# NATIONAL CAPITAL.

CONTINUED FROM FIRST PAGE.

, he derived it from the second section of the late endment to the constitution and from the clause giv- t to Congress the power to establish a uniform system naturalization. He contended that the right of natu- ization, was simply to confer on persons the ht to hold and convey property, and was not confined persons born in foreign countries, but might be ex- ded to persons born in this country and laboring under abilities.

Mr. ROGERS, (dem.) of N. J., said that it was well tled that the naturalization laws had no application pect to foreigners.

The SPEAKER *pro tem.* (Mr. Spalding)—Does the gen- man from Pennsylvania (Mr. Thayer) consider himself ficiently informed? (Laughter.)

Mr. THAYER said he had taken up some little time in ing to the House the grounds on which he supposed t objection was overthrown.

Mr. RAYMOND, (rep.) of N. Y., stated that he had en- vored to satisfy himself and to come to the same con- sion as the gentleman (Mr. Thayer) upon that very nt, and asked him whether he had examined and was pared to remark upon the opinion of Judge Curtis in Dred Scott case.

Mr. THAYER replied that he had not read that opinion ently, and should feel much hesitation in comment- upon it.

Mr. RAYMOND stated it as his opinion that Congress had ver to naturalize persons born in this country, but uld like to be strengthened in that opinion.

Mr. ROGERS remarked that Judge Curtis had taken the e ground in regard to the naturalization laws as he Rogers) did.

Mr. THAYER was not aware that Judge Curtis con- red with the gentleman from New Jersey in that y, or in the extraordinary views which he had pre- ed to the House yesterday.

s a subsequent stage of Mr. Thayer's remarks Mr. nas desired to interrupt him by reading Judge Cur- opinion, but Mr. Thayer declined to yield, as he had ed from that part of his argument.

eferring, in conclusion, to a reference made the other by Mr. Davis to the case of Cæsar's clemency to pey's friends, Mr. THAYER thought it a rather unfor- te illustration. Cæsar, he said, did take to his m, immediately after battles in which he had over- e his great rival Pompey, those who had been the friends of Pompey and the worst enemies of Cæsar. all know that Brutus, Cassius and all of the con- ators had fought against him under Pompey at rsalia and Philippi. Sir, let the republic take ning from the fate of Cæsar. Cæsar was betrayed stabbed in the Capitol by the friends (?) whom he naturely hardened and took to his bosom! Sir, I the republic may feel also in its heart the dagger of conspirators which the too rapid theories of the gen- an from New York (Mr. Davis) would bring prema- ly into places of power and responsibility in this rnment. No, sir; let us be generous; let us be just; let us be careful and let us be true.

Mr. HALL, (rep.) of Ind., moved to amend the pending on to recommit by adding instructions to except n those declared citizens of the United States such ave voluntarily borne arms against the government he United States, or given aid and comfort to the nies thereof, and also to except the right of age from the civil rights conferred. He spoke upport of his amendment. He supposed it not the intention of the friends of the bill to confer s of citizenship not now pressed on those who have in rebellion. His amendment took no right from n, but left their rights to be determined hereafter. amendment on the subject of suffrage was but a explicit declaration of what had been repeatedly ed in argument, but did not appear in the bill. It ned to him important to relieve the bill of any ambi- y, and that was the object of his amendment.

Mr. EDMUNDS addressed the House in opposition to the He looked upon it as one of the series of measures ng out of the fears and apprehensions of certain viduals in the House and in the country in regard to e who had formerly held slaves. He had hoped that before this the people would have come to the con- on that the subject of slavery and its consequent had been sufficiently agitated. He had hoped when the war was over, when peace was red, and when the institution of slavery finally given up and the constitution was nded in accordance with that idea, that this sub- would haunt us no more. He looked upon this bill e of the most dangerous and insidious of those ures intended to take away the rights of the States. rights of the States were the rights of the Union, and liberties of the States were the liberties of the citi- The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Thayer) asked what objection there was to this measure— right it took away. In the first place it laid pros- at the feet of the federal government the judiciary of State. It not only entered the States to regulate their e and municipal affairs, but attempted to destroy the endence of the judiciary. He elaborated his objec on legal and constitutional grounds, reading an ex- from the opinion of Judge Curtis referred to in the te to the effect that the naturalization laws applied to the removal of disabilities consequent on foreign

Mr. RAYMOND—Even if citizenship cannot under the itution be absolutely conferred on native-born citi- why may not Congress declare that all native-born bitants of this country are citizens, making it a de- tory act instead of one conferring citizenship?

Mr. EDMUNDS replied that there was no authority in onstitution for Congress to pass any such law. If re desirable to confer the right of citizenship on men there must be a constitutional amendment for purpose. He expressed his belief that the former holders would treat the freedmen with more kind- and clemency than would many of those who are ous for the passage of these measures. They knew nature, their wants, their habits, and had towards none of the prejudices or unkind feelings which hern people had.

Mr. DUMONT, (rep.) of Ind., proposed to amend the ndment of his colleague (Mr. Hill) by striking out the sed exception and inserting instead of it—

nothing herein contained shall be construed as ex- ng the rights of citizenship to any one who has re- ced the same or acknowledged allegiance to any govern- or pretended government in hostility to the United s, who held office under the same; nor to any one who tarily bore arms against the United States in the late llion, or who has been guilty of any act whatever which e law of nations makes a forfeiture of citizenship.

Mr. MILLER, (rep.) of Pa., proposed to amend by adding vision exempting from penalties judges of State s who decided justly under the constitution and of their respective States, and providing for an ap- to the United States courts.

Mr. THORNTON, (dem.) of Ill., took the floor in opposi- to the measure, which he opposed principally on the nd that it was an assumption of rights on the part e general government which it did not possess r the constitution. He fortified his position by cita- from Madison and Chief Justice Marshall. He ad- ed that Congress might go so far as to pass laws for punishment of those who would deprive the late of power to make contracts and control and re- r his wages. It might be, perhaps, necessary to such legislation. But to go beyond that was trench- on the rights of States and attempting to exercise r which always belonged to the State. These mat- should be all regulated by the people themselves. was but a stepping stone towards centralizing in this rnment the rights of the States and all the legal rs of the States. Whenever that was done, all the y, the power and the strength of the government gone, and there was nothing left but naked des- m.

Mr. WINDOM, (rep.) of Minn., supported the bill. He essed his surprise at listening yesterday to the h of the recognized leader of the democratic party his House, the honorable gentleman from New y (Mr. Rogers). He believed from what was daily s'd here that it was the judgment of the House to d to that gentleman that position.

Mr. ROGERS asked leave to interrupt.

Mr. WINDOM—If I do the gentleman too much honor he disdain it.

Mr. ROGERS—I hope no one on this side (the republican will make the assertion again. It is intended only vate dissatisfaction on my side of the House. ghter and manifestations of interest.) I do not to be a leader of the democratic party here, and I t want to have any such charge repeated. Gentle- will be doing me a service by keeping that still. ghter.)

Mr. CONKLING, (rep.) of N. Y.—I would like to know s a leader on that side if the gentleman from New y is not?

Mr. MARSHALL, (dem.) of Ill., and several other demo- tried to be heard on the question of leadership, but Windom declined to yield. He did not expect, he when he passed a well-merited compliment on the learned, and very logical and very patriotic gentle- from New Jersey, that it would stir up so much ex- ent on the other side of the House. That excite- seemed to have two causes. One of those was that gentlemen on that side were ambitious to be lead- and the other seemed to be because the very modest man from New Jersey declined the honor red him, and seemed to take it as an insult.

Mr. MARSHALL—I wish to say that we do not recognize as a leader.

Mr. WINDOM declined to yield.

Mr. MARSHALL—We have no leadership.

er democrats made attempts to be heard, but did ceed. The House, meanwhile, enjoyed the whole immensely.

Mr. SPALDING, (rep.) of Ohio—They need not quar- out the leadership. Mr. Rogers has rightfully d it.

Mr. WINDOM went on to criticise the speech of Mr. s, bringing into juxtaposition his declaration that n was more willing than himself to extend to the all the rights of life, liberty and property, and his nant outburst in reply to Mr. Thayer's question, e could not go to bed with a clear conscience be- ed if he had voted for the constitutional amend- abolishing slavery. He quoted from this leader of emocracy just to show how much they did love y. They would go any length to give liberty to the but whenever a constitutional amendment is pro- to do that thing they thank God that their con- es are clear of blood—that they did not vote for n this connection he desired to say that he was ned that the gentleman (Mr. Rogers) had been ed to vote for the constitutional amendment, and have done so but that he happened to be sick at me.

Mr. ROGERS—That is utterly false, without one particle th. Whoever gives such information to the gen- n states what he knows to be an utter falsehood. I agreed, either directly or indirectly, to vote for onstitutional amendment. I made a speech here st it, and, if I had been here when the vote was I should have unqualifiedly voted against it.

Mr. WINDOM—I don't know how the matter is, and of e I accept the explanation.

Mr. NIBLACK, (dem.) of Ind.—In making the interroga- f the gentleman yesterday whether he had voted st the constitutional amendment, I was actuated y by a desire to afford the gentleman from New y an opportunity to explain the circumstances under he failed to vote for that very important measure, re was some comment made at the time and some ry why he and a certain other gentleman failed to. in my own mind a reason for it, especially as ose, by the help he gets from other quarters and by action of gentlemen on the other side and by the great consideration of the Speaker, he is trusted as leader. I want to have him rectify in curia upon this as upon all other questions.—(laughter)—I wanted to give him an opportunity to explain why he was not here. I only regret that he was not able to give us more particularly the details. I never myself doubted that he had good reasons. (Laughter.) But I wanted to understand them, especially as we stand committed here before the House and country for what he says on this and on all other questions. (Roars of laughter.) I hope that men on all sides will afford the gentleman every opportunity to make any explanation he deems necessary in order to relieve himself.

Mr. WINDOM—I cannot yield further on that point.

Mr. HIGBY suggested that the fact of New Jersey not being in the Union might have restrained the gentleman from voting on that question. (Laughter.)

Mr. GARFIELD, (rep.) of Ohio—New Jersey has been in the Union since the last election.

Mr. HIGBY—But she was not at that time.

Mr. WINDOM would have to leave the gentlemen on the other side to settle the question of leadership among themselves. But he believed that in a few years they would be ashamed of belonging to the party at all, to say nothing about being a leader. (Laughter.)

Mr. NIBLACK—We feel on this side that we do not want any leader. There are not enough of us to make any trouble on that score. (Laughter.) Therefore we would rather carry on a guerilla fight. I mean no discourtesy to the gentleman from New Jersey; still, we do not like to surrender ourselves to his leadership. Some of us on this side do feel very keenly—especially those who have a taste for talking a good deal—to hear so much said about the gentleman from New Jersey being a leader of the party. It does provoke our jealousy. (Laughter.) It is very unpleasant to us.

Mr. ROGERS (who was sitting on the republican side of the House)—That is the object of the whole thing. (Roars of laughter.)

Mr. WINDOM—I am glad the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Niblack) has made the explanation. I have conversed with two or three on that side who do not recognize the leadership. I am satisfied from another reason. The gentleman says they do not need a leader, as they carry on a guerilla warfare. That explains why all on that side voted last Congress against the bill to punish guerillas.

This shot into the democratic ranks fairly brought down the house.

Mr. THAYER asked the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Niblack) to explain what he meant by referring to help from other parties.

Mr. NIBLACK—I mean defection in your own ranks.

Mr. GARFIELD—Then you would vote for a bill encouraging desertion, but not to punish guerillas. (Laughter.)

Mr. WINDOM shoved off from the subject of leadership and proceeded to argue in support of the bill. He only complained that it did not go far enough. It protected only the civil rights of freedmen and left for future adjustment the protection of their political rights. So far, however, as it did go it was in strict accordance with the designs of the grand old founders of the government, who, when they laid its foundation, made the right of human nature its chief corner stone.

Mr. SHELLABARGER, (rep.) of Ohio, made a short, legal and constitutional argument in support of the measure. The result he arrived at was that, on a candid and fair investigation of the matter, there was no difficulty in voting for the bill proposed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Raymond) for the naturalization of all these people. The usefulness of such a measure was just as great and profound as it was useful to be an American citizen.

Mr. BROMALL, (rep.) of Pa., got the floor, but yielded to Mr. WILSON, who proposed, in order to give the Committee of Ways and Means time to get through some important measure, to let the matter go over till Thursday next.

After considerable discussion this was at length agreed to.

Mr. WILSON withdrew a motion which was pending to recommit, which caused the various amendments to recommit, with instructions, to fall.

Mr. WILSON then offered some amendments of detail, which were agreed to, and also the following additional section, which he did not desire to press to a vote now:—

And be it further enacted, That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to affect the laws of any State concerning the right of suffrage.

Mr. RAYMOND asked Mr Wilson to consent to a vote on his (Mr. Raymond's) bill as a substitute.

Mr. WILSON could not agree to that. The bill was ordered to be printed, and its further consideration was postponed until Thursday next.

SATURDAY FOR GENERAL DEBATE.

To-morrow (Saturday) was set apart for general debate on the President's Message as if in Committee of the Whole.

EVENING SESSIONS.

Mr. STEVENS gave notice that he would move on Monday for evening sessions for business.

THE REGULAR ARMY.

Mr. SCHENCK asked the unanimous consent of the House to offer a resolution of inquiry in relation to the strength, &c., of the regular army, to which Mr. WASHBURNE, of Ill., objected.

MEXICAN MATTERS.

Mr. SCHENCK also asked consent to introduce a resolution of inquiry as to Mexican matters, to which Mr. BOUTWELL objected.

AGRICULTURE AND MECHANICAL ARTS.

Mr. HOTCHKISS introduced a bill to encourage education in agriculture and the mechanic arts, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The House adjourned.

## Amusements.

THE MATINEES TO-DAY.

The enjoyment of the brilliant matinees arranged for this afternoon at the undernamed fashionable and well conducted places of amusement will be enhanced by the mild and genial weather of the advancing spring. The advertising columns of the HERALD show that a grand matinee performance will be commenced at the Broadway theatre at half-past one o'clock. It will be a Solon Shingle matinee, the last at which that celebrated actor, Mr. John E. Owens, will appear in his famous impersonation of Solon Shingle. The announcement of this fact alone is sufficient to crowd the house to its utmost. The entertainment will conclude at a quarter past three o'clock—a most seasonable hour for the convenience of ladies, children and country visitors. George Christy's fashionable minstrel and dramatic matinee will commence at the New Fifth Avenue Opera House at two o'clock in the afternoon. A varied and delightful programme has been issued. The company will play to-day, for the first time, a laughable farce, entitled The Cobbler's Frolic. Everything else at Christy's, including "High Daddy," is excellent, and most of the pieces entirely new. Tony Pastor's well managed and well attended matinee will commence at his opera house, in the Bowery, at half-past two o'clock. It is enough to mention that Tony Pastor will appear as the Bootblack, Josh Hart as Mose, and Laura St. Claire as Lize. The New York Detective and The Skating Carnival are announced, with other good things.

JUIGNET'S FRENCH DRAMATIC COMPANY

will give another series of performances at the Academy of Music. Their new theatre on Fourteenth street, will be opened on the 14th of April. To-night they will give at the Academy *L'Aieul*, a drama which obtained a great success in Paris, and by their careful rehearsal they will will doubtless make it equally a success with the *habitués* of our French theatre.

HOOLEY'S MATINEE IN BROOKLYN.

Hooley has made preparations for a fine matinee at his opera house, in Brooklyn. The performances commence at half-past two o'clock. The favorite artists, James H. Budworth, Louis Nevers and George Moore, will appear in popular characters, supported by the entire company.

## City Intelligence.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT COTTON.—Two thousand eight hundred and thirty-three bales of Mobile cotton were sold yesterday in this city under the supervision of the United States authorities, bringing prices about equal to those of the general market, but prices about five cents a pound lower than the same quality of staple realized during last month. The following shows the rates of yesterday as compared with those of the 9th of January last:—

| *Amount and quality.* | *March 2.* | *January 9.* |
|---|---|---|
| 21 middling fair..... | 46c. | 51½c. |
| 137 strictly middling.. | 43½c. a 44c. | 49½c. a 49¾c. |
| 333 low middling..... | 40½c. | 47½c. |
| 397 good ordinary..... | 39½c. | 43½c. a 43¾c. |
| 173 ordinary..... | 38c. | 40½c. |
| 39 low ordinary..... | 35½c. | 37½c. |
| 248 pickings..... | 19c. a 21c. | 19c. a 20c. |
| 1,485 rebaled cotton.... | 38½c. | 42½c. a 43½c. |

2,833 bales.

Two hundred and eighty three bales of Savannah cotton were afterwards sold at an advance over those received for the Mobile quality. Some Memphis cotton was also disposed of at fair prices.

PREPARATIONS FOR ST. PATRICK'S DAY—IRISH SOCIETIES.—A largely attended meeting of delegates from Irish societies in this city was held last night in Hibernian Hall, 42 Prince street, for the purpose of making arrangements for the celebration of St. Patrick's Day. A subscription of one hundred and fifteen dollars was received from the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and five dollars from the Young Men's Temperance Society of Brooklyn, No. 1. The various Irish societies were well represented at the meeting, in the proceedings of which Judge Connolly and others took part. It is believed that the societies of Brooklyn will come over and march in procession with their brethren of New York, but this has not been yet finally decided on.

## Mexico.

MAXIMILIAN RECEIVING REINFORCEMENTS.

NEW ORLEANS, March 1, 1866.

The *Mexican Times*, of January 27, says that fresh foreign troops are daily arriving in Mexico.

## Personal Intelligence.

Major General Sickles, it appears from our late Charleston dates, is actively occupied at his post at Charleston. The announcement, therefore, of his arrival in New York is unfounded.

FIRE AT MIDDLE VILLAGE, QUEENS COUNTY.—The glue factory of George W. Baker, at Middle Village, Queens county, took fire on Thursday afternoon, and, with the exception of the engine house, was entirely destroyed. The fire is believed to have resulted from the boiling over of a pot of tar on the roof, which some workmen were engaged in repairing. Mr. Baker's loss will not fall much short of $15,000, on which there is an insurance of $11,000 in New York companies.

# EUROPE.

## OUR PARIS CORRESPONDENCE.

### AMUSING SCENE IN THE FRENCH CHAMBERS.

### The Paris Press on the Mexican Question.

### Significant Incident at the French Court.

### &c. &c. &c.

**Our Paris Correspondence.**

PARIS, Feb. 13, 1866.

*Speech of the Marquis de Boissy—Singular Scene in the French Senate—Speech of Marshal Forey on Mexican Affairs—The Opposition—Significant Incident, &c.*

Once a year, about the time that the carnival season is coming to a close, and the *bœuf gras* is going his rounds, an eccentric old gentleman, a member of the French Senate, gets up a little carnival of his own, and, like the clown in the circus, comes tumbling into the national ring with "Here I am again."

THE IRREPRESSIBLE BOISSY.

The gentleman in question is the Marquis de Boissy, the husband of Byron's early love, the Countess Guiccioli. He is a queer bundle of contradictions. He professes to be a friend of peace, and yet would sacrifice everything to a war with England; a lover of liberty and a strong supporter of the Pope's temporal power and the Bourbons of Naples. His great hobby is hatred of England. England is his *bête noir*, and he seems to hold her responsible for all the ills and evils in the world, from the fall of Adam down to the Rinderpest. In the speech which the Marquis annually makes, professedly upon the address to the throne, he travels over the whole field of politics; but all his efforts seem to tend toward the expression of his detestation, scorn and contempt for England and the English. In the progress of his speech a few days since a queer scene occurred in the Senate Chamber—such a scene as it would scarcely seem possible could occur in the midst of a body appointed by the sovereign as his special supporters and the upholders of the constitution. The Marquis commenced by recommending the government "to inscribe upon its flag, rather to-day than to-morrow, three devices—the treaty of commerce with England denounced, protective rights re-established, and parliamentary government restored. (Noise.) He thought they would be magical words, which would rally back to the government all those who appeared disposed to separate from it. In his opinion no throne could henceforward be solid without the basis of the parliamentary system, and no crown could pass from the head of father to son but in virtue of parliamentary institutions. When the astonishment which this bold utterance caused had partially subsided the following discussion took place between the speaker and the President:—

The PRESIDENT—M. le Marquis, I cannot allow you to continue in that strain; you have no right to do so; you have taken an oath to the constitution, and you are bound to keep it.

The Marquis DE BOISSY—I do not say the contrary.

The PRESIDENT—You demand the overthrow of the constitution.

The Marquis DE BOISSY—We are asked to give our advice——

The PRESIDENT—Yes, your advice is asked for, but you are not giving say; you are attacking the constitution.

The Marquis DE BOISSY—Not at all.

The PRESIDENT—You demand a change in it, and you have no right to do so at this moment. The constitutional reason opposed to such a demand is this:—The Senate is a constituent power, and has the right of initiative to ask for changes in the constitution, but only with the observance of certain forms prescribed by the regulations. If, as a Senator, you have any modifications to propose, you can only do so by conforming to the rules. And this is what you are not doing. When, here in the Senate, you ask for parliamentary government, you bring before the public propositions which, before being communicated even to this House, ought to be authorized by three bureaus. (Approbation.) Thus you are doing indirectly what is interdicted—you are eluding the constitution. I therefore call you to order, and I cannot allow you to continue on that subject. (Great applause.)

The Marquis DE BOISSY—I submit to the high authority of the President, remarking only that we had been told we had the right to indicate what we desired, and we cannot do so without expressing a wish. No crime certainly has been committed.

The PRESIDENT—But you have no right to give utterance to your wish in a privileged form which is not that prescribed by the regulations.

The Marquis DE BOISSY—Well, then, let it be supposed that I have said nothing. You desire to abridge the discussion, I consent; but it is a misfortune, for by so doing you shorten your great element of existence. If you wish to live, the country must well understand it, and you only live by publicity. If we extinguish discussion, we destroy ourselves.

The PRESIDENT—You have the right of discussion, but in confining yourself within the circle traced out by the constitution. (Approbation.)

The Marquis DE BOISSY—When I want to express a simple wish I am prevented from speaking.

The PRESIDENT—You are not expressing a wish; you are disparaging the constitution, and I cannot allow you to do so. (Applause.)

The Marquis DE BOISSY—I am devoted to the constitution and do not seek to disparage it; but it has been declared capable of being made more perfect, and that is what I demand. You have no right to say to the constitution, "So far shalt thou go and no farther." Were you to do so you would condemn it to immobility, which would be the same as condemning it to the tomb; we should then all go down together and sup with the dead. (Prolonged murmurs.) I will now say a word on the address. I approve of many things in it, but when I find something wrong, I am sincere enough to say as much. I am called a man of opposition. I am so, indeed, but it is for the sake of sustaining, not of subverting, whilst those who continually support on all occasions at last arrive at a convulsion. How was the restoration overthrown? By men who were more royalist than the King himself. I am a Bonapartist; but to support the dynasty I think a man should not be a shrub which bends, but an iron bar. It is not by flattery or by cringing that real support is given; it is by showing ourselves rigid and inflexible, for then it will be felt that we may be relied on in certain circumstances. (Noise.) I do not think I have said anything improper, and I consider those murmurs as compliments.

Coming to the passage in the address relative to the French and English fleets, the Marquis continued:—

I regret to see that occurrence represented as a mark of sympathy between the two nations. An attempt had been made to inspire the country with an opinion which it did not hold and which was not the true one. The meeting proved one thing only—the discipline of French sailors. As to the good understanding between the two countries it proved nothing of the sort. (Murmurs.) As to sympathy, I am informed that every man cried up his own country and depreciated the other. If you wish to have an idea of the sympathy so much talked about ask in what terms the French sailors spoke of the English navy and the English of the French.

M. LIBRECHT—I was there, and I neither heard nor saw anything at variance with good understanding and sympathy between the two nations.

The PRESIDENT—Yours is a policy of division and not of conciliation. (Adhesion.)

The Marquis DE BOISSY—I only repeat what I have heard. I love the French navy because it defends our coasts, and will one day carry our army into England. (Interruption.)

M. ROULAND—In the interest of the truth, of the dignity of the Senate, and of the security of the relations between the two countries, I protest against language which has never been heard in a deliberate assembly. (Hear, hear.)

The Marquis DE BOISSY—Gentlemen, allow me to remind you of the words of M. Dupin, when he presided over the Legislative Assembly. "Citizen," he said, "I call you to order; you have not the right to speak to interrupt one of your colleagues." (Murmurs.) I wish the President would do as much in my favor, and not allow me to be interrupted. (Marks of disapprobation.) I blame the meeting of the French and English fleets at a political point of view, and as an abuse of power and discipline. The French seamen were forced to cry out, "The English navy forever!" when they would have cried most willingly, "Down with the English navy!" The same may be said of the English seamen. (Oh! oh!) The two navies are enemies, and not friends. Such is the feeling among them. (No! no!)

M. ADOLPHE BARROT—Seamen who have fought against each other with courage always maintain a feeling of mutual respect. (Hear.)

The Marquis DE BOISSY—The Queen declares that the meeting of the fleets was directed against America. (Interruption.) I believe that the American people is great enough not to be intimidated by blank shots fired on the coasts of France and England. But America is young and, perhaps, badly brought up. She had the good sense not to abolish privateering. As England has more ships than America, the latter understood that without letters of marque she would suffer the most. America is less anxious for great naval victories than for the prizes and profits she may make by corsairs. America, by maintaining the right of fitting out privateers, has become a terror to England. The latter is now too weak to offer to France any real opposition, even should the annexation of Belgium be in question. (Interruption.) I am anxious to show the weakness of England, and when what I desire happens no Power will oppose it. England menaces in every direction, but only strikes the weak. She has, besides, the affair of the United states on her hands. England has given a good example. She fomented the rebellion in the South and recognized the Confederates as belligerents. America asked aloud for indemnities, but said to herself "I will excite rebellion in my turn, and England will not venture to say anything." England is clever, but what is her object? She applies to France and says, "Give us money, ships and men to preserve our possessions, and we will guarantee Maximilian." Besides that difficulty of America, who wishes for war. England has, thank heaven, another embarrassment—Fenianism. England has excited secret societies, and provoked discord in other countries. Providence now allows her to be punished by herself. She has sown revolutions, and now reaps them herself. (Murmurs.) If we had the wisdom to favor Fenianism in Ireland we should only be exercising reprisals. (No, no!) I do not understand the objections I hear; when some time back the revolution in Poland was applauded. Is not the revolution in Ireland as legitimate as that of Poland? The Irish also are Catholics. (Movement.) My desire is to see Fenianism extend widely. Does not England still show her hatred to France by again summoning to her councils the man who furnished funds to Mazzini, Orsini and those who armed the attempted assassins of the Emperor? His Majesty was wrong in expressing his regret for the death of the King of the Belgians. Since 1812 Leopold was the most skilful and the most implacable enemy of France.

A SENATOR—You are speaking of the dead.

The Marquis DE BOISSY—Yes; but I do not wish to attack him. I mean to prove only that those who weep must regret having done so. At the Congress of Vienna, with Lord Castlereagh, he played the principal part against France. In 1830 an English prefect, under the name of King or otherwise, was wanted at Brussels, and he was selected. When an enemy of my country dies I do not mourn; I sing a *Te Deum*. (Oh, oh!) I do not pretend that those are very Christian feelings; but they are patriotic. (Noise.) But I will leave the subject and make some remarks on agriculture. The address speaks of an inquiry, which I trust will be sincere, and on this point I request the government commissioners to give some explanation. Speaking of the commissioners—(noise)—I see one of them and desire his return among us, hoping that he will imitate the noble conduct of those among us who made a mistake in resigning.

The PRESIDENT—That has no connection with the address. Speak to the question.

The Marquis DE BOISSY—There is no question.

The PRESIDENT—The question is what you yourself have chosen—agriculture.

The Marquis DE BOISSY—I leave that question, but will return to it. I now ask whether we cannot, when discussing the address, speak on any subject whatever. The Emperor says so; he is my master, and I submit to him. Recurring to article 21 of the constitution, I ask——

The PRESIDENT—That question has been repeatedly discussed, and is settled for all right-minded persons.

Upon the subject of Mexico the Marquis stated that he had promised himself to say nothing except to express the wish that the French army might come home as soon as possible. Incidentally referring to the Jamaica insurrection, a Senator replied that France had no interest in that matter.

The Marquis DE BOISSY—There is a great interest in placing England at the ban of all civilized nations.

M. ROULAND—What you say has not common sense.

The Marquis DE BOISSY—I wish to exclude England from all nations, and to excite all the Powers against her.

The PRESIDENT—Your language is inconvenient in the highest degree—contrary to wise policy, to the interests of France and to the rights of nations.

The Marquis DE BOISSY—What! Contrary to the rights of nations! Who is it that violates them but England? If I could sacrifice her to spare a drop of French blood, I would do so with pleasure. The noble Senator then referred to the revolt in Jamaica, and regretted that there was not another Gladstone to write the atrocities of the English government; mentioned the ex-King and Queen of Naples, and declared that they would have a brilliant page in history, while their calumniators would be covered with shame; asked why the Committee on the Address had not mentioned several points in the speech from the throne, naming among others the meeting of the fleets, the promised neutrality in the affairs of Germany, the death of King Leopold (at which silence he was gratified), Mexico, the prosperity of the United States, the remarks concerning "restless spirits," and the crowning of the edifice. Now, added the Marquis, I ask your permission to pass to the "Livre Bleu." (Cries of "Oh, oh!" "Enough, enough!" with laughter.)

The Marquis DE BOISSY—I thank you for your applause.

The PRESIDENT—The Senate has not applauded you. You might have perceived that much of what you have said has been listened to with great inattention.

The Marquis DE BOISSY—I do not admit that.

The PRESIDENT—I appeal to the Assembly. (Marks of assent.)

The Marquis DE BOISSY—Many of my colleagues will say yes here, and when they are outside will declare the contrary. (Laughter.) I have remarked during the last year that there are a large number of foreigners in France, who, without having been expelled from their own countries, come here to ask for alms. The honorable gentleman then referred to the subject of religious intolerance in Sweden, and wished that France should support better ideas in that country, without an actual intervention. He also declared that he had learned by conversations with naval officers that the French artillery and iron-cased ships were much inferior to those of England. After touching on the jealousy which he said existed between the Guard and the regiments of the line, he terminated by saying that sovereigns were ruined by continually hearing that they are always right. Fidelity, he said, does not consist in burning a perpetual incense, but in showing the government when it was wrong as well as when it was right, and pointing out the road which leads to glory and prosperity.

THORN IN THE EMPEROR'S SIDE.

The government is in a "bad fix" about the Marquis de Boissy, and he is to it about as agreeable a personage as was "the elephant" to the man who "won him in a raffle." As a Senator he is appointed for life, and, unless impeached and tried for treason or some other high crime he cannot be removed even by the authority which made him a Senator. The government, which warns and stops newspapers for saying in their columns not one-half what the Marquis de Boissy says upon the floor of the Senate, would undoubtedly like to "suppress" him, but probably have concluded that the scandal and noise which such a proceeding would cause would do them more harm than good.

MEXICO IN THE LOWER HOUSE.

The discussion upon the address will commence in a few days in the lower house, where, as is known, there is a strong opposition minority, led by such men as Thiers, Berryer, Jules Favre and others among the ablest in France. At a meeting of the opposition yesterday it was agreed by most of the members, at the earnest request of M. Thiers, that nothing should be done to embarrass the government, and prevent the Emperor from getting out of his trouble as early as possible. This promise will be complied with unless the government exhibits a disposition not to carry out in good faith what it has promised. For a similar reason Prince Napoleon has left Paris for Italy, and will be absent during the discussion of the address. In the Senate the very offensive paragraph relative to the United states was adopted without any discussion. That paragraph is an insult to your government, which, if it possess a tithe of the sensitiveness attributed to it, it will certainly notice in some way.

SIGNIFICANT INCIDENT.

A significant "incident" occurred last evening at the grand ball cotillon given by the Minister of Marine. In the course of the evening a cortège appeared, representing the four quarters of the globe. America was represented by Miss Torrance, of New York; Mrs. Joseph Riggs and Miss Carter, all very beautiful ladies. As they entered the band struck up "Yankee Doodle," which they played with enthusiasm for five minutes, apparently very much to the delight of the guests. Anything which reminds the French people of "the old friendship between France and the United States" is pleasant to them.

## The French Press on the Mexican Situation.

MONTHOLON'S BAGDAD AFFAIR.

[From La France, Feb. 12.]

This despatch from M. de Montholon testifies that the government of the United States is firmly disposed to maintain and cause to be respected the laws of neutrality.

We stated a few days since, as soon as the capture of Bagdad was known, that the acts of a handful of adventurers would not be permitted to interrupt the peaceful relations existing between two great nations, and to solve in a violent manner the questions which they hold in consideration.

In the bands of filibusters which the agents of Juarez can by the hope of plunder induce to come from the United States to different points of the Mexican frontier we cannot in any manner see implicated the government of the United states. That government is indignant as ours is at such enterprises; it does all in its power to repress them; it has caused the arrest of the pretended general who was at the head of the filibusters of Bagdad; it has recalled General Weitzel, whose attitude might seem to have encouraged this expedition; it has given to Sheridan the plainest orders intended to prevent the repetition of such events. Decidedly nothing more could be wished for or demanded.

The address of the Senate proves that France only asks for the respect of the duties of neutrality and international law. In America there may be ardent passions which would like to enfeeble the ties which for nearly a century have attached the United States and France; but it is not in the higher regions of the government that these positions find an echo.

The eminent men who exercise the power at Washington now understand two things—first, that we have ourselves marked the term of our expedition to Mexico; and second, that France cannot come out of that country excepting at her own time, protecting at the same time her honor and interests, and that this situation should not be complicated by questions of national dignity as useless as they would be inopportune.

The despatch of M. de Montholon proves to us that these truths are understood in the United States. It is for this reason that we mention them as a testimony to the disposition, peaceful and in good faith, of the American government.

FOREY'S SPEECH.

[From the Paris Opinion Nationale, Feb. 12.]

His speech (Marshal Forey's) we do not hesitate to say it, is the antipodes of what, in our opinion, is the true interest of France in this delicate and knotty subject.

He has too long gazed with a soldier's eyes upon the situation in which we have placed ourselves in the New World. We have undertaken a great task there. Whether it is easy or difficult, whether it obtains the sympathy of the United States or not, the Marshal is unwilling to abandon it. What we have undertaken should be finished. Right demands it, honor commands it, and France should make a good bargain of her pecuniary sacrifices, "that the reproach of not having understood the grand idea of the Emperor may not be incurred."

The Marshal is consequently of the opinion not only that we ought to keep the troops in Mexico which are there at present, but that we must send new ones.

Such is the salient idea of his speech, as may be read in the official report.

We will content ourselves with adding, in order to give an exact idea of the reasoning of Marshal Forey, that in his opinion our occupation should be limited only by the regeneration of the Mexican people; since, according to his idea, "they must have time to regenerate their moral character by contact with our soldiers, so that they may acquire a sense of order and honesty, and the courage which animates them, and which all are bound to respect."

A beautiful rôle, without question, for our army! But when will it get through? In ten years, in twenty years, at the end of this century, or in the middle of the next?

The Minister of State understood the compromising nature of this kind of policy. He took care to assert—and we are glad he did so—that the Marshal had expressed only his personal opinion; that of the government remained as it had been promulgated in the speech of the throne and in the paragraph of the Senate's address.

As for ourselves, we deeply deplore this way of looking at the Mexican question, and the Marshal would have done well to have left to some of our journals the privilege and the care of defending these impossible matters instead of expanding them in the bosom of the Senate.

*The United States on this occasion have given us an example which we ought to follow. They have neglected nothing which could remove all cause of grievance.* We remember the resolutions which, in republican style, were presented in Congress. They were sent to the committees of each of the two houses, but negotiations continue between the Cabinets of Washington and the Tuileries, and since that time no *speech has resounded within the walls of Congress which could wound the susceptibilities of the French government.*

It is worthy of remark, also, that Mr. Bigelow, who has ever pursued a policy of conciliation in his mission at Paris, has nevertheless been confirmed in his nomination as Minister Plenipotentiary to Paris in the session of January 20; that is, after the publication of the diplomatic correspondence had put a new phase upon the question.

The Senate of the United States sanctioned on that occasion *the policy of conciliation, a fact which should not be lost sight of in the French Chambers.*

[Paris (Feb. 11) correspondence of the Independance Belge.]

The speech of Marshal Forey, at the close of the Senate's session yesterday, is the topic of conversation today. * * * It seems without doubt, however, that not only will no new troops be sent to Mexico, but *the movement for the return of our soldiers will not be suspended or delayed.*

# THE VETO.

### Meeting of the Constitutional Union General Committee—Report of the Special Committee Delegated to Wait on the President with the Resolutions of the Cooper Institute Meeting.

A regular meeting of the above committee was held last evening, at the Masonic Hall, East Thirteenth street. Mr. D. B. Northrup presided. The great business of the evening was the report of the committee from Washington.

Mr. DAVIES, Chairman of the Committee, then entered the room, and having been called on to report, spoke as follows:—Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen—I have to thank this General Committee for the kind greeting they have given me on my entrance here. It only proves that I have not been forgotten by some of my old friends. The delegation that was appointed for the purpose of calling on the President left on the 21st, in the evening, and reached Washington on the 23d, in the morning. They tried to see the President on that day, but found that it was impossible; therefore the matter was deferred till the next day. The committee then strolled around the city, and I, for one, then but too well remembered having been to Washington thirty years ago, and since then over twelve or fifteen times. Thirty years ago when I was in Washington it was all life, and the beauty of the South, and I may also say the wealth, was pouring into that city. Alas! what a difference when I saw it this last time. Washington was black. (Laughter.) It was black, sir. Everywhere we went it was black. The boot-blacks were black. Even the gallery in the House of Representatives and the Senate were black, so black that, although I am not proud, I did not like to sit down and have my mug right against such black mugs. I was, however, politely admitted to the ladies' gallery, and from there we went about the city and visited the public buildings, and lastly to the Smithsonian Institute. There, sir, it struck me again that something was black. A little further I noticed an object standing upright and holding a stick; I looked at it and found a couple looking at it just at the same time—a young man from Ireland and his wife. Says she,