THE NEW YORK HERALD.

WHOLE NO. 10,801. NEW YORK, TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1866.—WITH SUPPLEMENT. PRICE FOUR CENTS.

THE CAPITAL.

INTERESTING PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS

The Case of Senator Stockton Still Undecided.

Passage of the Postal Bill by the House.

THE BROOKS-DODGE ELECTION CASE.

The Committee Decide Against Mr. Brooks.

New York and Washington Air Line Railroad Again Up in the House.

Two Members Favorable to the Project Added to the Special Committee.

The Veto of the Civil Rights Bill Expected to be Sent to Congress To-day.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S LEVEE.

&c. &c. &c.

WASHINGTON, March 26, 1866.

THE PRESIDENT'S LEVEE.

The Presidential levee of to-night differed somewhat from the previous receptions at the White House, and, notwithstanding the chilly and forbidding aspect of the weather, was largely attended by officials and fashionables of the city. Passion week seemed to have been forgotten in the general desire to be present, and throngs of ladies and gentlemen in full dress were arriving and departing continually from an early hour in the evening until the time for closing the doors of the main entrance. The marine band were present as usual, and its leader was more than ordinarily felicitous in selecting airs for the occasion, and securing their faultless execution. The East Room and adjacent passages were crowded by young and old to listen to the delightful strains, where misses and matrons of every degree promenaded to measured cadences. Aristocracy and democracy were alike represented, and titled dames and republican wives and mothers were scarcely distinguishable in the crowded rooms of the Presidential mansion. The ladies displayed a large variety of toilets, from the plain parlor to the extreme evening, or party, dress. There were velvets, satins, pearl, lavender, crimson, garnet and black silks in profusion, as well as tulles and tarlatans. These, adorned with diamonds and other ornaments, with their neatly arranged coiffures, presented an attracting and fascinating scene.

The President, as usual, stood near the entrance in the Blue Room. The guests were introduced by Marshal Gooding. Mr. Johnson was dressed in plain black, with straw colored gloves. His daughters, Mrs. Patterson and Mrs. Stover, assisted in receiving the guests. They stood at the right and rear of the President. The former was attired in black velvet low neck and short sleeves, with illusion bodice, hair ornamented with flowers and back curls. Mrs. Stover wore a rich black silk trimmed with lace, low neck with hair tastefully arranged and back curls. Many of the guests loitered around the Blue Room, but the larger portion immediately found their way into the East Room. Among those who remained in the Blue Room were Secretaries Welles, Denison and McCulloch. Prominent among the promenaders were Mr. and Mrs. Gen. Banks, the latter attired in a rich salmon silk, with pink flowers, low neck and trail, and coral necklace. Governor Sharkey and lady were also quite conspicuous. Mrs. Sharkey was dressed in a rich pearl colored silk, long trail, with velvet border and trimmings, with steel edging, with an elaborate coiffure. Sir Frederick Bruce and Lady Thurlow were in the East Room most of the evening. He was dressed in the plain republican style, without any decorations, while Lady Thurlow's attire was of the same simple style. She wore a dark watered silk. Senor Romero, the Mexican Minister, escorted the lady of President Juarez. She was attired in rich lavender silk, richly trimmed, and long trail, with diamonds. Hon. L. D. Campbell also had a Mexican lady on his arm. She was attired in a blue silk, long trail and fluted trimmings around the bottom, with diamond pin. Mr. Labantree, of the State Department, also escorted a Mexican lady, who attracted considerable attention. The brunette countenances and well formed features of these Montezuma ladies furnished a contrast with the American ladies, and made them the centre of attraction. It is useless to attempt to describe all the ladies' toilets. A few of the most conspicuous must suffice. There were, however, many others as equally brilliant and attractive as those narrated above.

The army was well represented. Generals Howard, Fry, Bryce, Dyer, Ricketts, Robinson and many others were present, with and without their ladies. Among the Senators and Congressmen present were Stewart, of Nevada; Davis and McKee, of Kentucky; Saulsbury and Riddle, of Delaware; Darling, Taylor, Brooks, Humphrey and many more from New York. The evening wore away pleasantly to all, and by eleven o'clock the crowd was rapidly departing.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL.

The public has for some reason obtained the idea that the President's veto of the civil rights bill will be sent to the House of Representatives instead of the Senate, as was the case with the Freedmen's Bureau veto. The bill originated in the Senate, and was, like the Freedmen's Bureau bill, a concoction of Senator Trumbull. It passed that body and went to the House. In its consideration there Mr. Bingham, of Ohio, characterized some of its provisions as being so obnoxious that it would be an outrage to pass it. It was amended at his instigation and went back to the Senate. The action of the Senate on these amendments gave the impression that the bill originated in the House and the veto must be sent there; but this is not the case. The veto message will be sent to the Senate, and will undoubtedly be received there to-morrow. This fact accounts for the activity of the radicals and the renewal of the effort to get Stockton out of the Senate before the vote is taken on the veto. With Stockton disqualified from voting, and Senator Dixon's absence from sickness, the conservative strength is made two less. With this they hope to pass the bill over the veto. This is the sequel of the movement in the Senate to-day, and explains why Senator Morrill violated his pledge of pairing off when the vote on the report of the committee was taken.

THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE AIR LINE RAILROAD TO NEW YORK.

Mr. Thad Stevens introduced a bill to-day to authorize the building of a railroad from Cumberland, Md., to Pittsburg, Pa., and moved that it be referred to the special committee which has charge of air line railroad matters. In this connection Mr. Stevens moved that two more members be added to that committee. This brought about a passage at arms between Thad and Mr. Francis Thomas, a venerable and able gentleman from Maryland, who objected to the increase of the committee. It appears that the friends of the New York and Washington air line project have been swindled in the formation of the select committee on that measure. By parliamentary usage the majorities of select committees should be favorably disposed toward projects they have to pass upon. Speaker Colfax, after consultation with Thad, appointed such members as he supposed were friendly to the air line scheme. Colfax erred, however, and got one or two black sheep on the committee, and the result is that the majority are now ready to report adversely to the air line. Thad's object was to relieve the Speaker and allow him to correct the mistake. The directors of the four roads now forming the Washington and New York line, having been so successful with the present committee, are naturally averse to repeat their labors with a new committee; hence Mr. Thomas, their spokesman, protested earnestly against the appointment of the two extra members. It came out in the discussion, however, that a majority of those members present were determined to have another railroad to New York, so they voted Mr. Thomas down and Messrs. Washburne and Wilson were appointed additional members of Thad's committee. The reinforced committee will no doubt report favorably upon the air line project before the session is much older.

MR. ROGERS ON THE NATIONAL AND REBEL DEBTS.

Jack Rogers commenced business immediately after prayers in Congress this morning and usurped the entire morning hour for a vehement speech in support of a set of resolutions which he introduced last Monday, just at the expiration of the morning hour, and which consequently went over under the rules until this morning. The gentlemen to whom Rogers vaguely refers as "the other side of the house" could not comprehend how he got the floor and how he could keep it for an hour. Their minds did not become quite settled on these points till Rogers had got half through his speech. The resolutions, which have been published, call for the payment of the federal debt, total repudiation of all rebel debts, and for equality in taxation. Rogers spoke longest and strongest in favor of this last proposition. It was quite easy to gather from his rapid remarks that he was in favor of taxing the government bonds in the tin boxes of bloated aristocrats throughout the country, even if such a course should dilute the interest on smaller bonds, held in considerable numbers by persons who always vote with Mr. Rogers' party. He holds that it would be no violation of plighted faith if the government were to permit the taxation of its securities by the States. Mr. Rogers continued till he was cut off by the drop of the Speaker's gavel, when Mr. Blaine, of Maine, got the floor for next Monday, when another instalment of talk upon this barren subject may be expected, if somebody does not move to lay the whole subject on the table.

THE TAX ON PETROLEUM.

The Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania asks Congress to repeal the tax on crude oil or petroleum. The Ways and Means Committee have their petition under consideration, although they are of the opinion that our friends are crowding the mourners somewhat.

MR. SCHENCK'S ARMY BILL.

Monday next, after the morning hour, has been set apart for the consideration of Mr. Schenck's Army bill, the special order to be continued from day to day till disposed of. The Military Committee believe few objections will be found to the bill, and that a couple of days will suffice to dispose of it.

REDUCTION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE TAXES.

The Ways and Means Committee have decided to devote this week to considering questions relating to a reduction of internal revenue taxes. Several modifications of existing laws are likely to be made, but perhaps not in time to affect this year's assessments. It is nearly certain that none will be made on income exemptions. As taxes on railroad freights are direct taxes on producers and consumers to about twice the amount realized to the government, the committee is likely to be unanimous in recommending a great reduction in this source of revenue.

THE LOAN BILL IN THE SENATE.

The Loan bill was received by the Senate to-day from the House, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE PUBLIC LANDS IN THE SOUTHERN STATES.

In reply to numerous inquiries in relation to the amount of public lands still unsold in certain of the Southern States the following information has been produced by the General Land Office:—

State.	Acres.	State.	Acres.
Alabama	6,732,058	Arkansas	9,298,012
Mississippi	4,760,736	Florida	19,379,635
Louisiana	6,228,102		

MANUFACTURING AND MINING DIVISION OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The bill introduced in the House to-day by Mr. Grinnell, to establish a Manufacturing and Mining Division in the Treasury Department, has for its general design the acquisition and diffusion of information relative to manufactures and to aid Congress in its legislation. It provides for the appointment of a commissioner, with a salary of three thousand dollars per annum, whose duty it shall be to collect, digest and arrange information in regard to manufactures, consumption of raw material, &c., and the general course of trade with foreign countries. He is to be allowed three clerks, but no expense is to be incurred unless approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

DECISION IN THE MASSACHUSETTS LIQUOR CASES.

The Supreme Court of the United States has decided the Massachusetts liquor cases. The Court holds that licenses granted by the United States under the Internal Revenue laws for the wholesale sale of liquors, held by a citizen of Massachusetts, do not protect him in the sale, or keeping for sale, of liquors within said State, in view of the prohibitory laws of the State of Massachusetts. The Supreme Court affirms the decision of the Court below.

On Wednesday Mr. Richardson, of Boston, is to make an argument before the Committee of Ways and Means in favor of making licenses protection for the sale of spirituous liquors, instead of permission, as first decided by the Supreme Court of the United States.

IMPORTANT TO BROKERS AND HOLDERS OF NATIONAL BANK SHARES.

The Supreme Court of the United States this morning decided the case of Michael A. Nolan and others as the Board of Assessors of the city of Albany, defendants in error, at the suit of Adam Van Allen, plaintiff in error, and other cases. The question presented was, whether the shares of the stockholders in the banking associations created under the acts of Congress which provide for the creation of national banks can be subjected to taxation by State authorities. Associate Justice Nelson delivered the opinion of the Court, holding that shares held by individuals were not a part of the capital of a bank, and must be regarded as personal property of shareholders, and as such subject to taxation by the State within the provisions of the act of Congress; but that the judgment of the Court below must be reversed on the ground that there was a discrimination between the shares of these banks and the capital stock of the State banks. Chief Justice Chase read a minority opinion, not being able to concur that a State had the power claimed, which was an indirect mode of taxing the national securities, which was not authorized or intended to be authorized by Congress.

In the case of Cutting, Fisk and others, the Court held that a broker is chargeable on purchases of securities made on his own account and for his own benefit the same as on his commissions when purchasing for others.

THE TREATY WITH THE SIOUX INDIANS.

Official proclamation has been made of the ratification of the treaty between the United States and the chiefs and head men of the Minneconjou band of Dakota or Sioux Indians. These Indians bind themselves to discontinue for the future all attacks upon the persons or property of the other tribes, unless first assailed by them, and to use their influence to promote peace everywhere in the region occupied or frequented by them. The band agree to withdraw from the routes overland already established or hereafter to be established through their country, and in consideration of this the United States agree to pay them ten thousand dollars for ten years for such articles as the Secretary of the Interior may direct.

DISTRESS AMONG THE INDIANS.

Despatches dated at Fort Randall, Dakota Territory, March 6, 1866, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, have been received, announcing great distress among the Indians of that region for want of food. For some time they have been devouring their ponies, and even dogs. There are also three hundred lodges in the vicinity of Fort Sully short of commissary stores, and the commanding officer reports he is unable to afford them any assistance. The suffering is principally among the Sioux, owing to military operations and hostile incursions of various tribes during the past three years.

TRIAL OF GENERAL BAKER.

The Criminal Court to-day commenced the trial of General Lafayette C. Baker on the charge of robbery, preferred by Mrs. Lucy Cobb, well known as a pardon broker. The specific charge made by Mrs. Cobb is that General Baker, while she was under constraint from him, robbed her of two thousand dollars, which she had received from a man named Hine or Howell for procuring him a pardon. This is the second trial of the accused. It will be remembered in connection with this case that he, having been in January tried and convicted of her false imprisonment, there remains to be tried the charge of false imprisonment of Joseph R. Cobb. The accused demurred to the indictment, pleading former conviction. This point was argued, and the Judge said he would give his decision to-morrow.

CONDITION OF SENATOR FOOTE.

Senator Foote, of Vermont, is worse again to-day. His disease has now taken a turn that will bring a crisis at once. It must from this very nature of things either carry him off in a day or two or produce a decided reaction in his favor at once. He is so much reduced that it is feared the former will be the result.

SECURING THE RIGHTS OF THE FREEDMEN.

Senator Doolittle has prepared a bill to carry out the provisions of the constitutional amendment abolishing slavery, and secure the blacks the rights contemplated in that amendment free from the objectionable features of the Civil Rights bill. He intended to have introduced it to-day, but could find no opportunity, the debate on the Stockton case lasting until the hour of adjournment.

FIRE IN THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

A fire broke out in the third story of the War Department on Sunday, which would have destroyed the entire building had not the officers on duty for the day been promptly on hand to extinguish it. As it was, but little damage was done.

GENERAL JAMES B. STEEDMAN.

Among the general officers at present in the capital is James B. Steedman, or "Old Steady," as he is affectionately called by Sherman's "bummers." He has tendered his resignation to the President, with a view of retiring to the shadow of Toledo, Ohio. His great administrative abilities are well known, and his personal popularity was steadily increased while commanding the department of Georgia by his efforts in alleviating the condition of whites and blacks. Should the Senate fail to confirm Hon. Lewis D. Campbell as Minister to Mexico, the succession is to fall upon General Steedman.

THE NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD.

An influential delegation of citizens of Oregon, Idaho and Montana were at the Capitol to day urging upon prominent members of Congress the importance of proper legislation in favor of the Northern Pacific Railroad, as an economical means of developing the great Northwest. They urged its especial importance in view of the fact that the sixty-ninth article of the proposed confederation between the British North American provinces declares a railroad to the Pacific vital to their interests. They claim that a railroad is certain to be soon constructed, and that this Congress is called upon to decide whether it shall be on ours or on British soil.

THE EVIDENCE OF GENERAL LEE BEFORE THE RECONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE.

Representative Conkling will to-morrow report from the Reconstruction Committee the evidence of General Lee and others.

SMUGGLING—SEIZURES OF VESSELS.

The Commissioner of Customs has received intelligence of two important seizures of vessels violating the United States revenue laws by smuggling into the country cargoes free of duty. One vessel, loaded with rum, molasses, &c., from the West Indies, was seized at Newbern, N. C., a few days since. The cargo was landed, but was seized, together with the crew. Another vessel, with its cargo of liquors, worth from six to eight thousand dollars, was seized recently at Providence, R. I. The goods were landed and secreted in a barn, but the agent of the customs discovered their whereabouts, concealed himself with a force near at hand, and when the smugglers came for their goods they were arrested and possession was taken of the liquors.

SURVEY OF THE MAGDALENA RIVER.

The following is translated from a Bogota, Colombia, paper, containing President Murillo's message on the survey of the Magdalena river and its tributaries by the United States engineers:—"The coming here of these officers, who are the most distinguished in the engineer service of the United States of America, is due in great part to the benevolent solicitude of the Secretary of State, Mr. Seward, the enlightened friend of our country."

AID WANTED TO REPAIR THE DISMAL SWAMP CANAL.

A delegation from the business men of Norfolk, Va., is in Washington to secure, if possible, government aid for the repair and completion of the Dismal Swamp canal.

THIRTY-NINTH CONGRESS.

First Session.

SENATE.

WASHINGTON, March 26, 1866.

THE CASE OF SENATOR STOCKTON.

Mr. SUMNER, (rep.) of Mass., rose to a question of privilege. He moved to amend the journal by striking out the vote of Mr. Stockton in the question of his seat. As the motion was of some importance he had reduced it to writing.

Mr. SAULSBURY, (dem.) of Del.—I rise to a point of order. The journal is correct. It states that Mr. Stockton did vote, and no one denied that to be correct. Therefore, to undertake to correct it now would be to make it read falsely. My point of order is that the resolution cannot be entertained.

The CHAIR—The resolution must first be read before the point of order can be decided.

The SECRETARY then read the motion of Mr. Sumner as follows:—"That the journal of Friday be amended by striking out the vote of Mr. Stockton on the question of his seat in the Senate."

The CHAIR—The Senator from Delaware makes the point that this motion is not in order. The Chair decides that it is in order.

Mr. SUMNER then took the floor in advocacy of his proposition. He said there were certainly two ways of meeting the question presented to the Senate by the vote of Mr. Stockton. He should use Mr. Stockton's name directly, because it would be plainer and it would be more easily understood. There were two ways in which the case might be met. One was by a motion to disallow the vote; the other, such a motion as had just been made, to amend the journal; and perhaps a third way, though not satisfactory to his (Mr. Sumner's) mind, would be a motion to reconsider, and thereon that motion to review the circumstances and adjudge the question of Mr. Stockton's right to vote on this occasion. He called attention, however, at the outset to only two ways; one by disallowing the vote, the other by amending the journal; but, behind both of these ways, or all three of these ways, arose the simple question, had Mr. Stockton a right to vote? To that, said Mr. Sumner, I understand it is replied that his name was borne on the roll of the Senate, and accordingly was called at the desk by our Secretary. To that I reply, and to my mind the reply cannot be answered, the roll of the Senate is to be construed always in subordination to the principle of national law and parliamentary law, therefore you are brought again to the question with which I began: had Mr. Stockton a right to vote? Had he a right to vote, first, according to the principles of national law, or, in other words according to the principles of universal law? Mr. Sumner then proceeded to quote from ancient and modern authorities to sustain his position, that Mr. Stockton could not act as judge and party in his own case.

Mr. JOHNSON, (dem.) of Md., replied to Mr. Sumner that he (Mr. Sumner) had taken upon himself to sustain the honor of the Senate. For himself he (Mr. Johnson) would say that he felt quite as able to maintain his private and official honor without the aid of Mr. Sumner as with it, and he did not consider it a compliment to the Senate for Mr. Sumner to believe that upon him devolved the vindication of his honor. Mr. Johnson contended that in the vote cast by Mr. Stockson he represented not himself, but the State of New Jersey. Whether he properly represented New Jersey was not the question before this body. In the vote which he cast he cast it claiming to be a representative of New Jersey. His name stands upon your files as the representative of New Jersey. How are you to get it off? He has voted on every proposition that has been before this body. His vote has always been recorded, and when has he ceased to be a member of this body? Never. And, being a member of the body, what is there to prevent his casting his vote on a question affecting, as he believes, the rights of his own State as much as any question which has been presented before us during the period that he has honored us by his presence? Mr. Johnson said he would not repeat the causes that led to Mr. Stockton's voting on Friday. They were explained at that time, and he thought they more than justified his vote.

Mr. TRUMBULL, (rep.) of Ill.—I regret it exceedingly that this question is presented in the shape in which it is now before us. In the consideration of the right to a seat of the Senator from New Jersey, I had regarded it, and the committee to which it was referred had regarded it as a judicial question. He endeavored to look at it purely in that light. It was a question of law whether the Senator from New Jersey was entitled to his seat or not. In the opinion of the committee he was entitled to it. That was my opinion; that is still my opinion. I think he was clearly entitled to it; but there was a difference of opinion in the Senate, and when the vote came to be taken upon that resolution, the name of the Senator from New Jersey was called and he himself voted. Since I have been a member of this body for the last eleven years there have been a number of contested cases. The right to a seat of several gentlemen sitting here as Senators have been questioned. But it is the first time that any person whose right to a seat has been questioned has ever voted since I have been a member, and I confess I was very much surprised when the Senator from New Jersey cast his vote. When he directed his name to be called some gentleman sitting near me—I believe the Senator from Nevada—asked me privately if he had a right to vote in his own case. I said to him, "Certainly not." I believe he asked the question of the presiding officer of the Senate, who simply replied that his name was on the list. No more was said. No decision was made. It took the Senate by surprise, I think. The vote was recorded and the result announced. The presiding officer said there was no rule of the Senate on the subject. That is true; but there are some things that it needs no rule to determine. If any member of the Senate had risen in his seat and asked his name to be called to vote twice, there is no rule that a member cannot vote twice; but there are some self evident propositions among them. One is that no man can be a judge in his own case. This is a judicial question. It is not like an individual who is a candidate for office going to the polls and voting for himself, when his right to vote is not questioned. It is not whether the State of New Jersey is entitled to a representative; but whether a person who claims to have been elected to this body has been elected or not. It is a judicial question, and, in my judgment, the Senator from New Jersey had no right to vote. Now, sir, how is this to be corrected? I think it ought to be corrected. The Senator from Massachusetts proposes to correct it by striking from the journal the name of the Senator from New Jersey. What would be the effect of that? The resolution has passed. Suppose you strike his name from the list, where does the resolution stand? Suppose it had been an act of Congress instead of a resolution of this body. Suppose it had been a bill from the House of Representatives—and I submit that to the consideration of the Senator from Massachusetts. Suppose it had been a bill from the House of Representatives, in the passage of which a Senator was interested, and which had been carried by his vote. This occurred last Friday. Meantime the bill was presented to the President of the United States, and, having received his signature, we were to come in on the Monday following and move to strike from the journal the name of the interested party by which the bill was passed. What would become of the law? Now what would be the condition of this resolution? I believe the Senator from New Jersey, as I have said before, is entitled to his seat; but I do not believe he is entitled to hold his seat by his own vote. He would have held his seat without his own vote. The vote was a tie without the Senator from New Jersey. That would have left him in his seat. He having been sworn in it was not necessary that the resolution should have passed. It would have required an affirmative vote to deny him his seat.

Mr. NYE, (rep.) of Nevada, asked Mr. Trumbull whether the resolution affirming Mr. Stockton's right to a seat must not be affirmed by a majority vote.

Mr. TRUMBULL replied that Mr. Stockton was here without that.

Mr. NYE—That is a point we will decide hereafter.

Mr. TRUMBULL—You will have to get him out by a vote. In conclusion Mr. Trumbull said that the proper way to arrive at the result aimed at by Mr. Sumner was to move a reconsideration of the vote of last Friday. He would agree to make that motion if Mr. Sumner, who had voted with the majority and could not do so, would withdraw his motion.

Mr. SUMNER said if Mr. Trumbull would move a reconsideration he would withdraw his motion.

Mr. SHERMAN, (rep.) of Ohio, said the question was one of parliamentary law. Undoubtedly if a vote is given by any person, whether a Senator or not, it is the right of the Senate at the same time to supervise the right of the person to vote. There was no doubt that if a Senator was directly interested in a measure before the Senate, he was excluded by parliamentary rules from voting. As to the question when the correction shall be made, it was plain that it could not be made pending the vote. It must therefore be made after the vote was recorded. Mr. Sherman favored the motion of Mr. Sumner as the better mode of reaching the question before the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS, (dem.) of Ky., contended at length for the right of Mr. Stockton to vote, and characterized the attempt to remove him from his seat as a party measure—an attempt to get a two-thirds vote on the other side of the chamber.

Mr. STOCKTON, (dem.) of N. J., then took the floor. He said that at first he had no intention of saying anything on this subject to-day; but remarks had been made in the course of this debate which made it necessary for him to say something in his own behalf. First, he would ask whether he was entitled to a vote. The third section of the constitution says that "the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislatures thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote." He (M. Stockton) had flattered himself that, having passed through the four terrible years of this war, that he had been living under a constitutional government, and that when the constitution of the United States said a thing in so many words that all quibbles raised by parliamentary law would be inapplicable and would not control the judgment of anybody. In the Senate of New Jersey, when it assembled in the early part of the winter, there were twenty-one Senators—eleven republicans and ten democrats. At the opening of the session a republican Senator voted for himself for the office of President of the Senate, which he has held since. No question was ever raised as to his right to do so. He (Mr. Stockton) was here by virtue of his credentials. The Governor of the State of New Jersey, under the broad seal of New Jersey, told him he was elected Senator. He believed that was true. He had examined the subject thoroughly. As far as conviction could fasten itself upon the human mind that conviction had fastened itself upon his mind. He presented these credentials. He was sworn in. He took a solemn oath to do his duty as a Senator in this body, and to do it in this case. He had a doubt whether he should not have voted when his name was called in the first instance on the amendment. Gentlemen had failed to mention this fact, that he did not vote on the amendment of Mr. Clark. It was from delicacy that he refrained from voting then, not because he did not think he had a right to vote. It might have been a very serious question. It might have been a very difficult thing for him to have freed himself from the responsibility of voting, had his vote been sufficient to decide the vote in that amendment; to have allowed delicacy to overcome what was a constitutional duty. Gentlemen said that this was a judicial case, and that he (Mr. Stockton) had voted in his own case. Was that true? He had not thought so. If he thought it was his own case he should never have come to the Senate. He should never have asked to take his seat; he never should have presented his credentials. Some gentlemen might absorb their representative character in their personal consideration. He never did so. He never looked upon this as his case. It was always to him the case of the Senators from New Jersey. When one Senator from New Jersey by artifice was prevented from rendering his vote, he (Mr. Stockton) was not to be withheld from motives of delicacy from counteracting that artifice. There were eleven States out of the Union now, and an attempt was made to put New Jersey out. He did not mean that that should be done when the disregarding of motives of delicacy would prevent it. This made it necessary for him to make a revelation which was extremely disagreeable to him, which he did not intend to make. He would like to see the whole subject erased from the proceedings of this body. He would like to see it erased from the record, for the credit of the Senate of the United States. He yesterday received a letter from the home of Mr. Wright, his colleague. It was from the son of Mr. Wright, who served in one of the great campaigns as a major of the army. Mr. Stockton read from Major Wright's letter. It expresses astonishment at the course of Mr. Morrill, and accuses Mr. Morrill of breaking his pledge to his father. It asserts that Mr. Morrill had not written to Senator Wright on the subject. Mr. Stockton then caused to be read a letter from Mr. Morrill to himself, written on Wednesday evening, giving him notice that he (Mr. Morrill) would feel constrained to vote on the question. He also read a despatch sent by him (Mr. Stockton) to Mr. Wright, that Senator Morrill wished him (Mr. Wright) to know that, after allowing him a reasonable time to get to Washington on Thursday, he (Mr. Morrill) would consider himself at liberty to vote on his (Mr. Stockton's) case on Friday morning. He (Mr. Stockton) received a reply to his despatch. Mr. Wright stated that he was still confined to his room, and could not be in Washington before the middle of this present week, and could not, therefore, consent to the withdrawal of the agreement. In conclusion Mr. Stockton said he had always had a high regard for the Senator from Maine (Mr. Morrill). He desired to say now, that while he characterized the act to which he had just referred in the strongest terms that parliamentary language would permit him to use, he was convinced that Mr. Morrill meant nothing that was not right and honorable. He would notice, however, that the newspapers reported that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumter), who had taken upon himself the guardianship of the honor of the Senate, had advised Mr. Morrill to vote on that occasion.

Mr. FESSENDEN, (rep.) of Me., wished to know if Mr. Stockton referred to him.

Mr. STOCKTON said he did not. He referred to the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner).

Mr. SUMNER—I advised him to vote, certainly I did.

Mr. FESSENDEN rose to explain the circumstances under which his colleague (Mr. Morrill) voted on Friday. Six or seven weeks had elapsed since he paired with Mr. Wright. Mr. Morrill had given Mr. Wright notice of his intention to vote and had given him reasonable time to get here to vote. His colleague consulted him as to what he should do, and stated the facts to him. He told him that all that could be required of him was that he should give reasonable notice of his desire to terminate the arrangement. If there was any imputation on his colleague's conduct there was the same on his (Fessenden's). He considered Mr. Morrill as acting perfectly in the right.

Mr. SUMNER said he too was willing to take his share of the responsibility. He had advised Mr. Morrill to vote and believed he did right.

Mr. HENDRICKS, (dem.) of Ind., addressed the Senate in defence of the right of Mr. Stockton to vote on the question on Friday last.

Mr. SAULSBURY said the motion to correct the journal was not in order, he thought. The journal was correct as it stood. Objections were made on Friday last to Mr. Stockton's vote, and they were overruled by the Chair. There was no appeal then made from the decision of the Chair, and he did not think the question could properly now come before the Senate in its present shape.

Mr. LANE, (rep.) of Kansas, expressed his surprise that Mr. Stockton should have voted in his own case. He believed Mr. Stockton was entitled to his seat, but he felt sure that if he had reflected a moment he (Mr. Stockton) would not have voted on Friday. For the sake of giving Mr. Stockton an opportunity of setting himself right he would, if nobody else did so, move a reconsideration of the vote of Friday.

Mr. FESSENDEN, President pro tem., took the floor in a brief explanation of his decision as presiding officer on Friday. It was evident that that decision had been misunderstood. He understood the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Saulsbury) to say that after the roll had been called on Friday, after the name of the Senator from New Jersey had been called and he had voted, objection was made, and after the objection the Chair decided, in substance, that the Senator from New Jersey had a right to vote; and after that had occurred it was too late, in his judgment, to undertake to amend the the journal in the manner now proposed. Mr. Foster said that Mr. Saulsbury was entirely mistaken in regard to what occurred at that time. The Senator from Nevada (Mr. Nye) rose after Mr. Stockton had cast his vote on Friday and asked if a member had a right to vote in his own case, to which it was replied that the Chair had no prerogative to settle any question of the kind, except to hold that the name of every Senator on the list may be called, and it is the privilege of every member whose name is on the list to have his vote recorded. That is not, in my judgment, deciding that the Senator from New Jersey had a right to vote. It expressly disclaims the right of the Chair to decide that question.

Mr. STOCKTON—I rise to withdraw my vote. I am exceedingly anxious that I shall make my position, in doing so, perfectly clear. At the moment that I voted no man had questioned my right to vote in this body when my name was called. From the moment I entered this chamber until then I voted upon any subject whatever. I had been, on the contrary, told by republican Senators, as well as democrats, by gentlemen of different politics from my own, that in their opinion I was entitled to vote. The question of the validity of that vote never crossed my mind. I believe to-day, I believe at this moment, that that vote is a valid vote according to the constitution of the United States. Now, Mr. President, the vote being valid according to my judgment, there being no question raised, it was my duty, as I have said before, to overcome all scruples of delicacy in order that New Jersey might be represented; but the discussion to-day has exhibited to me the fact that there are in the minds of the ablest lawyers in the Senate, in the mind of the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee himself (Mr. Trumbull), grave doubts as to the constitutionality of the vote. I do not propose to occupy my seat in this body by an unconstitutional vote—an illegal vote. I desire that question to be examined carefully. I should like the Judiciary Committee to examine it—the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Illinois is chairman. I therefore withdraw my vote, and request some gentleman to offer a resolution that the Judiciary Committee be requested to examine carefully before I am again called upon to vote.

Mr. SUMNER—Does the Senator withdraw his vote?

Mr. CLARK, (rep.) of N. H., in the chair—It is the opinion of the Chair that he cannot except by unanimous consent.

Mr. FESSENDEN said Mr. Stockton could not withdraw his vote. His own judgment was that the best way to reach the matter was by a reconsideration.

Mr. POLAND, (rep.) of Vt., said he had voted in favor of Mr. Stockton, believing him entitled to his seat. He did not think, however, that he (Mr. Stockton) had a right to vote in his own case. He moved to reconsider the vote of Friday last.

Mr. JOHNSON moved to postpone further consideration of the subject until Thursday next, to enable Mr. Wright and others to get here to vote.

Mr. LANE, of Kansas, hoped Mr. Stockton would have leave to withdraw his vote.

Mr. CONNESS, (rep.) of Cal., favored a correction of the record by excluding the vote of Mr. Stockton.

Mr. SUMNER offered a resolution in lieu of the pending motion, declaring that the vote of Mr. Stockton be not received in determining the question of his seat in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK did not think it was necessary to adopt such a resolution, as Mr. Stockton had expressed regret for his vote already, and would not vote again until his case was decided.

Mr. STOCKTON denied that he had expressed a doubt as to his right to vote. Some of his friends had doubted the constitutionality of that vote, and under the circumstances he asked permission to withdraw it; and of course no gentleman would dream that he would vote until the question was settled.

Mr. SHERMAN believed it best to refer the resolution of Mr. Sumner to the Judiciary Committee, with instructions to report on Thursday morning.

Mr. GILMER, (rep.) of Iowa, moved to amend by instructing the Judiciary Committee to report a standing rule of the Senate that no gentleman shall vote in his own case.

Mr. TRUMBULL said the amendment was not necessary. If the resolution was referred it would be perfectly competent for the Judiciary Committee to report a general rule.

The motion to refer the resolution of Mr. Sumner was debated by several Senators, after which it was disagreed to by the following vote:—

YEAS—Messrs. Anthony, Buckalew, Cowan, Davis, Guthrie, Harris, Hendricks, Johnson, Lane of Kansas, McDougall, Nesmith, Norton, Riddle, Saulsbury, Sherman, Trumbull, Van Winkle and Willey—18.

NAYS—Messrs. Brown, Chandler, Clark, Conness, Cragin, Creswell, Fessenden, Foster, Grimes, Howard, Howe, Kirkwood, Lane of Indiana, Nye, Poland, Pomeroy, Ramsay, Sprague, Sumner, Wade, Wilson and Yates—22.

ABSENT OR NOT VOTING—Messrs. Dixon, Doolittle, Foot, Henderson, Morgan, Morrill, Stewart, Stockton, Williams and Wright—10.

The question then recurred on postponing further consideration of the subject until Thursday next. Pending the decision of this motion the Senate, at half-past four o'clock P. M. adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WASHINGTON, March 26, 1866.

REPUDIATION OF THE REBEL DEBT—PAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

The business in order being the call of States for resolutions, the resolutions of Mr. Rogers, (dem.) of New Jersey, came up as the pending question. The resolutions are as follows:—

Resolved, That the federal government has no constitutional right to assume or pay the debt of the so-called Confederate government of the insurgent States or the rebel debt of any of said States, and that it would be an outrage even to attempt to do so.

Resolved, That the honor of the federal government and every principle of justice demand that the federal debt should be paid to the utmost farthing; that repudiation be discountenanced and the plighted faith of the country sacredly preserved.

Resolved, That equal taxation is just, and that every person in this country should bear his equal share of the federal and State taxes, and that there should be no privileged class.

Mr. DAWES, (rep.) of Mass., suggested as an amendment the appending of the ten commandments.

Mr. ROGERS then rose to address the House in support of his resolutions.

Mr. BLAINE, (rep.) of Me., appealed to him to forego his right to make a speech in the morning hour. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Rogers) had certainly been heard as frequently and as graciously as any other member of the House. They always listened to him with the utmost delight; but he submitted that it was putting it a little too strong to take up the morning hour now.

Mr. ROGERS assured the gentleman from Maine (Mr. Blaine) that he had no intention of occupying the morning hour. He simply desired to define his position on the third resolution of the series. He avowed himself in favor of paying every dollar of the federal debt; but he had not forgotten the elementary principle lying at the foundation of the government, namely, the principle of equal and just taxation. He wanted to see the autocratic and wealthy holders of government securities pay their share of taxation on that property.

Mr. HALE, (rep.) of N. Y., asked whether the purport of the third resolution was to have federal securities taxed, and if so, whether that should not be set out in express terms.

Mr. ROGERS replied that that was the purport of the resolution and that everybody so understood it. He was in favor of taxing these bonds by the federal government and by State government.

Mr. CONKLING, (rep.) of N. Y., asked the gentleman to inform the House whether federal securities were exempt from State taxation by reason of the constitution of the United States, or by reason of an act of Congress.

Mr. ROGERS replied that federal bonds were exempt from State taxation by reason of the constitution of the United States, not that there was any express condition in the constitution preventing States from taxing federal securities, but because it would be against the spirit and intent of the constitution to allow States to interfere with the necessary functions of the federal government.

Mr. CONKLING, after a long legal catechism, inquired whether, without repudiation and without violation of the public faith, Congress could withdraw from the federal securities their immunities from taxation which their holders relied upon.

Mr. ROGERS replied that it would be no violation of plighted or public faith, nor would it have the first resemblance to repudiation, to compel the rich, aristocratic bondholders, who had three thousand millions of dollars invested in government securities, to pay taxes to the State and federal governments according to the amount of their investments.

Mr. STROUD, (dem.) of Pa., catechised Mr. Rogers to show that the holders of government bonds were really not exempt from taxation, as they paid income tax upon the proceeds.

Mr. BLAINE asked the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Rogers) to repress logic and indignation, and let the States be called for resolutions.

Mr. ROGERS replied that he proposed to go on and exercise his rights. The doctrine he advocated had been enunciated by conventions of the democratic party in Indiana, in New York, and almost every other State.

Mr. RANDALL, (dem.) of Pa., had no objection to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Rogers) speaking for himself, but he did not want to have him speak for the democracy of Indiana or of New York.

Mr. GRINNELL, (rep.) of Iowa, asked whether the gentleman from New