SEWARD'S DIPLOMACY.

He Studies a Grand Continental Alliance.

Peru Handles Him Gently---Chile Snubs Him Roughly.

Clarendon and Napoleon Still Ahead in the Game.

&c. &c. &c.

The following official correspondence will throw some light on the efforts at mediation made recently by the United States, England and France in the war between Spain and the allied republics of South America:—

WASHINGTON, Oct. 8, 1866.

Señor J. N. BARRENCHEA, Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Lima, Peru:—

On the evening of the 6th inst. I had a long conversation with the Secretary of State on our troubles with Spain. We exchanged ideas freely, as both of us took the ground of complete frankness in treating on the subject. Our interview was free from all official character, and we were thus enabled to express our ideas without any reserve.

His Excellency thinks that the time has come to end a war which, from the turn it has taken, will be very prejudicial to the allied republics, as it imposes on them enormous sacrifices in endeavoring to touch Spain in a spot where the blow will be felt by her. He deems it important that those republics should regain a solid peace under the auspices of governments that are proving their own ability to consolidate their institutions and promote the development of the great elements of prosperity which they possess. He thinks, also, that Spain is now anxious to take advantage of the means offered to bring to an end this struggle, from which she has lost all hope of ever deriving any benefit whatever. Under these circumstances Mr. Seward was anxious that we should seek some way of reaching a satisfactory solution of these questions.

I informed his Excellency that I was not ignorant of the difficulties that attended a continuation of the war under its present aspect, but that we were still increasing our means and elements of aggression, and that we expected soon to be able to carry the war into ground where it would be felt by our enemy; that, on the other hand, this war, by arousing the patriotism of our people, uniting all parties and elevating the sentiment of the nation's dignity, had really done us a great service at home, while at the same time our alliance with the other republics of the Pacific and the closer intimacy of our relations with them, as well as the unity of ideas that sprang up under the influence of the alliance, were destined to produce results of the most important kind. Moreover, that in the present state of public opinion in South America, the allied governments of the Pacific could make no peace that would not be highly honorable, and that would not in some way secure the realization of a continental solidarity that should put an end forever to all European interventions in America.

Mr. Seward replied that for some time he had been studying how to render of practical use in given cases that theory of a grand continental alliance—up to the present time impracticable in its absolute form—and that he believed it possible now to give it a partial application so as to secure a settlement of the pending questions. The plan which he proposed was that the President of the United States should address notes, drawn up in identical terms, to the allies as well as to Spain, setting forth the importance of bringing the war to an end, and inviting them to send plenipotentiaries to Washington. These latter, when assembled in a congress under the unbiassed presidency of the Department of State, could enter into negotiations with each other for peace. As to the subject of claims or any other matter on which they could come to no agreement—not even through the good offices of the United States—the President of the Union might choose an arbitrator who should decide thereon. Should the idea be accepted, an armistice might be signed involving the recognition of the nations signing it, as well as their territorial integrity. And should the republics of the Pacific agree to this method of arranging their difficulties, he (Seward) would extend a similar invitation to Brazil, with her allies, and to Paraguay, so as to bring their war to an end also.

The Secretary of State entered into some considerations as to the importance and excellence of this plan, and set forth the advantages of thus making the question a continental one, and of bringing it to a solution at Washington and not in Europe. He ended by stating that, although he had not mentioned his idea to anybody, because he wished previously to have a talk with me, he had some reasons for believing that Spain, under certain possible contingences, would not reject it. I must not disguise from your Excellency that I received the plan very favorably myself, and so I stated to Mr. Seward. In my judgment such an arrangement would satisfy the demands of our honor and of the nation's dignity, as well as the aspirations of all South America. From the moment that Spain binds herself to defend her case in a congress of American plenipotentiaries, and on American soil, from the moment that she accepts the arbitration chosen by the President of the United States, her moral defeat will be assured; and it may be said that, her influence and prestige in America being forever at an end, the loss of her control over the colonies which she now holds cannot be delayed for many years. Such an assemblage of plenipotentiaries may perhaps promote the adoption of certain general principles that may serve as clear and precise bases on which to rest an American code of international law, and in this way we might attain a partial reunion of the whole continent, in regard to its relation with Europe as well as in our relations with each other. Moreover, in the disturbed state of certain American countries, owing to their complications with European Powers, it would be no exaggeration to expect that the effect of such an American congress at Washington would be highly favorable to those countries, just as the Congress of Paris had been for Italy. As I had no authority from the supreme government to express its ideas on the subject, I agreed with the Secretary of State that I should lay the matter before the supreme government for its consideration, and also those of its allies. For the purpose of avoiding all misunderstanding, I must inform you that I have given his Excellency a copy of that portion of this despatch which details his project of pacification, and that I have received his approbation of the language in which I have set it forth.

I remain your Excellency's obedient servant,
F. L. BARREDA.

SANTIAGO, Nov. 16, 1866.

Don MARCIAL MARTINEZ, Minister Plenipotentiary of Chile in Peru:—

I have before me your confidential note, No. 236, dated the 4th inst., which informs me of a conference which your Excellency had on the evening previous with the Chief Magistrate of the Peruvian government on the subject of the method recently proposed by Mr. Seward to the Peruvian Minister at Washington, having for object to bring our war with Spain to an end. Señor Pardo, by orders from his government, has called my attention to the same subject, and I will here lay before you the substance and the grounds of the answer which I gave him.

In the first place, we do not think the case has been presented for us to accept the offer of the United States; for even if the idea of Mr. Seward had been approved by his government, still no formal proposition has as yet been addressed to the allies. But even supposing such a proposition to have been made, we should have to remove two obstacles before accepting it. The first consists in the acceptance, which we have already favored, of the Anglo-French mediation. Although it would not be impossible to find a way to get rid of that, it is necessary that we be freed from this compromise before accepting the proposition of the United States. The second obstacle appears more serious. It would be impossible for us to begin any new negotiations with Spain that would be practicable without having the assurance that we should obtain reparation for the bombardment of Valparaiso. We so stated to the representatives of France and England when treating for an Anglo-French mediation. That reparation is an inevitable term of the settlement for us, because without it the outrage committed by Spain would be sanctioned, and the most dangerous precedent for Spanish America established. Hence we cannot consent to strike out the requirement of such a reparation, which is indispensable before a representative of Chile can take his seat in the international congress in which the Washington Cabinet proposes to settle the present strife by peaceable means.

When the two obstacles which I have just pointed out have been removed, we would not object to second the views of Peru on this subject; but in doing so it would be in obedience to the desire we have of acting in harmony with that government, much rather than owing to the confidence with which we should be inspired by the favorable disposition of the United States government towards Spanish America. On the other hand, when we strip Mr. Seward's idea of its vague and uncertain surroundings, and look at it in a practical sense, it is easy to see that the international Congress at Washington would lead to no solution, and that in the end the basis of peace would have to be settled by the arbitrator who would have to be named after fruitless discussions. Well, then, we will never consent to submit to the decision of an arbitrator the power to qualify the bombardment of Valparaiso. For this reason it would be necessary, before acquiescing in the proposition of the United States, to settle the modifications that would have to be made in the terms of the proposal. This change is the more necessary as a pure and simple acceptance of the idea set forth by the government of the Union carries with it an immediate armistice, and would bring us an insecure peace—one that could not satisfy the essential and most legitimate objects of our alliance on the Pacific. Moreover, were it possible for us to enter on the path pointed out to us by the Cabinet at Washington, it should be, not for the purpose of discussing petty questions, but to establish solid principles and lasting rules of international conduct, so as to afford a solid guarantee for our republics, and allow them to return to peace after having obtained security and vindicated their honor. Among these principles there should figure an explicit condemnation of the bombardment of defenceless ports, *and the exemption from capture of private property afloat, so as to fully carry out the now defective principle of the abolition of privateering*, just as Prussia and Austria put it in practice recently.

Such are in sum our ideas on the subject of the pacific settlement, as informally proposed by the Washington Cabinet. Your Excellency will take care to explain and support them in the interviews you may have with the Chief Magistrate or with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Peru, and try to secure harmony between our views and those of said government.

God keep your Excellency, &c.
ALVARO COVARRUBIAS.

PROTOCOL OF THE CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 1, 1866, BETWEEN THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF CHILE AND THE CHARGES D'AFFAIRES OF FRANCE AND ENGLAND.

Señor Thomson, Chargé d'Affaires of her Britannic Majesty, explained, at the invitation of Señor Flory, Chargé d'Affaires of France, that both had received orders from their respective governments to tender anew their good offices to Chile and her allies for the purpose of arriving at a satisfactory and honorable conclusion of the war which they actually wage with Spain.

For this object he stated that their governments had already addressed both the government of Spain, as well as those of Ecuador and Peru; that, in the opinion of his government, the present circumstances were opportune for the government of Chile to accept their good offices, as the Spanish vessels were away from the coast of Chile, and at the moment there were in Chile representatives from all the allied republics.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs, before giving his answer, questioned the representatives of France and England as to the way their governments proposed to use their good offices in favor of peace. They replied that for the present their governments wished simply to know if Chile and her allies would accept those good offices. If they were accepted each one of the belligerents could afterwards draw up the formula of its claims, and the governments of France and England, taking the demands of all into consideration, would point out the bases of settlement that they might deem mutually satisfactory, honorable and worth accepting. These bases would be submitted to the consideration of the belligerents, who would be at full liberty to accept or reject them.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs announced that he would submit the matter to the consideration of his government, and would give his answer on the day following, but that he could not refrain from giving notice at once that, in his opinion, the obstacles to a pacific settlement with Spain had increased, notwithstanding the fact alluded to by their Excellencies that the Spanish naval forces had sailed from the Pacific and that the allied republics were fully represented in Chile. On this point he explained the weighty reasons he had for putting no trust in the promises of Spain, and referred to the conduct which she had observed, not only with Chile, but also with the United States, France and England, as also the reasons why Chile would never consent to let a precedent be established by allowing the bombardment of Valparaiso to be passed over. Chile, said the Minister, is a country entirely open, and requires that for its due security as well as for the protection of its commerce with the rest of the world, and for the safety of Spanish America, that said precedent be done away with.

The representatives of France and England objected that such arguments could be brought forward when the time came to draw up their claim. The Minister agreed that the proper opportunity would be the moment pointed out by the French and English representatives, and confined his present reply to the offer of an answer on the following day.

The French and English representatives then stated that during the negotiation begun by their present offer they believed no act of hostility should take place. The Minister for Foreign Affairs rejected this idea, and maintained, on the contrary, that the belligerents remained at perfect liberty to continue hostilities by whatever means they deemed proper, when there was no express stipulation for an armistice or suspension of hostilities.

In testimony whereof the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chile and the Chargés d'Affaires of France and England have signed and sealed with their respective seals the present protocol. Done in triplicate at Santiago on the 1st day of October, 1866.

ALVARO COVARRUBIAS.
EDMOND FLORY.
W. TAYLOUR THOMSON.

THE TURF.

Stallion Trot on the Fashion Course.

We seldom have a finer trot to report than one which took place yesterday afternoon, on the Fashion Course, between the stallions McClellan and Vanderbilt, mile heats, to wagons, for a stake of $2,000. Four heats were trotted, McClellan winning the first, second and fourth, the third being declared a dead heat by the judges. Their decision caused considerable dissatisfaction, it being argued by those most interested that Vanderbilt should have had the third heat on account of having trotted it out without a break, whereas McClellan broke so near to the score that he passed it on a canter and barely reached it in advance of his adversary; which he could scarcely have done by trotting. It would not have altered the result of the contest, however, if the heat had been given to Vanderbilt, as McClellan won the next and deciding heat. McClellan was the favorite in the pool selling before the race commenced at nearly two to one, and after a heat or two had been trotted the odds were much greater. It was late in the day before the horses made their appearance on the track, and considerable further delay took place in the starting, which was at last effected by giving one quite an advantage over the other in the lead. With the exception of the third heat, in which he trotted beautifully throughout, Vanderbilt acted unsteadily, and may be said to have lost the race more through it than from any deficiency of speed. The weather was unexceptionable and the track in prime condition for fast work, as is shown by the time in which the race was trotted, four better wagon heats being rarely recorded. The details of the race in all its material points is as follows:—

First Heat.—After much delay in scoring, both horses came up very fast to the stand, McClellan on the outside a clear length. The word was then given and they went away at a rattling gait. The relative positions at starting were not changed when they reached the quarter pole, but after they had passed that point and while going down the backstretch Vanderbilt footed so rapidly that he was soon on a level with McClellan, and passed the half mile pole side and side with him. They continued in this way down the Flushing end, where the pace being too hot for Mac he broke up and Vanderbilt led a length by the three quarter pole. Turning into the homestretch a spirited struggle ensued for the lead, during which Vanderbilt broke so badly while on a gaining lead that he could not be rallied before he reached the score, and McClellan came in a winner in 2:30¾.

Second Heat.—After some preliminary scoring both horses got a pretty equal send off, but almost immediately after leaving the stand, and as they approached the first turn, Vanderbilt became unsteady, and making one of his characteristic breaks, went into what may be termed a run, which continued a long distance, but during which he did not appear to either gain or lose a great deal. McClellan trotted steadily after the word was given, and at the quarter showed about two lengths in front. This distance he still further increased at the half-mile pole, which he passed with a lead on Vanderbilt of some three lengths. Vanderbilt had now recovered his gait, and trotted very fast down the Flushing end, but was unable to overtake Mac, who at the three-quarter pole still maintained about the same lead. A vigorous effort was now made by Vanderbilt for the heat, but he was too far behind for success, and only succeeded in decreasing the distance between them somewhat, while Mac, pursuing a steady pace, reached the score a winner by about two lengths in 2:31½.

Third Heat.—They got off on very equal terms and at a telling pace, but before they reached the turn McClellan broke into a run, which was continued for some distance. They passed the quarter pole simultaneously, and went along the backstretch rapidly together until near the half-mile pole, where, in consequence of another slight break by McClellan, Vanderbilt showed a length in front. Along the Flushing end, and until after passing the three-quarter pole and entering upon the homestretch, he maintained this advantage, and footed rapidly homeward, hard pressed by Mac, however, who broke into a run when near the stand, and reached the score at the same moment. The judges, amid great dissatisfaction, declared it to be a dead heat, Vanderbilt's friends insisting that he had won it fairly. Time, 2:31½.

Fourth Heat.—The get off was a very good one for both horses, who went away so very fast that McClellan broke as they approached the turn, while Vanderbilt footed steadily along and passed the quarter about a length in front. He maintained this position for a couple of hundred yards along the backstretch, when he too made such a decisive break as to lose all hope of winning the heat. Mac then went by him rapidly, and at the half mile pole was three lengths ahead. This distance he increased on the Flushing end, when Vanderbilt broke again, so that at the three-quarters and passing into the homestretch he was five or six lengths in front of Vanderbilt. He continued trotting very fast until he reached the stand, which he did nearly a distance in advance of his competitor, in 2:30¾, thus winning the heat, race and money.

The following is the summary:—

FASHION COURSE—TROTTING.—Monday, June 10—Match for $2,000, mile heats, best three in five, to wagons.

D. Mace entered br. s. McClellan............	1	1	0	1
D. Pfifer entered b. s. Vanderbilt............	2	2	0	2

Time—2:30¾—2:31½—2:31½—2:30¾.

MORALS IN WESTERN NEW YORK.

An Elopement in Seneca County.

[From the Seneca Falls Reveille.]

John Sanford is an honest, industrious tinsmith, residing at the Kingdom, midway between this village and Waterloo. The cares and responsibilities of life hung lightly upon John's shoulders, and peace and happiness and a loved wife were the angels of his household. By practising economy and leading a virtuous life John Sanford had accumulated enough to engage in business and give employment to others. At the height of his prosperity he procured a horse and wagon wherewith to peddle tinware, and placed one Lafayette Dillabaugh in charge thereof. Time rolled on and John Sanford prospered. The smooth current of his domestic affairs flowed on with no ripple to disturb its placid waters. Dillabaugh peddled successfully, and John Sanford's tinware yielded an hundred fold. Mrs. John Sanford was elated with the flow of greenbacks from the hands of the fascinating young Dillabaugh. Her words of encouragement and tenderness found a responsive echo in his susceptible heart. A yearning passion had been kindled there, and Lafayette Dillabaugh loved Mrs. John Sanford. Peddling tinware became irksome to the enthusiastic lover, and to the gentle and captivating Mrs. John Sanford he confided his tender passion. Mrs. John Sanford sighed, and willingly consented to an elopement with the bewitching Dillabaugh. On Friday last the home of the too confiding John Sanford was made desolate and dreary by the sudden and cruel flight of his loved one. Whither John knoweth not, and great is his agony. Unsophisticated John Sanford! Cruel Mrs. John Sanford! Wicked tin pedler Dillabaugh!

Intrigue and Murder.

[From the Rochester Union and Advertiser.]

It is intimated that a large number of intrigues have been in progress in this city for a few months past. Confiding husbands have lately been aroused to the danger that besets them, and it need not surprise anybody to hear of men being shot. That remedy for injury is now popular, and will of course be speedily resorted to by injured husbands. It may be that some wives who are inclined to the side of the strong-minded will venture to try cold lead upon females who have seduced their husbands from the path of rectitude and virtue. Why should not a woman shoot the betrayer of the honor of her husband and the destroyer of her peace?

RECONSTRUCTION.

The Power of Military Commanders in the South—The President's Veto on the Return of the Reconstruction Bill to Congress.

The following are the points of the President's veto of the Reconstruction bill in relation to military domination in the South:—

The bill places *all the people of the ten States therein named under the absolute domination of military rulers*, and the preamble undertakes to give the reason upon which it is justified. *It declares that there exists in those States no legal governments and no adequate protection for life or property, and asserts the necessity of enforcing peace and good order within their limits.* * * *

All these conditions must be fulfilled before the people of any of these States can be relieved from the bondage of military domination; but when they are fulfilled then immediately the pains and penalties of the bill are to cease, no matter whether there be peace and order or not, and without any reference to the security of life and property. The excuse given for the bill in the preamble is admitted by the bill itself not to be real. The military rule which it establishes is plainly to be used not for any purpose of order or for the prevention of crime, but solely as a means of coercing the people into the adoption of principles and measures to which it is known that they are opposed and upon which they have an undeniable right to exercise their own judgment.

I submit to Congress whether this measure is not, in its whole character, scope and object, without precedent and without authority—in palpable conflict with the plainest provisions of the constitution, and utterly destructive to those great principles of liberty and humanity for which our ancestors on both sides of the Atlantic shed so much blood and expended so much treasure.

The ten States named in the bill are divided into five districts. For each district an officer of the army not below the rank of brigadier general is to be appointed to rule over the people, and he is to be supported with an efficient military force to enable him to perform his duties and enforce his authority. Those duties and that authority, as defined by the third section of the bill, are to protect all persons in their rights of person and property, to suppress insurrection, disorder and violence, and to punish or cause to be punished all disturbers of the public peace or criminals. The power thus given to the commanding officer over all the people of each district *is that of an absolute monarch—his mere will is to take the place of all law.* The law of the States is now the only rule applicable to the subjects placed under his control, and that is completely displaced by the clause which declares all interference of the State authority to be null and void. *He alone is permitted to determine what are the rights of person and property, and he may protect them in such way as in his discretion may seem proper.* It places at his free disposal all the lands and goods in his district, and he may distribute them, without let or hindrance, to whom he pleases. Being bound by no State law, and there being no other law to regulate the subject, he may make a criminal code of his own, and he can make it as bloody as any recorded in history, or he can reserve the privilege of acting upon the impulse of his private passions in each case that arises. He is bound by no rules of evidence; there is, indeed, no provision by which he is authorized or required to take evidence at all. Everything is a crime which he chooses to call so, and all persons are condemned whom he pronounces to be guilty. He is not bound to make any report or keep any record of his proceedings. He may arrest his victims wherever he finds them, without warrant, accusation or proof of probable cause. If he gives them a trial before he inflicts the punishment he gives it of his grace and mercy, not because he is commanded so to do. To a casual reader of the bill it might seem that some kind of trial was secured by it to persons accused of crime; but such is not the case. The officer may allow local civil tribunals to try offenders, but of course this does not require that he shall do so. If any State or federal court presumes to exercise its legal jurisdiction by the trial of a malefactor without his special permission he can break it up and punish the judges and jurors as being themselves malefactors. He can save his friends from justice and despoil his enemies contrary to justice. It is also provided that he shall have power to organize military commissions or tribunals; but this power he is not commanded to exercise. It is merely permissive, and is to be used only when in his judgment it may be necessary for the trial of offenders. Even if the sentence of a commission were made a prerequisite to the punishment of a party it would be scarcely the slightest check upon the officer, who has authority to organize it as he pleases, prescribe its mode of proceeding, appoint its members from among his own subordinates, and revise all his decisions. Instead of mitigating the harshness of his single rule such a tribunal would be used, much more probably, to divide the responsibility of making it more cruel and unjust. Several provisions dictated by the humanity of Congress have been inserted in the bill, apparently to restrain the power of the commanding officer; but it seems to me that they are of no avail for that purpose.

The fourth section provides, first, that trials shall not be unnecessarily delayed; but I think I have shown that the power is given to punish without trial, and if so this provision is practically inoperative. Second, cruel or unusual punishments are not to be inflicted; but who is to decide what is cruel and what unusual? The words have acquired a legal meaning by long use in the courts. Can it be expected that military officers will understand or follow a rule expressed in language so purely technical and not pertaining in the least degree to their profession? If not, then each officer may define cruelty according to his own temper, and if not usual he will make it usual. Corporeal punishment, the gag, the ball and chain, and the other almost insupportable forms of torture invented for military punishment, will be within the range of choice. Third, the sentence of a commission is not to be executed without being approved by the commander, if it affects life or liberty, and a sentence of death must be approved by the President. This applies to cases in which there have been a trial and sentence. I take it to be clear under the bill that the military commander may condemn to death without even the form of a trial by a military commission; so that the life of the condemned may depend on the will of two men instead of one. It is plain that the authority here given to the military officer amounts to absolute despotism. But to make it still more unendurable the bill provides that it may be delegated to as many subordinates as he chooses to appoint; for it declares that he shall "punish or cause to be punished." Such a power has not been wielded by any monarch in England for more than five hundred years. In all that time no people who speak the English language have borne such servitude. It reduces the whole population of the ten States—all persons, of every color, sex and condition, and every stranger within their limits—to the most abject and degrading slavery. No master ever had a control so absolute over his slaves as this bill gives to the military officers over both white and colored persons. It may be answered to this that the officers of the army are too magnanimous, just and humane to oppress and trample upon a subjugated people. I do not doubt that army officers are as well entitled to this kind of confidence as any other class of men; but the history of the world has been written in vain if it does not teach us that unrestrained authority can never be safely trusted in human hands. It is almost sure to be more or less abused under any circumstances, and it has always resulted in gross tyranny, where the rulers who exercise it are strangers to their subjects and come among them as the representatives of a distant power, and more especially when the power that sends them is unfriendly. Governments closely resembling that here proposed have been fairly tried in Hungary and Poland, and the suffering endured by those people roused the sympathies of the entire world. It was tried in Ireland, and, though first tempered by principles of English law, it gave birth to cruelties so atrocious that they are never recounted without just indignation. The French Convention armed its deputies with this power, and sent them to the Southern departments of the republic. The massacres, murders and other atrocities which they committed show what the passions of the ablest men in the most civilized society will attempt to do when wholly unrestrained by law. The men of our race, in every age, have struggled to tie up the hands of their governments and keep them within the law, because their own experience of all mankind taught them that rulers could not be relied on to concede those rights which they were not legally bound to respect. The head of a great empire has sometimes governed it with a mild and paternal sway; but the kindness of an irresponsible deputy never yields what the law does not extort from him. Between such a master and the people subjugated to his domination there can be nothing but envy. He punishes them if they resist his authority, and if they submit to it he hates them for their servility.

Veto of the Supplementary Bill—The President's View of the Power of Commanders as Embraced in that Law.

When I contemplate the millions of our fellow citizens of the South, with no alternative left but to impose upon themselves this fearful and untried experiment of complete negro enfranchisement and white disfranchisement (it may be almost complete), or *submit indefinitely to the rigor of martial law, without a single attribute of freemen, deprived of all the sacred guaranties of our federal constitution* and threatened with even worse wrongs, it seems to me their condition is the most deplorable to which any people can be reduced. It is true that they have been engaged in rebellion, and that in their attempt to bring about a separation of the States and a dissolution of the Union there was an obligation resting upon every loyal citizen to treat them as enemies and to wage war against their cause. Inflexibly opposed to any movement imperilling the integrity of the government, I did not hesitate to urge the adoption of all measures necessary for the suppression of the insurrection. After a long and terrible struggle the efforts of the government were triumphantly successful, and the people of the South, submitting to the stern arbitrament, yielded forever the issues of the contest. Hostilities terminated; soon after it became my duty to assume the responsibilities of the chief Executive officer of the republic, and I at once endeavored to repress and control the passions which civil strife had engendered, and, no longer regarding these erring millions as enemies, again acknowledged them as our friends and our countrymen. The war had accomplished its objects; the nation was saved, and that cardinal principle of mischief which from the birth of the government had gradually but inevitably brought on the rebellion, was totally eradicated. Then, it seemed to me, was the auspicious time to commence the work of reconstruction; then, when these people sought once more our friendship and protection, I considered it our duty generously to meet them in the spirit of charity and forgiveness, and to conquer them even more effectually by the magnanimity of the nation than by the force of its arms.

I yet believe that if the policy of reconstruction then inaugurated, and which contemplated an early restoration of these people to all their political rights, had received the support of Congress, every one of these ten States and all their people would at this moment be fast anchored in the Union, and the great work which gave the war all its sanction and made it just and holy would have been accomplished. Then over all the vast and fruitful regions of the South peace and its blessings would have prevailed, while now millions are deprived of rights guaranteed by the constitution to every citizen, and *after nearly two years of legislation find themselves placed under an absolute military despotism.* "A military republic, a government formed on mock elections and supported only by the sword," was nearly a quarter of a century since pronounced by Daniel Webster, when speaking of the South American States, as "a movement, indeed, but a retrograde and disastrous movement, from the regular and old fashioned monarchical system;" "and," he added, "if men would enjoy the blessings of republican government they must govern themselves by reason, by mutual counsel and consultation, by a sense and feeling of general interest, and by the acquiescence of the minority in the will of the majority, properly expressed, and, above all, the military must be kept, according to the language of our bill of rights, in strict subordination to the civil authority." Whenever this lesson is not both learned and practised there can be no political freedom. It is absurd, preposterous, it is a scoff and a satire on constitutional liberty, for forms of government to be prescribed by military leaders *and the right of suffrage to be exercised at the point of the sword.*

I confidently believe that a time will come when these States will again occupy their true positions in the Union. The barriers which now seem so obstinate must yield to the force of an enlightened and just public opinion, and, sooner or later, unconstitutional and oppressive legislation will be effaced from our statute books. When this shall have been consummated I pray God that the errors of the past be forgotten, and that once more we shall be a happy, united and prosperous people, and that at last, after the bitter and eventful experience through which the nation has passed, we shall all come to know that our only safety is in the preservation of our federal constitution, and in according to every American citizen and to every State the rights which that constitution secures.

ANDREW JOHNSON.

The Sheridan-Wells Controversy—A Spicy Letter from Governor Wells.

GOVERNOR WELLS TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON.

STATE OF LOUISIANA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, NEW ORLEANS, June 4, 1867.
[Telegram.]

To his Excellency ANDREW JOHNSON, President of the United States:—

In advance of communication by mail I respectfully and earnestly protest against the act of General Sheridan in removing me from office as a usurpation of power on his part, and to gratify a feeling of personal malice toward me, because I dared to appeal from his unauthorized and arbitrary exercise of power in appointing a Levee Board.

J. MADISON WELLS, Governor of Louisiana.

THE SAME TO THE SAME.
[By mail.]

STATE OF LOUISIANA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, NEW ORLEANS, June 4, 1867.

To his Excellency ANDREW JOHNSON, President of the United States:—

SIR—The enclosed order from General Sheridan removing me from office is respectfully submitted for your consideration as to the question of his power to do so. As to the reasons assigned by him for taking this step—viz, that I have impeded him in the execution of the law of Congress, I enter a respectful but emphatic denial to the accusation. I am prepared to establish the truth of this assertion. It is evidently a mere pretext on the part of the General to give the color of cause for an act which originated in personal malice toward me, because I dared to defend myself from his personal attacks. Had the General stated that I was an "impediment" in the way to the gratification of his inordinate ambition to make himself a great man, he would have come much nearer the truth than he did. His abuse of me personally I do not condescend to notice. His eminent skill in that line is well known to this community. That he should so far degrade the office he holds as to make his official orders the vehicle of his malice may surprise you, but not me, who know his reckless habits.

It is not my purpose, however, in this communication to make your Excellency a party to the personal quarrel of General Sheridan and myself. It is foreign to the question at issue, which is simply if military commanders, under the law of Congress, have the right to remove civil officers under the provisional governments of the States established thereby, or, in other words, if they possess any power beyond those delegated in said act, and definitely expressed.

Knowing that this question, touching the general powers of the military commanders thereunder, particularly growing out of the frequent exercise of the removing power by General Sheridan, is now under consideration by the Attorney General, I respectfully submit the case of my removal, in connection therewith, as another instance of the illegal exercise of power by General Sheridan. Believing the importance of the question involved will call forth an early decision, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

J. MADISON WELLS, Governor of the State of Louisiana.

GOVERNOR WELLS TO GENERAL SHERIDAN.

STATE OF LOUISIANA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, NEW ORLEANS, June 4, 1867.

To Major General P. H. SHERIDAN, commanding Fifth Military district:—

GENERAL—I had the honor to receive at the hands of one of your orderlies this morning, at half-past three o'clock, at my residence in Jefferson, a written document purporting to be "Special Orders No. 59," in which you promulgate that you have removed me from the office of Governor of Louisiana.

For the delicate consideration you displayed in delivering your order at that early hour I owe you many thanks, as I suppose you meant that I should enjoy one good night's sleep before my decapitation. It may appear ungracious in me to disappoint your expectations, but, strange to say, the effect of your order did not drive sleep from my eyelids. I returned to my couch, with a feeling of relief that my fate was no worse. When the morning paper came containing a copy of your telegram to the Secretary of War, I again congratulated myself on my merciful sentence, as, knowing your ideas of the unlimited power you possess, I might have been condemned to the Dry Tortugas, or been shot by a drum head court martial. From the tone and temper of that document it is very evident, General, you were in one of your wrathy moods when you penned it, and that I was not hanged, shot or banished, appears to me, under the circumstances, as if I were indebted for my safety to the interposition of Divine Providence.

In your order removing me, General, you allege as reason therefor that I am impeding you in the execution of the laws of Congress; but how and in what way you do not condescend to state.

Now, General, it may appear discourteous in so humble an individual as myself to contradict so exalted a functionary as you conceive yourself to be; yet as there is not a word of truth in the charge you make, you must excuse me if I decline to give you the benefit of so serious an accusation.

To go back to the date of the July riots of last year, your memory cannot fail to serve you that you availed yourself of the occasion, in your telegrams to General Grant relative to that affair, to make a direct personal attack on me, impeaching my efficiency as a public officer and recommending my removal from office. Not conscious of having deserved your severe strictures, I confess I was surprised and pained when I read them in print, the more so as you were not in the city on the day of the riot, you having found it convenient to be off to Texas several days before—I will not say in anticipation of a riot, nor will I use the word "skulk."

I bore your damaging accusations a long while in silence, but finally exercised the right belonging to the humblest individual, of defending myself publicly against your charges. This I did in a letter addressed to an honorable Senator from Illinois, but couched in language devoid of scurrility and personalities.

I spoke of your military services in the highest praise. At that time I did not suppose for a moment that any personal hostility on your part would result from that publication. In fact, I had dismissed the transaction from my mind, and when you received your appointment as commander of this district, I called on you as if there had been no controversy between us, and tendered you my co-operation in carrying out the law of Congress. You received my visit courteously, and I fully expected there would be harmonious relations between us. When, however, the time arrived for you to act, in the appointment of Registrars, and in the removal and appointment of officers, I discovered no disposition on your part to consult me in the slightest manner, which, as a loyal Governor, and intimately acquainted with the people of the state, I did not think unreasonable in me to expect of you. I did not complain, however; my official intercourse with you was frequent, though about this time I saw published what purported to be an extract of a letter from you to the Secretary of War or General Grant, in which you asked for advice as to your power of removal, as it was probable you would find it necessary to remove me from office. I have seen no denial from you as to the authorship of that letter. Notwithstanding these repeated evidences of an unfriendly spirit on your part, I said nothing, and it was only when you assumed to nullify my appointment of a Levée Board and to substitute one of your own, for which I think you had no authority under the law of Congress to do, that I referred the question of your right to appoint to the proper officers at Washington to decide. If to remonstrate against the illegal and arbitrary exercise of power by you—having no connection with the law of Congress, which specifically defines your duties—is an "impediment" to the execution of the law, then your power is supreme, which, in my opinion, was never contemplated by the act of Congress.

But, General, you are not content with charging me as an "impediment" to the execution of the law, as your sole reason for removing me from office. As if conscious that the charge was a mere invention of yours to afford a pretext for doing an act you had predetermined on to gratify an ancient grudge, you come down to your true forte, and pour out the vials of your wrath in a stream of abuse and scurrility on my devoted head. You will pardon me, General, for not imitating your exmaple by way of retaliation. My education has been sadly deficient in that polite branch of literature, and I am willing to leave the field to you as without an equal. I cannot forbear the remark, however, that when a major general of the United States army has to play the part of a "bugler" in sounding in person his own honesty, it may well excite a curiosity in the community to surmise the cause therefor. As to your charge of appointing rebels to office, if it is a crime, I would like to ask, General, if you are free from the same accusation. Out of a Levée Board composed of five members, one of your appointees was a member of the Secession Convention, and signed the ordinance of secession; another is not a citizen of the United States, but claimed the protection of the British flag on the arrival of Commodore Farragut and his fleet, and a third was a blockade runner, who was arrested and tried by a military commission. There is a trite maxim, General, in this connection, which it would be well for you to remember in your future personal controversies. Equally faulty and unfortunate in point of memory is your insinuation that you could not find me on the day of the riot, when I called at your office on my way to the Mechanics' Institute, and talked over the matter with you. I did not call on you for a guard, because one had been furnished me by General Baird.

Having disposed of your misstatements concerning me, and defended myself from what I conceive to be a wanton and malicious attack on my character on your part, I leave the public to judge between us.

It is with no pleasure I have been forced into this controversy. My desire was to hold the most amicable relations with you officially, but to silently submit to your arbitrary exercise of power, and your aspersions on my character, would be to prove false to my official trust, and to admit the truth of your slanders.

And I now call on you to make good your assertion of dishonesty as charged against me, if you expect to avoid the verdict of the people, which is always meted out to the calumniator and slanderer.

J. MADISON WELLS, Governor of the State of Louisiana.

The Deposing of Governor Wells, of Louisiana.

[From the Washington Intelligencer, June 10.]

The grounds for this act, set forth by General Sheridan himself, so far as they have been yet made public, do not seem to have the slightest bearing upon the reconstruction question. They are wholly disconnected with it. The most important among them were actions of the Governor anterior even to the passage by Congress of the reconstruction laws. Governor Wells himself, in his letter to the general, attributes his removal exclusively to personal malice entertained towards him by General Sheridan. Be this as it may, the exercise of the power that has been assumed by General Sheridan in this case is a fearful subject for the contemplation of the people of the United States. It is a death blow to civil liberty and the establishment of a military despotism more terrible and more dangerous than history has ever before recorded. If such assumptions of power by a military officer are to be for a moment tolerated by the government, civil government everywhere, North and South, is placed at the mercy of the caprices or bad passions of a single individual, and the liberty of the citizen is already utterly gone. * * *

The letter of Governor Wells to General Sheridan contains a very significant imputation in regard to the absence of General Sheridan from New Orleans at the time of the July riots. It has always appeared singular that the commanding general should make it convenient to leave the city upon the eve of a riot that was even then apprehended. This matter is certainly worthy of investigation.

[From the Springfield Republican, June 10.]

General Sheridan has put the removal of Wells through with his usual boldness and in apparent defiance of positive orders from Secretary Stanton. The report that Secretary Stanton and General Grant had censured Sheridan for removing Governor Wells, however, has been contradicted in a despatch from General Grant himself to Sheridan. The whole matter will come before the President and Cabinet at once, and although the action of General Sheridan may be condemned in some particulars, he is not likely to be removed nor his action reversed.

[From the Boston Post, June 10.]

Governor Wells and other officials whom General Sheridan has unceremoniously disposed of, are not men in whom any respectable class has any confidence; but that fact does not justify such extreme measures as the commanding officer there has chosen to adopt.

[From the New Orleans Times, June 6.]

A very pretty quarrel as it stands is that which has arisen between the commanding general of the Fifth military district and Mr. J. Madison Wells, whom he recently removed from the office of Governor of Louisiana. Up to the present time it has proved an inexhaustible theme for discussion and speculation among our citizens, and the source of no little amusement; for while it is true that the interests of the community generally must suffer from any cause which tends to aggravate and perpetuate existing political dissensions, individually there are few who regard this dispute otherwise than as a neat little intellectual "set-to," in which they, as spectators, have but little personal concern.

Governor Wells Without an Organ in New Orleans.

It is a rather curious fact that the only paper which published Governor Wells' response to General Sheridan, on the 5th instant, was the New Orleans *Picayune*, and it appeared there as an advertisement, in small type, headed "A Card," and marked "one time, inside, paid." No editorial comment. The *Republican* (anti-Sheridan) publishes it on the 6th, without comment. The *Bee* (conservative) does the same. The *Bulletin* (conservative) don't seem to have known anything about it. The *Tribune* (colored radical) is equally dark. The *Times* is the only New Orleans paper of the 6th at hand that mentions the *brochure* editorially at all.

Letter from General Longstreet.

[From the New Orleans Republican, June 5.]

NEW ORLEANS, La., June 3, 1867.

J. M. G. Parker, Esq.:—

MY DEAR SIR—Your esteemed favor of the 15th ult. was duly received. I was much pleased to have the opportunity to hear Senator Wilson, and was agreeably surprised to meet such fairness and frankness in a politician whom I have been taught to believe uncompromisingly opposed to the white people of the South.

I have maturely considered your suggestion to "wisely unite in efforts to restore Louisiana to her former position in the Union, through the party now in power." My letter of the 6th of April, to which you refer, clearly indicates a desire for practical reconstruction and reconciliation. Practical men can surely distinguish between practical reconstruction and reconstruction as an abstract question. I will endeavor, however, with renewed energy to meet your wishes in the matter. The serious difficulty that I apprehend is the want of that wisdom which is necessary for the great work. I shall be happy to work in any harness that promises relief to our distressed people and harmony to the nation. It matters not whether I bear the mantle of Mr. Davis or the mantle of Mr. Sumner, so that I may help to bring the glory of "peace and good will toward men."

I shall set out by assuming a proposition that I hold to be self-evident, viz.:—The highest of human laws is the law that is established by appeal to arms.

The great principles that divided political parties prior to the war were thoroughly discussed by our wisest statesmen. When argument was exhausted resort was had to compromise. When compromise was unavailing discussion was renewed and expedients were sought, but none could be found to suit the emergency. Appeal was finally made to the sword to determine which of the claims was the true construction of constitutional law. The sword has decided in favor of the North, and what they claimed as principles cease to be principles, and are become law. The views that we hold cease to be principles because they are opposed to law. It is therefore our duty to abandon ideas that are obsolete and conform to the requirements of law.

The Military bill and amendments are peace offerings. We should accept them as such, and place ourselves upon them as the starting point from which to meet future political issues as they arise.

Like other Southern men I naturally sought alliance with the democratic party, merely because it was opposed to the republican party. But as far as I can judge there is nothing tangible about it, except the issues that were staked upon the war and there lost. Finding nothing to take hold of except prejudice, which cannot be worked into good for any one, it is proper and right that I should seek some standpoint from which good may be done.

If I appreciate the principles of the democratic party, its prominent features oppose the enfranchisement of the colored man, and deny the right to legislate upon the subject of suffrage, except by the States individually. These two features have a tendency to exclude Southern men from that party; for the colored man is already enfranchised here, and we cannot seek alliance with a party that would restrict his rights. The exclusive right of the States to legislate upon suffrage will make the enfranchisement of the blacks, whether for better or for worse, a fixture among us. It appears, therefore, that those who cry loudest against this new order of things as a public calamity are those whose principles would fix it upon us without a remedy. Hence it becomes us to insist that suffrage should be extended in all of the States, and fully tested. The people of the North should adopt what they have forced upon us; and if it be proved to be a mistake they should remove it by the remedy under republican principles of uniform laws upon suffrage.

If every man in the country will meet the crisis with a proper appreciation of our condition, and come fairly up to his responsibilities, on to-morrow the sun will smile upon a happy people, our fields will again begin to yield their increase, our railroads and rivers will teem with abundant commerce, our towns and cities will resound with the tumult of trade, and we shall be invigorated by the blessings of Almighty God. I am, sir, very respectfully, your most obedient servant,

JAMES LONGSTREET.

PERSONAL INTELLIGENCE.

Judge Miller, of Hudson, is stopping at the Hoffman House.

Captain Dixon, of England; Robert C. Winthrop, of Boston; Rev. D. Clark, of Massachusetts; Rev. C. T. Woodruff, and Rev. L. B. Bissell, of Norwalk, and Col. Bradley Martin, of Albany, are stopping at the Fifth Avenue Hotel.

Professor Laurent Clerc, of Hartford, Conn., is stopping at the Everett House.

J. M. Forbes, of Boston, and J. P. Millidge, of New Orleans, are stopping at the Brevoort House.

A. W. Kelsey, of California, is stopping at the St. Julian Hotel.

Captain Jeff Maury, of California; A. L. Kerr, of St. Louis; John B. Campbell, of Nashville, and Judge Nathan Davis, of Salt Lake City, are stopping at the Metropolitan Hotel.

Brigadier General O. Cross, of the United States Army; A. Browning, of Camden; Geo. M. Grier, of Goshen, and Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, are stopping at the Astor House.

General T. C. Hindman, of Arkansas, is making speeches in that State favorable to reconstruction under the Military bill.

Joseph E. Brown, ex-Governor of Georgia, was in Milledgeville, in that State, on the 5th instant.

Judge J. D. Walker has resigned the office of Solicitor General of the State of Arkansas. Major W. W. Wilshire, of Little Rock, has been appointed his successor by the Governor.

John L. Helm, democratic candidate for Governor of Kentucky, was in Louisville on professional business on the 6th inst.

John M. Washington, lately appointed Mayor of Newbern, North Carolina, has declined to take the oath of office prescribed by General Sickles.

Governor Patton, of Alabama, has gone over to the radical party of his State.

Wm. G. Swan, formerly member of Congress from Tennessee to the Confederate government, is practising law in Memphis.

General J. B. Hood, late of the rebel army, is on a visit to Lexington, Kentucky.

Hon. Schuyler Colfax made a speech at Lansing, Michigan, on the 6th inst.

Hon. George Bancroft, Minister to Prussia, instead of leaving New York for Europe on Wednesday, will leave on Saturday, 15th inst., on board the Hamburg steamer Allemania.

General N. B. Forrest, of Tennessee, is in New Orleans.

General Burton, commanding at Fortress Monroe during Jeff Davis' imprisonment, is on his way to Charleston.

THE MORRISANIA DRUG CLERK CASE.

An Englishman named Alfred West, who, as stated in yesterday's issue of the HERALD, was arrested on Sunday morning at the instigation of Mr. H. P. Monaghan, at Morrisania, for the alleged theft of a quantity of valuable fancy articles from the drug store of the latter, all of which were discovered in his possession at the time of arrest, was discharged from custody yesterday morning, at the request of Mr. Monaghan. It appears that West is the main support of a widowed mother, who resides in England, and has heretofore borne an excellent character.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS.

BOARD OF ALDERMEN.

The Leases of City Property—The Prosecution of Sureties, &c.

The Board of Aldermen met yesterday afternoon, Alderman Shannon presiding.

Alderman NORTON moved that the Comptroller be requested to furnish the Board with a list of all leases of city real estate made since 1862, who they were made with, the reasons, if any, why they were not submitted to the Common Council for their sanction, the time for which the leases were made, and the rate at which they were made. The resolution was adopted.

The Comptroller's regular monthly communication was received and ordered to be printed.

A communication from the Corporation Counsel informed the Board that, in answer to a resolution and inquiry in March, 1866, he commenced an action on behalf of the corporation against W. R. and Charles Devlin, sureties of Dr. Bradford, late Public Administrator, to recover $10,000, the amount of their bonds. The defendants' demurrer has been overruled by the Court, and an appeal is now pending to review the order for judgment in favor of the city upon the demurrer.

The paper was placed on file.

The Board then adjourned till Thursday next at four P. M.

BOARD OF COUNCILMEN.

The Dry Dock Railroad Company Again—Public Baths—Proposed Regatta by the City Fathers—Report of the Committee on Railroads Prohibiting the Running of Steam Cars on the Eleventh Avenue—Veto of the Mayor Relative to the Sale of Ferry Franchises, &c.

The Board met yesterday, the President, Mr. Brinkman, presiding.

A resolution was offered directing the Street Commissioner to cause the Battery, Dry Dock and East Broadway Railroad Company to move the cars blockading Grand street between Cherry street and the East river. It was laid over.

PUBLIC BATHS.

Mr. HARTMAN offered a preamble and resolution relative to the sanitary advantages to the poorer classes of the establishment of public baths in the thickly populated portions of the city, and referring the matter to a special committee to inquire into the propriety of establishing them. The resolution of inquiry was adopted.

PROPOSED REGATTA.

A resolution was introduced, and laid over, that a committee of five members from each Board be appointed for the purpose of getting up a regatta on the Fourth of July, and that $1,000 be appropriated for prizes, to be distributed as the committee might think best.

PROHIBITING STEAM CARS ON ELEVENTH AVENUE.

Mr. HENRY MURRAY, chairman of the Committee on Railroads, presented his report on the subject of prohibiting the use of steam by the Hudson River Railroad Company on the Eleventh avenue. The subjoined resolution was appended to the report:—

Resolved, That the Counsel to the Corporation be, and he is hereby, requested and directed to take such action as is requisite and necessary to compel the Hudson River Railroad Company to fully comply with the conditions and stipulations contained in the resolutions adopted by the Board of Aldermen, November 22, 1858, by the Board of Councilmen, December 2, 1858, and approved by the Mayor, December 13, 1858, in relation to the removal of the high rail in Chambers street and Broadway up to Fifty-third street and laying in its stead the groove rail, the running of small cars on their track, and the cessation of the use of steam below Fifty-third street. And that the Counsel to the Corporation report his action at his earliest convenience to this Board.

Mr. MURRAY, in an earnest speech, urged the immediate adoption of the resolution, affirming that not only was property depreciated on the Eleventh avenue, but the lives of men, women and children were endangered. He alluded to the serious accident which befel Mr. Creiger, a member of the Board, and in conclusion alluded to a statement which Mr. Horace F. Clarke is said to have made in Albany, to the effect that the Hudson River Railroad Company had paid "blood money" to the New York Common Council. If any sums were paid to any of the members of the Boards in reference to the violation of the city ordinances by the Hudson River Railroad Company, by running steam cars on the Eleventh avenue, he called upon Mr. Clark to furnish their names.

[Mr. MURRAY stated to our reporter that in the heat of the debate he neglected to mention the significant fact, that while the committee were in session he procured a number of volumes from the library containing city ordinances, but that everything relating to the use of steam by the Hudson River Railroad Company was torn out of the books. He (Mr. Murray) procured a copy of a compilation of ordinances from another source, which enabled him to conduct the investigation in a proper manner.]

Mr. W. B. ROBERTS moved to lay the report and resolution on the table for further consideration, which gave rise to a lengthy debate, in the course of which the conduct of the Corporation Counsel was severely animadverted upon for his alleged lethargic movements in neglecting to enforce resolutions passed by the Common Council.

Mr. FLYNN moved as an amendment the imposition of a fine of $300 upon the Hudson River Railroad Company every day they run their steam cars below Fifty-third street, which was lost.

Mr. ROBERTS introduced another amendment, to the effect that the report be laid over, and one hundred copies printed, which was carried.

A motion to reconsider the vote was adopted, and the paper was made the special order for this (Tuesday) morning, at twelve o'clock.

Mr. W. B. ROBERTS rose to a question of privilege. He called attention to an editorial article which appeared in a morning paper, charging that a resolution which he introduced in favor of renumbering the streets, was designed to create "a job" for some person. Mr. Roberts disclaimed any selfish consideration in offering the resolution. He submitted a paper, showing the advantages which would accrue from the adoption of the proposed plan, which was referred to the committee having that matter in charge.

THE MAYOR'S VETO RELATIVE TO FERRY FRANCHISES.

The following veto was received from his Honor the Mayor:—

MAYOR'S OFFICE, NEW YORK, June 10, 1867.

TO THE HONORABLE THE BOARD OF COUNCILMEN:—

GENTLEMEN—I return without approval a resolution adopted by your honorable body June 3, 1867, and concurred in by the Board of Aldermen the same day, repealing a resolution which was approved by the Mayor February 26, 1864, and which authorized the Comptroller to sell, at public auction, ferry franchises, wharves, piers and slips, and also all improved real estate belonging to the city at that time unoccupied and yielding no revenue.

The particular real estate referred to has, I think, been all sold. There are no ferry franchises now for sale, nor is any auction sale of wharves and piers, or of leases of them, contemplated at present. The subject of what disposition should be made of them is under consideration by the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund, who propose to have public meetings in relation thereto at the rooms of the Chamber of Commerce. Whatever power the Comptroller may possess in relation to them is derived from the charter and from the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund, and not from the resolution of 1864. While therefore I do not consider this repealing resolution of any practical importance, I feel bound to withhold my approval, because I am unwilling to give my assent to any action of the Common Council which, whether effectively or not, aims to deprive the Comptroller of power in relation to public property, which he has never shown any disposition to abuse, and which the public interests demand he should continue to exercise from time to time.

JOHN T. HOFFMAN, Mayor.

The Board adjourned to meet this day (Tuesday) at twelve o'clock.

HEAVY ROBBERY IN A BONDED WAREHOUSE.

Some time between Sunday night and yesterday morning the United States bonded warehouse which extends along Nos. 393, 395 and 397 Greenwich street, was entered by burglars, who, undetected by the police, carried off a case of black silk belonging to A. T. Stewart & Co., and which is valued at $4,000. A case of velvet valued at the same amount was also taken.

When the robbery was discovered yesterday morning on the store being opened for the regular business of the day, the room from which the cases had been taken was strewn with various articles which the thieves did not consider worthy of their serious attention after they had once ascertained their valuation or comprehended that they could not be easily carried off. The floors were covered with loose rice which the burglars had evidently emptied from the bags into which they had crammed the stolen property. Four rice bags were also found in the room, each containing four pieces of costly velvet, which for some reason or another the burglars were forced—for they certainly did not leave them willingly—to leave behind them. The police argue that the perpetrators of this robbery were concealed in one of the three houses which form the bonded warehouse, from the fact that they made their entrance into the department containing the silks and velvets by cutting through the solid wall, and that they made their egress through a door leading out into Beach street, to do which they were compelled to remove over fifty boxes of glass that were piled against it on the inside. Two dogs that were kept on the premises the thieves took good care to strangle before commencing their operations, the carcasses of the animals being found in Beach street yesterday morning.

This is one of the boldest of a series of bonded warehouse robberies that has happened during the past few months, and it would seem that, if greater watchfulness is not maintained by the warehousekeepers to prevent thieves hiding themselves by day in the store rooms to commit depredations by night, and the police have a more careful eye about them in the vicinity of these buildings, the burglars will hereafter consider United States warehouses the only fruitful nuts worth cracking.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

Rather Too Officious.

Several barrels of whiskey were seized a few days ago on the premises of one of the flourishing liquor merchants in Broadway. It afterwards appeared that this party had bought them at full price, as free whiskey, for the purpose of copper distillation and rendering them first class spirits. Two revenue officers soon after seized them, without any apparent reason, but on yesterday, on application at the Thirty-second district, the barrels were returned to their proper owners, and the officers were censured by their superior. Colonel Mesmore, lately acting in this city as special commissioner from the Revenue Department, has returned to Washington, where he will remain for some time, being the only commissioner now on duty in that district.

The Alleged Seizure of a Distillery in Hamilton Street.

In the article on the Internal Revenue which appeared in several of the city papers of the 9th inst., a statement was made to the effect that Mr. Marshall, the deputy inspector, was forcibly ejected from the premises, and that the owners made their escape. It now appears that such was not the case, and that nothing transpired at the seizure of the distillery No. 12 Hamilton street in any wise compromising the character of the owner or that of the deputy collector.