRIMES offered an amendment returning the Naval Academy to Annapolis, Md., on or before the academic year commencing in September, 1865. Mr. Grimes proceeded in an elaborate speech to set forth the advantages of Annapolis over Newport. He contended that in addition to the want of accommodations at the latter place, the temptations presented to the cadets were so great as to be prejudicial to good order and discipline, and no one could be a good officer in our navy who had not learned himself how to be commanded.

Mr. ANTHONY defended the advantages of Newport as a site for the Academy.

After considerable debate, pro and con, the amendment was concurred in, ayes 20, nays 17, as follows:—

YEAS—Messrs. Collamer, Conness, Cowan, Davis, Doolittle, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Harlan, Harris, Henderson, Hendricks, Johnson, Nesmith, Powell, Ridd e, Sherman and Willey.

NAYS.—Messrs. Anthony, Buckalew, Chandler, Dixon, Howard, Lane of Kansas, Morgan, Pomeroy, Ramsay, Sprague, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, Wilson and Wright.

Mr. POWELL, (opp.) of Ky., offered an amendment as an additional section, repealing the bounties given to vessels engaged in the cod and other bank fisheries. Mr. Powell said he would not attach this important measure to the bill were it not for the fact that all his efforts to a direct vote upon it as an independent proposition had failed. This was due to some hocus pocus which he did not understand. Having tried at the last session to get his measure reported by the Commerce Committee, he tried the Finance Committee, and met with no better success, and he concluded to offer it now. Mr. Powell contended that his ill-success arose from the fact that a New England interest was at stake, and as New England out of twelve Senators had fourteen chairmen of committees, it was easy to perceive how the other portions of the country were being taxed for her benefit. The great State of New York had a chairman of a committee—that of Private Land Claims—from which he had never read a report; and Pennsylvania had a chairman of the Committee on Patents and the Patent Office. (Laughter.) New England had the chairmanships of the Army, Finance, Foreign Affairs, &c. How could the great West get matters of importance to them presented before this body when such partiality was shown in the distribution of chairmanships. When he approached the chairman of the Committee on Commerce to get his bill—of which the present amendment was the substance—reported upon, he was told to see Mr. Morrill, of Maine.

Mr. CONNESS, (rep.) of Cal., inquired if before the rebellion the Senator had been in the habit of complaining to the lords or the South of the disposition of the chairmanships and how they took it?

Mr. POWELL replied he had never served as chairman of a committee since he had been here.

Mr. CONNESS said that was not an answer. Was the Senator, then as now, in the habit of complaining?

Mr. POWELL said the only reason he complained now was on account of the gross partiality shown by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce (Mr. Chandler), who, though not representing New England, was New England born. The gross amount of bounties now paid was $600,000, to pay which the resources and labor of other sections of the country were taxed. It was said that we needed these bounties to maintain our mercantile marine. He wanted no such nurseries for seamen. He hoped his friends from the great West would vote for his amendment, as it was just about as just to tax the pigs of Kansas or the power of the mills of Illinois as to pay these bounties.

Mr. FESSENDEN, (rep.) of Me., explained that there was no "hocus pocus" in the treatment of the Senator's proposition in the Finance Committee, and the Senator found it again in the Commerce Committee, solely because the Finance Committee thought it belonged there, and it was so referred in open Senate. He would not attempt to reply to what the Senator had heretofore said in derogation of the bravery of New England citizens. New England was as far above Kentucky in this respect as Heaven was above the earth, and her bright record could not be gotten by anything the Senator might say. The Senator might make something of this in Kentucky, but he could not do it here. He (Mr. Fessenden) would not say a word against Kentucky, for he made many allowances for the position in which she had been placed, and lamented her attachment to the fatal delusion of the justice of human bondage. Mr. Fessenden then proceeded to show that previous to the present troubles the chairmanship of all but four of the committees were in the hands of the Southern democratic leaders. He also denied that New England was represented in the Commerce Committee at the expense of any other section.

Mr. SHERMAN, (rep.) of Ohio, remarked that while he was in favor of this amendment, he should probably vote against it. He gave notice that when the Internal Revenue bill came up he should introduce a carefully worded amendment, accomplishing what was desired.

Mr. CHANDLER, (rep.) of Mich., said he would not defend the Committee of Commerce from the onslaught of the Senator from Kentucky. He would not condescend to do so. He was proud, as the chairman of that committee, to have the abuse. He had voted heretofore for his expulsion as a friend of traitors.

Mr. POWELL wished to understand whether the Senator called him a friend to traitors now?

Mr. CHANDLER rose to reply amid cries of "Order."

Mr. FOSTER submitted that personalities were out of order. He was sustained by the Chair.

Mr. POWELL said if the Senator said he was now the friend of traitors, his statement was false and untrue. (Cries of "Order.") The Senator was not one for whom he had a personal respect.

Mr. CHANDLER rose to reply.

Mr. POWELL refused to yield, as what he said was of such a character that a man of honor and a gentleman could not reply to in this chamber. (Sensation.) He put it to the Senator from Maine, if the people of his section had not been assaulted, and the Senator from Massachusetts had denounced as barbarians those who agreed with the minority? In reply to Mr. Fessenden, Mr. Powell said there was not strength enough in his feeble arm to reach him or his State. In conclusion, he reiterated that he had a right to speak of the Committee of Commerce in the manner he had.

Mr. CHANDLER said if there was a man on God's earth he had ceased to have respect for it was the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Powell) since the rebellion had broken out. His own and the Senator's feelings were, therefore, mutual.

Mr. POWELL said—Nothing more could be expected from ——

Here Mr. SAULSBURY, (opp.) of Del., made an appeal to the Senators that, as sons of common sires and as brothers, they should, in the present unhappy state of affairs in which the country found itself, act as became the dignity of American Senators.

Mr. DAVIS, (opp.) of Ky., said in his votes he had heretofore opposed the present amendment; but, seeing New England come up in solid column for the purpose of prostrating the interests of other sections, he should change his course and vote for the amendment, as a measure of retaliation.

The amendment of Mr. Powell was rejected by a vote of 19 yens against 19 nays, as follows:—

YEAS—Messrs. Buckalew, Cowan, Davis, Harding, Harlan, Harris, Henderson, Hendricks, Lane of Ind., Lane of Kansas, McDougal, Nesmith, Pomeroy, Powell, Saulsbury, Trumbull, Wilkinson, Willey, Wright.

NAYS—Messrs. Anthony, Chandler, Conness, Doolittle, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Howe, Johnson, Morgan, Ramsay, Sherman, Sprague, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Wade, Wilch.

The Senate then adjourned until Thursday.

House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, April 12, 1864.

The galleries were as densely crowded as on Saturday and yesterday.

THE DEPRECIATION OF THE CURRENCY.

Mr. STEVENS, (rep.) of Pa., from the Ways and Means Committee, reported a bill to prevent a depreciation of the currency. It provides that every person, bank, association or corporation issuing notes to circulate as money shall pay a duty of one fourth of one per centum per month on the amount issued. Monthly returns are to be made. After one year it shall be unlawful to issue such notes unless authorized by act of Congress.

The consideration of the subject was postponed.

THE EXPULSION OF MR. LONG.

The House then resumed the consideration of the resolution of Speaker Colfax for the expulsion of Mr. Long, of Ohio.

Mr. ELDRIDGE, (opp.) of Wis., said this resolution was wrongfully brought here. The only object could be to stir up strife and ill feeling at a time when we ought not only to have good fellowship and kind feeling, but union of sentiment. Referring to the constitutional provisions, he denied the right and power of the House to expel the gentleman from Ohio under this resolution. They could not expel him for opinion's sake. The constitution submitted no such question. A man could not be expelled for opinion, but for acts. He disagreed with the gentleman from Ohio, and also with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Harris). He had not come to the conclusion that secession is a fixed and unalterable fact, and that the alternatives mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio have not yet been presented to the country. It is possible, however, they may be. He referred to the New York *Times*, which says that Speaker Colfax's zeal has outrun his discretion, and that his resolution is neither right nor expedient, and the *Evening Post* says that Mr. Long's speech was a perfectly legitimate expression. If the war was conducted on a proper policy, the seceded States may be brought back; but carry it on for subjugation, and you never can accomplish your purposes. You accuse the democrats of sympathizing with the rebels, but you do not believe it. The charge is for wicked and party purposes. He said the republican was the revolutionary party in opinions and practices, for, in overthrowing the constitution they overthrow the Union.

Mr. SPAULDING, (rep.) of Ohio, said that some men were willing to become famous by consenting to be infamous. He (Mr. Spaulding) had carefully read and considered the obnoxious speech of the member from Ohio (Mr. Long), and he found no palliative in or about it. His colleague (Mr. Long) commenced his wild harangue by announcing his intention to express the convictions of his judgment. Nothing was said without premeditation or under excitement by the gentleman (Mr. Long), and yet at the commencement of his singular harangue he made a vile fling at our Chief Magistrate, by asserting, in effect, that in the assassination of the President on his way to Washington there would have been a warmer greeting than would have been agreeable. Mr. Spaulding quoted from the speech of Mr. Long, which he characterized as "criminal licentiousness," and if it was not restrained it would do more to sap the foundations of our republic than the armed cohorts of the rebellion. His colleague had come to the conclusion that the Union is lost, never to be restored, and, according to his own language, he regarded all pains to restore the Union as worse than folly, and that there was no sentiment, either North or South, on which to build a Union; and further, that every clause and letter of the constitution has been violated. His (Mr. Long's) language was uttered within seventy miles of where the two armies are now located, and who are only waiting for a few sunny hours to solve the great mooted question whether we are capable of self-government. In conclusion, Mr. Spaulding denied the truth of a paper read by Fernando Wood yesterday, that he (Mr. Spaulding) had at the Fremont Convention made a speech for the dissolution of the Union. He made no such speech there, and never entertained such an opinion.

Mr. SMITH, (rep.) of Ky., did not hear the speech of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Long), but after a careful examination of it he (Mr. Smith) had come to the conclusion that there was scarcely a sentiment or word in it that he (Mr. Smith) could endorse. Nor did he believe such sentiments should be uttered in this House, or were endorsed by any considerable portion of the people of the United States. He (Mr. Smith) then arraigned the democratic party, a portion of which are now in rebellion, with being the origin and instrumental in bringing on the rebellion; but for them, he (Mr. Smith) said, we would not be in the attitude we are to-day. In the course of his remarks he repeated what Douglas had said, that "there could be but two parties—patriots and traitors"—(applause)—and then proceeded to quote from Davis, Yancey, Brooks, Law and others, to show that they were prepared to sever the Union, making the election of Fremont the pretext. If the advice of Brooks was followed, namely:—"place none but slavery men as sentinels," the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Cox) would have been thus selected.

Mr. COX, (opp.) of Ohio, replied that he never held the doctrine that the democratic party was anti slavery. He had said that party was neither slavery nor anti slavery, but in favor of non-intervention, leaving to the people of the States and Territories the right to regulate their own domestic matters.

Mr. SMITH, in reply to Mr. Cox, stated that he (Mr. Smith) voted for Douglas, and he (Mr. Smith) believed that the spirit of Douglas endorsed every word and sentiment that he (Mr. Smith) now uttered, and that the same spirit was saying to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Cox), "You have departed from the truth." (Laughter.)

Mr. COX wanted to know what peculiar right the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr Smith) had to speak for the deceased statesman, Stephen A. Douglas? He (Mr. Cox) had made the first speech against secession, backing up Mr. Douglas in his views, and had never departed from the stand he had then taken. He stood where Douglas stood.

Mr. SMITH replied that he understood from the Good Book that all true and honest spirits are liberal spirits, and thus communicate; but there was an impassable gulf between the good and the bad, and therefore it was not surprising the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Cox) had not heard from Douglas. (Laughter.) Mr. Smith then adverted to the acts of Buchanan, Floyd and others, in their connection with the late administration, declaring that as slavery was the cause of the war it ought to be removed, so that we might have an independent nation of freemen. (Applause.)

Mr. VOORHEES, (opp.) of Ind., here rose to a point of order, owing to the disorderly demonstrations in the galleries not being suppressed. He made this point in the presence of the gentleman occupying the chair, (Mr. Rollins, of New Hampshire.)

Mr. GRINNELL, (rep.) of Iowa, called Mr. Voorhees to order.

Mr. SMITH hoped that the gentlemen in the galleries would keep their feet still and their hands in their pockets. He (Mr. Smith) said that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Long) had left his own desk and occupied his (Mr. Smith's), at which to deliver his speech. Was there ever such a desecration of a loyal desk? Mr. Smith earnestly contended that we should whip down the rebellion. If we cannot do that let us subjugate the South and populate it with a better people. If gentlemen have sympathies with the Southern rebellion let them honestly define their position.

Mr. PENDLETON, (opp.) of Ohio, would not discuss the soundness or unsoundness of the views of his colleague (Mr. Long), nor would he indulge in any partisan discussion or allusions. The design was that members of Congress should represent the views of their constituents, and by argument, persuasion, and a comparison of opinion, arrive at an intelligent conclusion as to such measures of legislation as would contribute best to the general welfare and the perpetuity of the government. What questions are brought before us? Confiscation, taxation, organization of State governments, and amendments to the constitution. Debate here should be to make an impression on the minds of members. The speech of his colleague (Mr. Long) was made for that purpose. The speech of the gentleman (Mr. Long) was made in a calm, decorous and argumentative manner. Were gentlemen on the other side afraid of the argument of his colleague? Were they afraid to trust the country? Were they, with the power which stood behind them, afraid of an honest expression of opinion? Were they afraid of the speech of his colleague (Mr. Long), made at the proper time and under the rules of the House? The truth was that the matter was entirely beyond the jurisdiction of the House. All that the House could do was to punish for "disorderly conduct."

Mr. WASHBURNE, (rep.) of Ill., inquired whether the gentleman (Mr. Pendleton) did not, during the last Congress, vote to expel two members of this House for other than "disorderly conduct?"

Mr. PENDLETON asked—What two?

Mr. WASHBURNE replied—Mr. Read, of Missouri, and Mr. Burnett, of Kentucky.

Mr. PENDLETON said he voted for their expulsion because they were in arms against the government. Did not the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Washburne) consider that "disorderly conduct?"

Mr. WASHBURNE replied that he accepted the explanation.

Mr. GARFIELD, (rep.) of Ohio, would put a case to his colleague (Mr. Pendleton), in order to obtain a better understanding of his views. Suppose that he should, in a decorous manner, introduce here the plans of General Grant for the campaign about to be commenced, and suppose that he should oppose such plans, and state the number of men, &c., that would not be disorderly conduct; but was it not an offence for which he should be punished?

Mr. PENDLETON replied—If the gentleman (Mr. Garfield) obtained his facts of the campaign from the newspapers—and the facts were of public notoriety—he (Mr. Garfield) would be perfectly right in mentioning them, and it was not in the power of the House to punish him for it. But if the gentleman (Mr. Garfield) went to the War Department and procured important information, under the seal of secrecy, and he came here and made a speech openly unfolding that information, when he (Mr. Garfield) had a right to move that the doors of the House be closed, and by thus publicly speaking gave "aid and comfort" to the enemy, that would be "disorderly conduct," of the gravest character. Mr. Pendleton, in conclusion, alluded to the history of the past, including in its events the presentation of a memorial here by John Quincy Adams from Haverhill, Massachusetts, asking for a dissolution of the Union, and also referred to a former remark of Mr. Stevens, of Pennsylvania, in which he (Mr Stevens) said that "he would never vote for the restoration of the Union with the protection of slavery."

Mr. AMOS MYERS, (rep.) of Pa., said that in their experience as lawyers they had never before seen a man come into court and express his guilt. All the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Long) had to do to show himself a full rebel was to present his revolver. They would not have to wait long for him to join the rebel army after he had been excluded from the hall. Our soldiers would take him by the neck and heels and throw him out of the camps for declaring such sentiments as he had done in the presence of him (Mr. Myers.) Mr. Myers then alluded to the speech of Mr. Long, examining into his motives, and maintaining that he (Mr. Long) had the heart of a traitor, and had made use of language similar to that of others previous to their openly going into the rebellion. He (Mr. Myers) should vote for the expulsion of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Long), for the reason that he believed from the member's (Mr. Long's) own declaration that he preferred the recognition of the Southern confederacy to the subjugation of the South.

A conversation here took place among members concerning the time at which the debate shall be closed.

Mr. COLFAX, (rep.) of Ind., was willing to close the debate to-night, and not to call the question on the expulsion till early Thursday afternoon.

Mr. FENTON, (rep.) of N. Y., was anxious that the debate should be closed to-night, in order that the House might proceed to the consideration of other business, including that relating to taxes and finances, and especially in view of the fact that gold is now rising rapidly in the market, owing to our present monetary condition.

A motion was here made at a quarter to five o'clock for a recess until six o'clock.

This motion was agreed to.

EVENING SESSION.

At six o'clock the galleries were crowded. There were very few members present, as no vote will be taken till Thursday.

Mr. CRAVENS (opp.) of Ind., had read Mr. Long's speech, and was unable to discover anything in it justly subjecting him to censure or dismissal. He did not believe with the gentleman in many of his conclusions. He hoped he would never arrive at the conclusion that it was necessary to recognize the Southern confederacy. He would not have made the declaration the gentleman did in the House; but if the issue were presented to him whether he would exterminate every man, woman and child in the Southern confederacy, he would have come to the same conclusion. The gentleman from Ohio, as the representative of a free people, had a right to be heard. Many of his views were widely different from those of the gentleman. He was an advocate of the war for the restoration of the Union and the suppression of the rebellion. He did not believe, however, that the measures of the administration were best calculated to produce that result. He regretted that there was a disposition to proscribe every man who did not agree with the republicans in their particular policy.

Mr. HARRINGTON, (opp.) of Ind., alluding to the pending proposition, characterized it as a partisan proceeding and not prompted by patriotism. His colleague (Mr. Colfax) had not only descended from his high position, but had at once become the accuser and prosecutor of the gentleman from Ohio. In the course of his remarks he said the people of New England have no stomachs for fighting.

This called up Mr. BOUTWELL, (rep.) of Mass., who asked him what authority he had for that assertion?

Mr. HARRINGTON replied that he judged such to be the case from the fact that Massachusetts had agents in Indiana recruiting negroes to fill up the quota of their State. Indiana would have nothing to do with negroes. She sent white men into the field.

Mr. BOUTWELL wished to know what proof the gentleman had?

Mr. HARRINGTON replied there was no doubt of it. Recruiting agents had been at work in his own town, and the negroes thus gathered said they were going to Massachusetts.

Mr. BOUTWELL observed that Massachusetts had less to fear from secession than any other State because of her isolation and having two-thirds of the maritime power o the continent. The men of that State had rallied to the defence of the republic without a second invitation. He knew of no act of her representatives on this floor to justify the gentleman saying that they had no stomach for prosecuting the war.

Mr. HARRINGTON—I said "stomach for fighting."

Mr. BOUTWELL said they could draft without producing a mob.

Mr. HARRINGTON said the name of Indiana was written on every battle field.

While Mr. Harrington was speaking there was some hissing in the galleries.

Mr. ELDRIDGE, (rep.) of Wis., said they had suffered enough from New England men in the galleries, and their breaches of order ought to be prevented.

Some one asked how he knew that they were New Englanders?

Mr. HOLMAN, (opp.) of Ind., said there was ample power for the Chair to suppress such disturbances.

Mr. ELDRIDGE said he would move that the galleries be cleared if any further disturbance occurred.

The SPEAKER *pro tem.* (Mr. Rollins, of N. H.) directed the Doorkeeper to remove from the galleries persons who may repeat the disturbance.

M. HARRINGTON resumed, and concluded his remarks, advocating the right of free speech; for no force could overcome the mind, however it might oppress the body.

Mr. BROOMALL, (rep.) of Pa., offered an amendment to the pending resolution, declaring Alexander Long to be an unworthy member of the House, and that the Speaker read this resolution to the said Long during the session of the House.

Mr. ELDRIDGE raised the point of order that Mr. Long's speech was made in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union. No exceptions having been taken in the committee, the proposition could not under the rules be entertained in the House.

The SPEAKER overruled the point of order, on the ground that it was proposed in the amendment not to censure Mr. Long for words spoken in debate, but for the publication of his speech in Washington and New York, thus giving evidence of his disloyalty and aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. ELDRIDGE appealed from the decision.

Mr HOLMAN also raised a point that Mr. Broomall's substitute was not germane to the original proposition. These questions were reserved for future action.

Mr. BROMALL said he offered his resolution of censure because from what had already taken place they could not obtain the requisite constitutional two-thirds to expel the member. As he could not be gratified in having him expelled, he must be content to get the resolution of censure. The democratic party had drifted to the position of Mr. Long, of Ohio, and Mr. Harris, of Maryland. They had been so used to running in the democratic harness on the democratic track, that all the republican side could urge failed to switch them off. President Buchanan laid down the same doctrine as the member from Ohio, and so did Jeff. Davis. He was glad there had been some improvement, for many democrats believed that there was power to coerce evildoers to good behavior under the constitution. This discussion showed where the dividing line was to be drawn.

Mr. WINFIELD, (opp.) of N. Y., said there always had been and there always would be war democrats. When assailed in the past they had always been on the side of the country to the extent of the last dollar and the last available means. This war had not been precipitated on the country by the democratic party or any of its members. The democrats have stood by the country's honor by precept and practice. He spoke of the rebellion as unjustifiable, unlawful and unholy. Considering the readiness with which democrats had rallied to the cause, it was too late to say there were no war democrats. It was right to resort to arms to bring back the rebellious citizens to their allegiance to the constitution. If he thought there was a prospect of peace by negotiation he would leave no means untried to bring it about; but before he would agree to sending commissioners, it must be first shown that peace overtures would be met with a corresponding spirit. And because he would not pursue this false light he was to be told by his colleague (Mr. Fernando Wood) that he had ceased to be a democrat. He said that his colleague, who had risen in democratic conventions to give law, had expressed his willingness to let the reins of power remain with the present administration. He was sorry his colleague had himself proclaimed his separation from the democratic party. In this his colleague would seem to be in unison with those on the other side. The democratic party had not lost confidence in itself and its principles. He knew the war had not been prosecuted on the principles at first declared; but that should not separate them in the common effort to bring the war to a close. It had become a common threat to speak of democrats as sympathizing with the rebellion, and to say that after the enemy has been crushed in the front, attention will be paid to the enemy in the rear. These things had a tendency to divide the people and to protract the war. The unity of the people was more important than a party triumph for four years." Mr. Winfield referred to the unjust remarks frequently applied to Governor Seymour, and defended that gentleman, showing that he had always advocated force so put down rebellion, and that on every call of patriotism he was always in the right.

Mr. GRINNELL referred to the democratic party as the "sick man" of 1864. It was too far gone for any medicine yet discovered to cure it. He protested against Mr. Winfield's turning over Fernando Wood to the republicans. They had done nothing to justify such a terrible infliction. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Harrington) had said the soldiers of Massachusetts had no stomach for the fight ——

Mr. HOLMAN remarked that his colleague did not say soldiers, but the representatives of Massachusetts had no stomach for the fight.

Mr BOUTWELL, having been appealed to, Mr. GRINNELL said that Mr. Harrington first said the soldiers of Massachusetts have no stomach for the fight, and next the people, and in the third place her representatives on this floor.

Mr. GRINNELL repelled the base slanders on New England, and remarked that the Western soldiers think the soldiers from that section fight as well as any other. He referred to the action of the House in 1842, when Joshua R. Giddings was censured for offering resolutions declaring the slaves of the creole had a right to rise and assert their native freedom. The democrats voted in a solid body for it, and he reproduced the case as a democratic precedent in regard to an abolitionist. We do not hear so much of the crack of the slavedriver's whip as we did four years ago. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Harris) said he was willing to take all the sins of slavery. Every one of the slaves of that gentleman had a note against him without compound interest. Lovejoy, the abolitionist, had his seat in Heaven, but the gentleman from Maryland would not have one near him. I would (remarked Mr. Grinnell) rather say a thousand times let the country be divided—the South go their way all slave, and the North all free, rather than to see the country once more under democratic misrule.

Mr. HOLMAN demanded that this sentence should be taken down by the Clerk.

There was much merriment on the democratic side, when Mr. SMITH expressed the hope that the House would keep quiet. (Cries of "Order.")

Mr. ELDRIDGE trusted the House would hear the gentleman from Kentucky.

Cries of "Order."

After some further noisy proceedings, Mr GRINNELL said he was merely attempting to quote the remarks of Mr. Conway.

The SPEAKER *pro tem.* said under these circumstances the gentleman from Iowa was in order.

Mr. GRINNELL concluded his speech.

Mr. ROLLINS, (opp.) of Mo., said his heart had been filled with sadness at the notes of party sounding here. It seemed that all was for party and nothing for the country. But for the resolution introduced by the Speaker of the House, the speech of the gentleman from Ohio would have soon been forgotten, like many others. Now, however, it would be read by thousands who otherwise would never have heard it. He relied on the discriminating sense of the country, and did not apprehend the speech would produce harm. If the country was to be stricken down by such a speech as that it ought to perish. While he disavowed the sentiments in that speech, thinking it was improper, if not unpatriotic, in a time like this, he would not censure the gentleman for its delivery, being in favor of the liberty of speech. He concluded by making strongly patriotic remarks.

At half-past eleven the House adjourned.

The Fourth National Bank Difficulty.

PRESIDENT OPDYKE REMOVED.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.

Before Judge Peckham.

APRIL 12.—*Robert S. Taylor and others against the Fourth National Bank, Benjamin Hatton and others.*—The controversy between the majority of the directors of the Fourth National Bank and the President, George Opdyke, is at an end for the present, Judge Peckham having issued an order yesterday which virtually ousts Mr. Opdyke from office. David Dudley Field, it will be recollected, moved for an injunction restraining the majority of the directors from removing Mr. Opdyke from office. Mr. Joseph H. Choate appeared for the directors, and urged that by the act of Congress under which the bank was organized the President could be removed at the pleasure of two-thirds of the board of directors, and that the Revised Statutes of the State conferred no power on the court to interfere in the matter.

Judge Peckham's opinion, denying the motion for an injunction, will be read with interest, as follows:—This is substantially an application for the continuance of an injunction to prevent the alleged illegal removal of the President of the Fourth National Bank, threatened by two-thirds of the directors, defendants herein. It is charged in the complaint that the defendants entered into a combination shortly after the election of the President to "drive him from his office, with the view of putting a more pliable person in his place, and using the funds of the bank to aid in stock operations, instead of employing them in legitimate commercial and banking operations." The suit is commenced by two of the directors and two stockholders of the bank, the President not being a party. The purpose of the removal is very fully and specifically denied, though the intent to remove is admitted, and, as the defendants insist, for the true interests of the bank. It appears from the papers on this motion that soon after the election of the President, on the 19th of January last, until the commencement of this suit, unpleasant difficulties and differences have existed between the President and a majority of the directors as to the proper officers of the bank, and as to some other matters not material to specify. The directors finally determined to remove him, and it is now insisted that they have no such power. No allusion was made in the complaint, on which the temporary injunction was obtained, to the articles of association of this bank, signed by the stockholders. The chief ground urged against the authority of the board to remove the President is, that the bank has never legally adopted any by-laws, and that there are none now existing; that they should be adopted by the stockholders, and not by the directors, and that they should also be approved by the Comptroller of the Currency. They have been adopted by the directors only. It is conceded that they have never been adopted by the stockholders, nor in form by the Comptroller of the Currency. But suppose there are no by-laws yet adopted, I do not think it follows that the directors may not remove the President. The articles of association, signed by all the original stockholders (in some degree in the nature of a charter), gives express authority to remove. Its sixth article provides that "the board of directors (a majority of whom shall be a quorum to do business) shall elect one of their number to be president, who shall hold his office (unless he should become disqualified or sooner removed by a two-thirds vote of all the members of the board) for the term for which he was elected a director." These articles of association, so adopted and signed, are to be, and in this case, from the facts presented, have been transmitted to the Comptroller of the Currency, who is by law required "to record and carefully preserve the same in his office" (Section 6 of the act.) He must then, in substance, have approved of them, or he would not have issued the circulating notes to this bank, which he, in fact, issued under the 16th section of the act. The act of Congress also, in my judgment, authorizes this removal. In speaking of the powers of the directors, as I interpret the act, it says "they shall have power to carry on the business of banking by obtaining and issuing circulating notes in accordance with the provisions of this act, by discounting bills, notes, and other evidences of debt, &c., &c.; to choose one of their number as president of such association, and to appoint a cashier and such other officers and agents as their business may require, and to remove such president, cashier, officers and agents at pleasure, and appoint others in their places." (Section 11 of the act.) I think this construction of the act, as having reference to the directors to do these things and not to the stockholders, is quite plain. It does not seem to be at all necessary that any by-laws should be adopted before a president may be chosen or removed, and another appointed in his place. This power is expressly given to the board, irrespective of any by-laws, both by the articles of association and by the act of Congress. Besides, it is a power that might be required to be exercised, or that it might be expedient to exercise, prior to the adoption of any by-laws. It is also insisted that one of the defendants (Mr. Whitewright) is not legally a director, and hence he has no right to unite in the removal. It appears that one of the original directors resigned, and that Mr. Whitewright was appointed to fill the vacancy by the other members of the board, without any nomination at a prior meeting of the board as required by the by-laws, as plaintiffs allege, adopted by the board. Here the plaintiffs must invoke the aid of by-laws. The act of Congress prescribes that the vacancy in the board shall be filled by appointment by the remaining directors. (Section 43.) Assuming the plaintiffs to be correct in their position that there are no by-laws, there is certainly no objection to the appointment under the statute. Besides, I may add, that the statute seems to require the aid of no by-laws, and that none could be made to annul it, if the by-laws exist and are valid. I do not think they apply to the appointment of a director, though it might have been a sound provision, had it been made. Irrespective of the by-laws and of the articles of association, the board have power, under the act, to remove the president by a mere majority vote; assuming that they modify and qualify the act, a two-third vote is required. It is argued that the Court should stay the action of the board until the 14th instant, when a meeting of the stockholders will be held and the whole difficulty settled. On mere questions of expediency of this character, courts have no power to interfere with the action of a bank or its officers. The preliminary injunction is therefore dissolved, and the motion for its continuance is denied, with costs.

The Sailing of the Africa.

BOSTON, April 12, 1864

The mails per the steamship Africa, for Liverpool, via Halifax, will close at ten o'clock to-morrow (Wednesday) morning, but she will not sail until about one o'clock.

Three inches of snow fell here last night. The weather is cloudy this morning, and an easterly wind is blowing.

A New Extacy is in Store for Those who have never yet inhaled the fragrance of PHALON & SON'S Night Blooming Cereus. It has enduring as it is refreshing. The imitators try their hands at counterfeiting it in vain. They can only mock the outside appearance. Inquire for PHALON'S Night Blooming Cereus, the standard perfume of the nineteenth century. Sold by all druggists.

A Household Card.
Not only all the fashions in Hats which may be found elsewhere, but a great diversity of styles which
CAN BE FOUND NOWHERE ELSE,
are comprised in the immense first class stock at
GENIN'S, 513 BROADWAY.
The fashions for the spring (now complete) at this establishment include a more extensive variety of dress and undress Hats for gentlemen than is presented by any other assortment in this country. The exposition of
LADIES', MISSES', CHILDREN'S AND INFANTS' HATS
comprehends, not only all the standard styles of Europe for the present and approaching season, but innumerable unique fabrics suited to all the
CAPRICES OF TASTE,
and adapted to all purposes. It is believed that no mother can make the tour of the store with her family without finding for each member of it a fabric for the head, which will strike her as becoming and suitable.
GENIN, 513 Broadway.

A Bad Breath.—How Many Lovers it has separated—how many friends for ever parted. To effect a radical cure use the BALM OF A THOUSAND FLOWERS as a dentrifice, night and morning. It also beautifies the complexion. Price 50 cents. For sale by all druggists.

All Ye who Suffer Headache, Toothache, neuralgia and catarrh know ye that WOLCOTT'S instant Pain Annihilator speedily and permanently cures you. Sold everywhere.

Address to Smokers.—Pollak & Son, Meerschaum manufacturers, 357 Broome street, near the Bowery, sell goods at wholesale and retail. Pipes cut to order, repaired, boiled and mounted.

**A Thousand Refrigerators, from $4 50