THE SPANISH-CHILEAN IMBROGLIO.

The Case of the Alleged Privateer Meteor.

INTERESTING PROCEEDINGS IN COURT.

Motion to Release the Vessel on Bond.

ARGUMENTS OF COUNSEL.

&c. &c. &c.

United States District Court.

Before Judge Betts.

MARCH 14.—At the opening of the court this morning the case of the Meteor, postponed from the previous day, was called on.

MOTION TO RELEASE ON BOND.

Mr. Choate—May it please your Honor, we move in the case of the United States against the steamship Meteor, which was seized in January last for an alleged violation of the act of 1818, known as the Neutrality law, for the appointment of an appraiser to report the value of the vessel to the court, with a view of having it delivered to its owners on bond. The motion is made on the part of the claimants, representing the entire ownership of the vessel, the Messrs. John M. Forbes and R. B. Forbes, of Boston, through their agent, W. F. Carey. We did not anticipate any opposition to this motion, which we thought would be taken as a matter of course; but your Honor will remember that the learned District Attorney appeared here yesterday to oppose it, as he suggested, under instructions from one of the departments of the government, and he was proceeding to state his objection to our motion when he was interrupted by other proceedings which caused the adjournment of the court. The learned gentleman is now present, and will perhaps proceed with a statement of his objections.

ARGUMENT AGAINST THE MOTION FOR RELEASE.

Mr. S. G. Courtney then addressed the Court. He said that after the most thorough examination he could find no authority upon which this motion to bond the steamer Meteor could be based, except it was to be found on the general rule of the court. He supposed that this bonding of a vessel and the rule of the court are based and founded entirely under the revenue act, and that where a bonding is permitted and allowed it must be in a case where a vessel is seized in and by virtue of that act. Independently of this objection there were others, which he believed were fatal to the motion. This vessel (the Meteor) was seized by the United States government under a provision of what is termed and known as the Neutrality act—the act of April, 1818. The libel of information was filed under the third section of the act. After the libel had been framed and due service made, the Messrs. Forbes, claiming to be the owners, appeared through their proctor in this court, and by their agent, Mr. Carey, and put in their answer. Your Honor will perceive that the claim is put in by Carey, and not by the owners, the Messrs. Forbes. To this answer exceptions were taken by the United States, which were duly served, and have been noticed for trial before this court. Now, he would submit that while the question of ownership is at issue and undetermined this motion is premature, if no other objections existed. On this point learned counsel referred to the case of the Struggle, 1st Gallison, page 476. He submitted, therefore, in the first place, that there is no power, as he understood the decisions and practice of the court, to bond a vessel seized under the circumstances and in the manner in which this vessel appears to be, as taken from the libel; that the power to bond vessels is derived entirely from the Revenue law of March, 1799, eighty-ninth section, and the rules of the court are based upon the Revenue laws. This act has no application whatever, in any shape, manner or form, to a case of the nature and description now before the court. Let the case be looked at in another light. What is the object of this Neutrality law? It is to prevent armed vessels leaving the ports of a Power at peace with another Power that may be at war with other nations. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that the Meteor should be bonded. She immediately leaves this port, goes to sea and reaches some other, where she is fitted out, and at once from there proceeds on the predatory cruise to put a stop to which she was first seized here. He would ask whether that was carrying out in good faith the Neutrality laws of the United States. He opposed this motion of release not only because he deemed it his duty in his official capacity to do so, but also from the instructions which he had received from the State Department, which he would read and make part of his argument in the case. It would seem that information had been sent to the Spanish Minister that an application to bond the vessel would be made in this court. How that information was received he did not know; but he did know that it was not sent from the office of the District Attorney. It was, however, sufficient to know that the information got there, and on the 6th of March the Spanish Minister sent to the Secretary of State a letter acquainting him with the fact and requesting his interposition. In consequence of this letter to the Secretary of State we received a communication from the Secretary, of which the following is a copy:—

LETTER OF INSTRUCTION FROM SECRETARY SEWARD TO UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY DANIEL S. DICKINSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, March 10, 1866.

SIR—I give you herewith a copy of a note which I have just had the honor to receive from his Excellency Mr. Tassara, the Minister of Spain, in which he states that he is advised that the owners of the Meteor have applied to the District Court for a release of that vessel under security.

An application has heretofore been made to the President to favor such a proceeding. It has been considered with the following result, viz:—"That the Executive authority finds no sufficient grounds for interfering with the due and the regular course of the administration of justice."

It is expected, therefore, that you will take such course in regard to the present question as shall be best calculated to maintain the Neutrality laws of the United States in their full force and virtue. I am, with much respect, your obedient servant, WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

The Hon. DANIEL S. DICKINSON, United States District Attorney, New York.

The government opposes this motion on the grounds I have stated; and, in addition, I will merely add to what I have already said that to bond this vessel would, in my opinion, be an exercise of the jurisdiction of this court not warranted by the circumstances of the case. It would be nothing but a mere evasion of the Neutrality laws of our government, and I think a breach of faith which ought not to be tolerated or encouraged by the court on behalf of this motion. If it had been shown that this was a merchant vessel, and not a ship-of-war, it would be an entirely different case. If she came under the provisions of the revenue laws of the country it would be quite a different case. But here is a vessel, formidably armed and equipped, a ship-of-war about to start on a predatory cruise against a nation with whom we are at amity, seized by the government for an alleged violation of the Neutrality law.

Judge Betts—Is this set forth in the affidavits?

Mr. Evarts (counsel for the claimants)—No, sir; the fact is that this vessel is a merchant vessel, and not a ship-of-war.

Mr. Choate (also for the claimants)—They do not assert that she is an armed vessel; but they expressly omit to say so. If she had been armed they would have said so.

Judge Betts—How is she described in the pleadings?

Mr. Choate—She is merely described as armed in the words of the statute.

Mr. Evarts—She might have been confiscable, but not as an armed vessel; she never was an armed vessel.

Mr. Courtney—The libel shows that she was to be used for warlike purposes. The vessel was built at Boston, with others, for the express purpose of going after and capturing the Alabama. In conclusion, he would say that to bond this vessel would be an encouragement to violations of the Neutrality act of the United States which he was sure his Honor would not sanction.

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION.

Mr. Wm. M. Evarts then proceeded to address the court in support of the motion. The claim for bonding this vessel is put in here in the ordinary manner required by the rules of the court for a ship lying in the port of New York, belonging to merchants in Boston. The first exception taken is on the ground that the claimants are not the owners. But this is undeniable—the owners are the claimants here. Counsel does not except to the form in which the owners come in through their agent or consignee—not in the least; but he excepts that the Messrs. Forbes are not the owners. Now, if we do not prove ourselves the owners then the prosecution of the United States remains undefended. The exception is not that the owners have not put in a proper claim—that exception could not be made; because a claim on the part of the consignees of a ship representing its owners is always admitted. A ship has to answer claims against it, whether of forfeiture or of debt. That being the case, application is made to take from the custody of the court the res itself and substitute for it its value in bond. That is all. Now, then, the utmost the court needs to look at in deciding whether the applicant should be permitted to substitute a bond for the ship is whether he is the party from whom the ship was taken by the process of this court, and if so the court puts back the res where it found it, taking a bond as the representative of the value, and if the bond of the principal and the securities are good—if the stipulators are sufficient—the res is still in court, whether the ship has been delivered to the rightful owner or not. The question of rightful ownership does not in the least touch the validity or value of the bond. These are familiar suggestions, and such as your Honor has considered many a time. Now, it is well known that these claimants are the owners of the ship—the Messrs. Forbes, of the China house of Russell & Co., Boston—and they ask your Honor to deliver them their vessel on their bond. Now, as to the Secretary of State or President of the United States having anything to say on this subject, your Honor very well knows that any intervention of the Executive will or purpose, represented by letters or by official presence through the District Attorney, are not matters that the judiciary of the United States attends to in the ordinary administration of justice. The judiciary of the United States, acting according to the law and the constitution of the United States, are the complete, independent and final interpreters and arbiters of the law, and the wishes of the Secretary of State or the President of the United States are, in cases of this kind, no more to be regarded than the wishes of any editor of a newspaper or the leader of a political party. I will say here, however, that I do not regard the letter of the Secretary of State as attempting in the least to express a wish, much less to give a hint, concerning any judicial action of your Honor in this case. Here in this court of justice, without any pressure to overshadow the administration of justice, there is but one question to be tried—that is, whether this is a cause in admiralty in which, by statute and by rule, we are entitled to the bonding of the vessel seized. Your Honor, for the purpose of this motion, must regard the government as able to make out the allegation on this libel: that the vessel has been armed and equipped, furnished and fitted out, or attempted to be so armed and fitted out, &c., to effect her forfeiture under the neutrality laws of the country. This is the first time, after a great many years' practice, I ever heard the right of a claimant of a ship to substitute a bond of value for the vessel questioned. In the case of slavers, where the object is to repress the slave trade and to prevent vessels under seizure from proceeding on the slave trade, the vessels seized are always given up on bonds, and there is no right or power in the court to prevent it, none whatever; and no ingenuity can draw a distinction between the purposes of the Slave Trade act in this respect—to wit, to prevent slave trading—and the Neutrality act in this—to wit, to prevent an infraction of the neutrality laws of this country by furnishing cruisers in aid of one belligerent against another. Why, then, is it that a slaver falls under the ordinary rule that it is a pure question of forfeiture to substitute a bond for the ship, and that it is denied in this case? The District Attorney treats the claim as if to grant it would be equivalent to a license on a purchase of the bond for the vessel to go cruising against Spain on behalf of Chile. In the same way I suppose he would argue that a slaver admitted to bond and released might proceed to Africa in a slave traffic. But this is a mere confusion of ideas. It is not more than four or five years since a vessel delivered bond under a libel for the infraction of the slave laws, and was seized and libelled over again on a charge of attempting to go out of the port on a slave voyage. This was perfectly right and proper. The fact that this vessel had been seized as a slaver and prosecuted, and had been released in the ordinary course on the conduct of forfeitures, and a bond substituted in her place, put her back as property in the possession of her claimants and owners; and if hereafter they moved a finger towards fitting her out for actual departure from the port for the purpose of engaging in the slave trade, she was immediately subjected to new seizure, new forfeiture and to new bonds. That disposes of this question, of its being repressing on the part of the government to hold a vessel seized under these peculiar acts, against the right of the substitution of a bond, on the idea that this would be permitted in pursuance of the alleged illegal voyage. Now, what reason can be given why a vessel seized under the circumstances attending the seizure of the Meteor should not be delivered on bond under the same rules of policy and duty in dealing with us that the courts have recognized and the statutes and rules have established? None whatever; and the argument of the learned counsel for the prosecution rests on the mistaken notion that we are buying from the court a license to cruise against Spain, as the slave trader would be alleged to be purchasing a license from the court to carry on the slave trade. Nothing can be more mistaken. The learned counsel then submitted authorities to the court sustaining him in his argument, and resumed:—If the Court please, the power—as I think the statutory obligation—certainly the power, being ascertained, I see no escape from the proposition that it is obligatory on the court; but, treating it as a matter of power, having a rightful view of the subject, I submit it would be oppressive to refuse to deliver to responsible and respected citizens their vessel, they depositing, in the form of a bond, its value in this court. It was claimed that she was an armed vessel, furnished and equipped as a ship-of-war. But my learned adversary knows that she is not in that condition, and never has been. It has been said that this vessel was built to aid the government in its efforts, not to destroy the Alabama—our government had ships enough for that purpose—but to catch the Alabama. That was what she was built for. You would not fit out a war ship to catch the Alabama. If that had been the kind of vessel wanted the government had four hundred or five hundred war ships. The Meteor was to be a saving ship, a ship that, by her sails and steam, could catch the Alabama. The power of the Alabama was against unarmed ships, not armed ones. But it is a mistaken idea that this vessel was built expressly to catch the Alabama. That scourge of the seas was fortunately destroyed before this vessel was at all prepared for sea. I again say it would be a most oppressive act to refuse the claim of these wealthy and loyal citizens to deliver to them their vessel on bond—a vessel seized in her regular trading between the Northern ports and New Orleans. Previous to that she had been used as a transport for the government, and then she had no more than the ordinary guns of a merchant vessel, but since then she had no guns at all. He trusted, in conclusion, as an act of mere right and justice to the claimants, that the usual course in similar applications would be followed, and the vessel delivered on bond.

REPLY OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

Mr. Courtney, on rising to reply, said that as the learned counsel on the other side had discussed the matter thoroughly he proposed to make a few remarks in reply. He had not introduced the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury with any view of attempting to influence the Court, or to prejudice the case in his Honor's mind. He merely introduced that letter for the purpose of showing that those gentlemen had deemed it their duty to present this question to the government of the United States, and to ask their favorable action on it. The letter shows that such action was taken, and the government had declined to grant them the relief they asked for. It is to be presumed that they presented their whole case, and laid before the government the strongest reasons they could adduce when asking that their vessel be released. Having failed in this they come here and make this motion. Counsel argued that all these parties had to do was to give a bond for the release of the vessel. In a certain case that was all; but the circumstances provided for in that case have no bearing on the statute and no application to the section of the statute under which these proceedings are had. The act in that case simply provides that the owners of an armed vessel fitted out shall give a bond to the government. He did not see what bearing that section had with the question now before the Court. The question here is, whether this Court has any authority or will think it within its discretion or authority to bond this vessel under the circumstances. The executive department of the government having the power to release this vessel independent of any judicial action, and having declined to do it, that fact ought, he thought, to have some bearing on the question now before the Court, a great deal more than a speech of the President or the utterance of a member of the Cabinet, for it is an official document showing the action of the government on a certain matter and the result thereof. He contended that the rules of the Court in regard to the question of bonding were made in view of the revenue acts and no other act whatever. He defied the learned counsel on the other side to find a parallel case with this in slave cases, or to show where a vessel seized by the government for an alleged violation of the third section of the Neutrality act was ever bonded by this or any other government. The inference was strong in this case that it was the intention of Congress not to permit a vessel seized for violation of the Neutrality act to be bonded, because there are provisions made for the bonding of vessels in other cases. If it had been the intention of Congress to permit a vessel of this kind to be bonded, it would be specifically provided for in the act itself. Mr. Courtney, in the course of a very lengthy and able argument, presented the following points to the Court:—

First—The motion of the claimants cannot be entertained now, because the exceptions to the answer of Mr. Corey, the agent, are undisposed of. Until they are passed on, the alleged owners have no more standing in court than a person who had filed no claim whatever. (See rules 74 and 94, District Court; rule 30, Supreme Court, and Betts' Practice.)

Second—Even if the Court should hold that the claim already filed and excepted to gives the party sufficient standing in court to be heard on the motion preliminary to bonding and delivery of the vessel to them, it is still not obligatory on the Court to grant their motion. It is already within the discretion of the Court, and the Court should deny the motion. The allegations in the libel are that the vessel in custody has been fitted out for the purpose of and is intended to be used for hostile purposes against a nation with whom the United States is at peace. These allegations are denied only by an answer unsworn to by either of the claimants whose right to intervene is contested.

Third—The purpose of section 3 of the act of 1818 (Neutrality act) was to prevent the departure from the United States of such vessels as this. The allegations against the vessel are that she has been fitted out and was about to depart in violation of this act of Congress, and on the prayer of the United States the Court has intervened its process to prevent her departure. This mode of prevention on the part of this vessel is manifestly proper. So long as she is in the custody of the Court the power conferred on the President by section 8 of the act, and which should only be availed of in extreme cases, need not be exercised.

Fourth—The Court should not lend an indulgent ear to this application unless peculiar ground has been laid therefor. (See opinion of Judge Story, *in re* brig Struggle, 1st Gallison, page 476.)

Fifth—The act of 1799 only relates to vessels seized for violation of the revenue laws, and has no application whatever to seizures under the Neutrality act. (Same citation.)

Sixth—There is a common desire among all nations, including England, that laws of neutrality be made as stringent as possible, in order to prevent all enterprises of a hostile tendency not inspired or controlled by the governments themselves.

Seventh—There is a disposition manifested everywhere, not only to give to the laws already enacted a construction in the interest of neutrality, but even to adopt more stringent provisions. If the Court holds that the bonding provisions of revenue laws apply to and become part of the act of 1818, the vitality of our Neutrality act, so far as hostile vessels are concerned, will be destroyed. A decision by the Court to the extent claimed by counsel will open a seam in the act of 1818 through which a whole navy of either belligerent can go to sea.

Having submitted these points he left the matter in the hands of the Court.

Mr. Evarts briefly replied.

Judge Betts took the papers, and stated that he would render his decision in a few days.

Notices of New Publications.

The following is a complete list of the new publications received at the HERALD office to March 10:—

Stories Told to a Child. By Jean Ingelow. Published by Roberts Brothers, Boston.

The Capture, the Prison Pen, and the Escape; giving an account of prison life at the South. By Willard W. Glazier. Published by S. R. Gray, Albany.

DeBow's Review for March.

Littell's Living Age for February.

The London Quarterly Review for January.

The Westminster Review for January.

The New York Magazine and Illustrated Journal of Fashion for March.

Court Calendar—This Day.

SUPREME COURT, CIRCUIT.—Part 1—Nos. 1031, 1047, 1131, 1145, 1163, 1053, 1065, 1111, 1169, 1175, 1177, 1181, 1183, 1187, 1189, 1191, 1195, 1201, 1203, 1205. Part 2—Adjourned to Monday next. Part 3—Nos. 746, 998, 852, 1250, 997, 472, 246, 1103, 1139, 670, 308, 1044, 1202, 882, 890, 876, 1019, 1023, 931, 742.

SUPREME COURT, SPECIAL TERM.—Nos. 186, 206 to 223.

SUPERIOR COURT.—Part 1—Nos. 980½, 1215, 1755, 1461, 1965, 1685, 2317, 1217, 1513, 1779, 1973, 1977, 1979, 1981, 1983. Part 2—Nos. 2492, 2482, 2156, 2566, 2102, 2500, 2616, 2618, 2620, 2624, 2630, 2632, 2634, 2636, 2638.

COMMON PLEAS.—Part 1—Nos. 950, 898, 1332, 1058, 1361, 849, 1119, 102, 1317, 928, 1510, 1511, 1512, 1514, 1518. Part 2—Nos. 1852, 1447, 836, 843, 1481, 1669, 991, 1697, 1621, 1302, 1505, 1510, 1608, 1607, 1609.

OUR NATIONAL FINANCES.

Sharp Letter from Comptroller Clarke to the Secretary of the Treasury—Who is the Chief of the Treasury Department?

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY,
WASHINGTON, March 10, 1866.

DEAR SIR—Your letter of yesterday is received.

My letter of the 24th ult., in answer to yours of the same date, was so altered before it was published as not to indicate the person to whom it was addressed, and had no other object, and, I think, had no other effect, than to simply express my objections to your Loan bill. I do not see any impropriety in my giving publicity to my dissent from your views of public financial policy. In accepting the office I hold I did not surrender my independence of judgment nor my freedom of action. I have made no concealment from you or any one else of my views in regard to the bill from the time it was first proposed by you.

After a lapse of twelve days you notice my letter to you of the 24th of February, and quote my statement therein, that "I suppose there must be at that time, including deposits in national banks, at least one hundred and fifty millions of dollars in the Treasury of the United States." To this you now reply that the actual amount of money on the 24th in the Treasury and in national depositories to the credit of the government, exclusive of special gold deposit, was $111,149,632 29.

I cannot see any valid reason for your making a distinction between gold deposits and deposits made in currency. Both alike are stated in your monthly reports as liabilities and assets, and you have the right by law to use a portion of the gold, as you can safely use but a portion of the currency deposits, because you must be prepared by having a reserve on hand to respond to the calls of depositors. In this view of the case there is no reason why you should not add your gold deposits to the $111,149,632 29. The special gold deposit, as appears by your statement of the first day of this month, was $12,627,600. This added to the amount that you state was in the Treasury, &c., on the 24th of February, will make $123,777,232 29.

Giving you the benefit as I have of gold deposits, swelling the aggregate of money on hand, I now unhesitatingly state that your statement just made to me, as well as your published statement showing the condition of the Treasury and the public debt on the first of this month, is inexcusably erroneous.

You state the amount of coin in the Treasury to be.....$55,736,190 12
Currency.....60,282,767 12

Total.....$116,018,957 24

Your monthly statement, made the first of this month, shows that you have retired $6,466,850 of compound interest and United States legal tender notes. This amount must have been paid before the date of my letter, and as there is no law authorizing you to retire any of the compound interest notes in any other way than by converting them into five-twenties bonds, and no law authorizing the retirement of any of the United States legal tender notes in any other way than by converting them into compound interest notes, and no appropriation or provision made by Congress other than that now mentioned, I cannot understand why these compound interest and United States notes should not be counted and included as currency on hand. You have just as much right to reissue them as to pay out any other government notes, and no right or authority to cancel them.

It also appears by your last monthly statement that you have sold during the month, without any authority of law, $10,672,700 of five-twenty bonds and purchased $11,956,000 of seven-thirty notes, making your purchase $1,283,300 more than your sale. This sum should also be included as money on hand. I will remark in passing, that, while you have the right to convert seven-thirty notes into five-twenty bonds as the former mature, you have no right whatever to buy or sell them.

You have omitted entirely from your statement of the 1st of March, as you have uniformly omitted from your monthly statements for several months past, the amount of money on deposit in the national banks. The amount so held on the 24th of February, the date of my letter, must have been about $28,000,000. Taking, therefore, the amount stated by you as on hand on the 1st of March in coin and currency.....$116,018,959 24

Add the amount of United States and compound interest notes retired.....	6,466,850 00
Also add 7 30 notes purchased over the amount of 5-20 bonds sold.....	1,283,300 00
And also amount on deposit in national banks.....	28,000,000 00
You must have had a total actual amount on hand of.....	$151,768,944 24
Add to this the premium on the balance of the coin on hand, after deducting the amount of coin to be returned to depositors, say.....	15,000,000 00
Making the total currency value of money in your custody on the 1st of March last.....	$166,768,944 24

This is manifest from your own showing, in your published statement of March 1, excepting the item of deposit in the national banks. The report of the banks will show that I have not overstated the amount of those deposits.

I will now state the amount of money that I suppose was in the Treasury and on deposit in the banks, as set forth in my letter of the 24th of February, deriving my knowledge from other sources than exhibits from your department.

The regular report of the Assistant Treasurer in New York, published within three or four days after the date of my letter, shows that the amount of money on hand in his office, at that time, was over.....$109,000,000

It is fair to add to this amount the compound interest and United States notes said to have been retired, as they must have been paid for before that date.....	6,466,850
I estimate the amount in the Treasury in Washington, and in the hands of Assistant Treasurers in Baltimore, Philadelphia and Boston, and in the Pacific States and the eleven Southern States, and in the various depositories in other States, aside from banks, at the very moderate sum of.....	12,000,000
Currency value of the gold over its reported value.....	15,000,000
Total.....	$170,466,850

It seems to me to be apparent that this amount which I supposed to be available in the Treasury on the 24th of February is far short of the reality and exceeds what you declared it to be in your last monthly statement by more than $54,000,000.

I will add that I can show to the satisfaction of any one that neither of your monthly reports for the last few months has shown within $50,000,000 the amount of money in the Treasury or on deposit in national depositories.

An accurate statement of the condition of the Treasury is not merely a matter of interest to the public; it is of grave consequence that Congress should be constantly informed as to the actual resources of the government, that it may legislate intelligently and appropriate wisely.

I will call your attention to another matter. In your annual report you state that you will probably require $112,000,000 more than your current receipts to carry you through the remainder of the present fiscal year. I regret to differ with you so widely as I do in regard to this estimate. I am of the opinion that with an economical administration of your resources, you will have a surplus on hand at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1866, of nearly or fully $200,000,000, instead of being short $112,000,000. The difference between my estimate and yours is more than enough for the legitimate requirements of the government for the entire next fiscal year commencing the first day of July next.

It is only from a sense of duty that I have gone into this discussion to which you have invited me; and, as there are various and contradictory statements in regard to the difference between us of measures and estimates, I feel that no harm will be done, and indeed that it is proper, to make public this letter. If I have erred in any of my statements or estimates, I shall be glad to be corrected and to have the public advised of the correction. Very respectfully yours, FREEMAN CLARKE.

Hon. HUGH MCCULLOCH, Secretary of the Treasury.

Brooklyn City News.

THE LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE.—The strike of the Longshoremen of Brooklyn, which commenced on Monday, still continues, employers still holding out against the increase demanded—namely, from twenty-five to thirty cents per hour for labor. Yesterday some of the employers, who were in immediate want of workmen, sent to New York for them, when twenty or thirty, found in the Fourth ward, were brought over and were put to work at Woodruff & Robinson's stores, foot of Harrison street. When this fact became known a party of the "regulars" went to that vicinity, but showed no disposition to interfere with the operations of the outsiders, probably from the fact that a detachment of the Forty-third precinct police were on hand to preserve the peace. Another gang of the "regulars" congregated yesterday morning about Commercial wharf, Atlantic dock, where they stoned a party of outsiders; the police interfered and the row ceased. There is certainly great justice in the demands of the "strikers," but a rigid adherence to the observance of the laws will do more to accomplish their object than acts of rowdyism. Two arrests were made during the day, viz:—Thomas Clifford and John Sullivan, on a charge of using threatening language; they were bound over to keep the peace by Justice Walsh. It is understood that more men from New York will be put to work to-day by the various employers.

GREENWOOD CEMETERY COMPANY.—The annual meeting of the lotholders in Greenwood Cemetery took place yesterday noon in New York. The annual report of the Comptroller was read, from which we learn that the receipts from sales of lots, interments in public lots, interest, labor, &c., during the past year was $237,128 41; cash in hand, $919 66; making a grand total of $238,048 07. The expenditures for labor, improvements, contingent account, real estate, investments in United States securities, $236,639. The assets of the company, chiefly in United States bonds, are $252,976 07. Of this amount $8,427 07 are held in trust for the care, preservation and renewal of monuments and enclosures of lots of several owners. There being no other business, and the affairs of the company being found in a prosperous condition, the meeting adjourned.

THE EASTERN DISTRICT MURDER.—Coroner Lynch is still engaged in the inquest in the case of the murder of George Collins, who was murdered in his store in the Eastern District about ten days ago. The principal witness examined yesterday was Mr. Dohrer, a German, who keeps a cigar store adjoining the late premises of the deceased. He testified that there was a thin board partition between his store and that of deceased, and that any disturbance occurring in the store of Collins could have been heard by him. He was in his store at the time the murder was committed, but heard no unusual noise or high words. In regard to a club found near the door of the deceased, the witness never saw it before his attention was called to it first by Mr. Collins' son. The investigation is still in progress.

REAL ESTATE.

Extensive Sales During the Past Two Days.

The sales of real estate for the past two days were more numerous and the bidding more spirited than on the three or four days previous. The approach of moving day seems to add new zest to purchasers of house property, and sellers who have been holding back now put in a strong appearance. The auction rooms on Broadway are always crowded during a sale, and each person present seems to have a personal interest in the bidding. There are very few tyros present, as all seem to be well posted on the value of property, which is mainly decided on its location. It is not likely that the prices will fall to any perceptible extent, as the stock on hand seems inexhaustible, and the sales do not promise to stop until every inch of Manhattan Island has been auctioned off. Yesterday and the previous day bidding was brisk, and some of the property sold realized a high price. As will be seen on reference to the list of sales a building on Second avenue, said to have been Washington's headquarters, was sold for eight thousand dollars. Tradition goes to prove that the General remained here for a short time subsequent to the battle of Harlem Heights. For a revolutionary relic the price was small, as in other countries a property associated with the name of so great a man would have brought an almost fabulous price. The remainder of the property auctioned brought good, in some cases very high, sums. The following is a list of the real estate sold:—

BY A. J. BLEECKER SON AND CO.

Warren st., house and lot Nos. 60, 60½ and 62, at the n. e. cor. of College place, the buildings are the four story Merchant's Exchange Hotel, on College place, formerly known as the Franklin House, No. 23 College place; the lots are 54.9 on Warren st. and 75.4 on College place.....	$80,000
E. 13th st., Masonic Hall building, 114 and 116; lot 56x103.3; building 50x80; rear 20x50.....	60,000
W. 23d st., house and lease of lot 57 London terrace, 22x117; house 22x53.....	10,750
"Washington's Headquarters," 3 lots and house on 2d av., 51 ft. s. of 84th st.; house 30x40; lot 28.6x101.3.....	8,000
36th st., house and lot, n. side, 232 ft. w. of 7th av.	5,750
55th st., 1 lot, n. side, 125 ft. e. of 8th av., 25x100.5	5,500
Oak street—House and lot 44, n. side, lot 25x50..	6,750
James slip—House and lot No. 11, 18.9x40.....	6,000
East 14th street—House and lot 167, n. side, 23x½block.....	15,500
6th avenue—House and three lots, n. s., 51.5 feet s. of 57th st., 25x100.....	6,450
56th street—Two lots n. s., 295 feet e. of 6th av., each 25x½block.....	6,450
9th avenue—One lot n. e. cor. 62d st., 25.2x100..	6,200
One lot adjoining, 25.1x100.....	5,100
8th avenue—One lot next to s. w. corner 66th st., 25.1x100.....	9,750
8th avenue—Two lots, e. s., 100 ft. s. of 116th st., each 25x100, each.....	2,000
115th street—Five lots, n. s., 300 feet e. 8th av., each 25x½block, each.....	875
116th street—Five lots, s. s., 300 feet e. 8th av., each 25x½block, each.....	1,075
5th avenue—Four lots s. e. corner 135th st., each 25x100, each.....	1,650
5th avenue—Four lots adjoining, es. 25x100, each	1,625
135th street—Four lots, s. s., 200 ft. e. of 5th av., each 25x100, each.....	650
5th avenue—One lot, e. s., 75 feet n. of 133d st., 25x100.....	1,550
43d street—One lot, s. s., 295 feet w. of 9th av., 18.4x½block.....	1,850

BY A. JOURNEAY.

Third avenue, bet. 93d and 94th sts., lot 25x100...	2,275
124th st., near 9th avenue, 5 lots, 25x66 to 100....	2,400
123d st., near 10th av., 2 lots, 25x100, each.....	430
123d st., two lots adjoining above, each.....	440
Broome st. (522), bet. Sullivan and Thompson sts., two story and attic brick house and lot, 20x75..	9,250
Goerck st. (21), cor. Broome, two story and attic frame house.....	5,400
Grand st. (607), near Monroe, two story and attic brick house on lot 22.9x60.1.....	5,450
84th st., bet. 4th and 5th avs., 1 lot, 25x170.11....	3,750
84th st., adjoining, lot 25x94.1.....	2,200
46th st., bet. 9 and 10 avs., 2 lots, 22.8x100.4, each.	1,175
51st st., lot 575, e. of 11th av., 36.6x176.7 and 17.7½x179.6.....	2,000
Greene st. (199), 3 story and bas't brick house on lot 25.6x75.....	9,650
20 Greene st.—House similar to above, lot 20.10½x75.....	7,850
203 and 205 Greene st.—Two 2 story and basement brick Houses on lots 18.0½x75, each.....	7,450
207 and 209 Greene st.—Two Houses similar to above.....	7,400

BY MULLER, WILKINS AND CO.

1 lot n. s. 139th st.—325 ft. e. 6th av., 25x91.7....	225
1 lot s. s. 140th st.—475 ft. e. 6th av., 24.9x99.11.	300
1 lot and gore s. s. 140th st.—575 ft. e. 6th av....	275
1 lot and gore s. s. 140th st.—675 ft. e. 6th av....	305
2 gore lots s. s. 140th st.—725 ft. e. 6th av., each	240
Building and lot Nos. 19 and 21 Leonard st.—25x91	14,950
4 lots s. s. 41st st.—100 ft. e. 3d av., 25x98.9, each	2,950
3 lots w. s. 46th st.—145 ft. e. 6th av., 25x105, each	8,900
Houses and lots, Nos. 525 and 527 Grand st.—running through and fronting on Henry st., 45 ft. 6 in. on Grand st., 65 ft. 7 in. on Henry st.....	11,050

BY D. M. SEAMAN.

Houses and lots 413 and 415 Pearl st., e. 26x73....	10,075
House and lot 52 Rivington st., c. Eldridge, 20x75.	11,450
House and lot 311 av. A, 19.4x94.....	4,200
House and lot 315 av. A, 19.4x94.....	4,200
House and lot 315 av. A, 19.4x94.....	4,200

BY WILLIAM KENNELLY.

Lot s. s. 41st st., 300 feet west 9th av.....	2,750
Lot s. w. corner 4th av. and 120th st.....	1,100
English basement house and lot 351 West 35th st.	8,500
3 story brick house, store and lot, 328 Water st...	16,900
Do. do. 330 do.....	16,900
Do. do. 112 Roosevelt st	16,000
Do. do. 112½ do...	16,900
Lot n. e. corner of 2d av. and 56th st., 4 lots adjoining on 2d av. and 2 frame buildings and 2 lots, 100 feet e. 2d av., all.....	24,500

BY E. H. LUDLOW AND CO.

564 and 566 8th av., 2 brown stone houses.....	30,200
21 Brevoort place, brick house and lease of lot, having 20 years to run, at $450.....	20,000
210 East 18th st., brick house and lot.....	12,400
164½ 2d av., brick house and lot.....	8,000
25 North Moore st., brick house and lot.....	8,350
198 10th st., brick house and lot.....	7,900

SEIZURE OF THE WHISKEY DISTILLERIES.

Ten Warrants Issued—The Cases to be Heard on Friday Before United States Commissioner Betts—Names of the Establishments Seized, &c.

The internal revenue authorities are energetically pursuing their investigations into the alleged whiskey frauds. Ten warrants in all have been issued for the arrest of parties charged with bribing revenue officers, and it is expected that they will have a hearing before United States Commissioner Betts to-morrow (Friday) morning, when the government will be represented by Assistant United States District Attorney Samuel G. Courtney and Mr. Hamilton Harris. The gentlemen representing the government were in consultation at No. 4 Astor House yesterday with a large number of persons interested in these alleged frauds, and it is anticipated that some extraordinary developments may be looked for when the cases are brought to trial.

NAMES OF THE ESTABLISHMENTS SEIZED.

The following is a correct list of the establishments which have been seized:—

DISTILLERIES.

Sanger, Thirty-ninth street, near Ninth avenue.
Davis & Hanlon, foot of West Thirty-ninth street.
—— Larentz, Thirty-ninth street, near Ninth avenue.
—— Oppenheimer, Twenty-sixth street, near Ninth avenue.
Kahnweild & Goodkind, Seventeenth street and Seventh avenue.
Johns & Co., Eighteenth street, between Tenth and Eleventh avenues.
Kahnweild & Loewenstein, 180 East Eleventh street.
Sims & Brother, 47 First avenue.
—— Keenan, corner of Lewis and Seventh streets.
J. Rooney, Fifty-second street, near Ninth avenue.
Richard Deary, Broadway, between Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth streets, and Forty-fifth street, near Eleventh avenue.
—— Quinn, 101 Laurens street.
—— Frank, 50 Division street.
Henry Rogers, 32 Front street.
Hourey & Collins, 10 Cedar street.
Haefen & Co., Morrisania.
Peter Schildknecht, Jones' Wood.

RECEIVING ESTABLISHMENTS.

F. A. Hemmer, Thirty-ninth street, near Ninth avenue.

Keepers are stationed in all the above-mentioned establishments, and business is suspended, in accordance with orders from Washington.

Several other establishments (not distilleries) were seized; but it is not deemed necessary to give publicity to their names and locations.

As much information in relation to these alleged frauds is known to be in possession of private parties, by which the operations of the revenue officials may be facilitated, it is desirable that they should communicate with Mr. Richards, at room No. 4 Astor House, at the earliest opportunity.

Pickpockets on the Cars.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD.

Something should be done to protect our citizens from the ravages of pickpockets upon the cars. Whenever a car is overcrowded it becomes a signal for pickpockets (who seem to stroll through our streets in trios) to leap upon the platform, and by producing a great pressure to so pinion their victims that they can abstract whatever they may have in their pockets unknown to them, or, if known, without the possibility of effectual resistance. This scheme is practised occasionally in all parts of the city. It is more frequently attempted of evenings, when gentlemen are returning from their business, on the Third, Sixth, Eighth and Ninth avenue and other cars, whose terminus is near the Park. Not a night passes that several of these operators are not at work. A few days since a conductor was knocked from his place because he announced to the passengers that a pickpocket was on board. Last evening several gentlemen had their pockets picked on entering the cars of the Eighth avenue line. If the Commissioners of Police would detail a detective or two to be on hand at these cars between the hours of five and seven P. M. greater safety would be insured. C. T.

New York, March 12, 1866.

METROPOLITAN HEALTH BOARD.

Meeting and Proceedings Yesterday—By-Laws Adopted for the Government of the New Board—Sanitary Reform, &c.

The new Health Board met yesterday afternoon, President Schultz in the chair.

Dr. STONE read the report of the committee appointed at the last regular meeting of