IMPEACHMENT.

Trial of President Andrew Johnson for High Crimes and Misdemeanors.

Argument of Mr. Nelson for the Defence.

The President's Political Course Reviewed.

Status of the Court of Impeachment.

SPECIAL TELEGRAM TO THE HERALD.

WASHINGTON, April 23, 1868.

An hour and a half sufficed to-day for Manager Boutwell to finish his speech, the longest that has as yet been delivered during the impeachment trial. Throughout the closing part of his speech this morning Mr. Boutwell's style of language and delivery showed a marked improvement on yesterday, and the attention of his audience was equally marked in the much greater interest they exhibited.

A recess was taken after Mr. Boutwell's speech, and then Mr. Nelson, counsel for the President, proceeded with his address. Mr. Nelson's style showed little artistic finish, and his arguments were thrown around with a magnificent indifference as to point and arrangement. Some of his rhetorical flights were marvellously giddy, yet sustained without accident. On the whole, his speech, which has not yet been finished, was a great impassioned appeal to defend the President without strict regard to time and place, the rules of logic or the nicer distinctions in grammar and philology. It was the speech of a lifetime friend of the President, and if it were not as courtly, as scholarly and as unimpassioned as it might have been, it had the merit of being the sincere expression of the speaker's mind. Mr. Nelson will probably occupy two or three hours to-morrow in continuation of his argument commenced to-day in defence of the President.

It is now arranged that Mr. Groesbeck will follow Mr. Nelson on the part of the defence. He will probably not finish his argument until Saturday. He will be followed by Mr. Williams, of Pennsylvania, who will be succeeded by Thad Stevens. Mr. Evarts and, if his health permits, Mr. Stanbery will then close the defence, and Mr. Bingham, for the prosecution, will complete the case. It is understood that the Senate will retire for consultation before the final vote is taken.

Thad Stevens displays the strongest belief in the success of conviction. To-day he stated that thirty-eight of the Senators were known to be in favor of conviction. This will be two more than the requisite two-thirds necessary to success from his standpoint. Mr. Stevens feels so much encouraged by this fact that he even thinks the number will be more than thirty-eight, which he illustrates by that principle in natural philosophy called gravitation. He says, "a larger body always attracts the smaller, and by the law of gravitation, the thirty-eight Senators being the larger body, he thinks they will bring to their senses those of the radicals who hang back." Mr. Stevens never looked in better health during the present session. The prospects of consummating a political necessity which he has so long been pressing seems to act with a remarkably invigorating influence.

Mr. Stanbery's health is reported to be improving fast, and it is thought to-day that he will be well enough to close the argument for the defence.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COURT.

Twenty-first Day.

UNITED STATES SENATE CHAMBER, WASHINGTON, April 23, 1868.

The Senate reassembled at eleven o'clock, and the court was opened in the usual form.

Senator GRIMES submitted the following:—

Ordered, That hereafter the hour for the meeting of the Senate, sitting for the trial of the impeachment of Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, shall be twelve o'clock meridian of each day, except Sundays.

Senator SUMNER and others objected, and the order was laid over.

At twenty minutes past eleven o'clock Mr. Boutwell resumed his address.

When Mr. Boutwell had concluded, at five minutes past one o'clock P. M., on motion of Senator JOHNSON the court took a recess for fifteen minutes.

Mr. Nelson's Address in Behalf of the Defence.

At twenty minutes before two o'clock Mr. Nelson took the floor in behalf of the President. His opening words were rather indistinct, but he spoke substantially as follows:—

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE AND SENATORS—I have been engaged in the practice of my profession as a lawyer for the last twenty years, and I have in the course of my somewhat diversified professional life argued cases involving life, liberty, property and character. I have prosecuted and defended every species of crime known to law, from murder in the first degree down to simple assault; but in rising to address you to-day I feel that all the cases in which I was ever concerned sink into comparative insignificance when compared to this one, and a painful sense of the magnitude of the case in which I am now engaged and of my inability to meet and to defend it as it should be defended oppress me as I rise to address you. But I would humbly invoke the Great Disposer of Events to give me a mind to conceive, a heart to feel and a tongue to express those words which should be proper and fitting on this great occasion. I would humbly invoke the assistance which comes from on high, for when I look at the results which may follow from this great trial; when I endeavor to contemplate in imagination how it will affect our country and the world, I stand back, feeling that I am utterly incapable of comprehending its result, and that I cannot look into the future and foretell it. I feel, Senators, that it will be necessary upon this occasion for me to notice many things which, as I suppose, have but little bearing upon the specific articles of impeachment which have been presented, and in doing so to follow the language of William Wirt upon the trial of Judge Chase. If I follow the argument of the honorable Manager more closely than would seem necessary to some of the court it will be remembered that it would seem presumptuous to slight any topic which the learned and honorable Managers have deemed it proper to press upon the consideration of the court. It has been charged that the President was trifling with the Senate. Scarcely had he entered upon this trial before charges were made against him of seeking improperly to gain time to effect an unworthy and improper procrastination. I shall dwell but a moment upon that. We supposed that there was nothing improper in our asking at the hands of the Senate a reasonable indulgence to prepare in our defence, when the subject of impeachment had been before the House of Representatives in some form for more than a twelvemonth, and when the honorable Managers were armed at all points and ready to contest the case on the one hand, and we, upon the other, were suddenly summoned from our professional pursuits; we, who are not politicians, but lawyers engaged in the practice of our profession, measure arms with gentlemen who are skilled in political affairs and who are well posted upon all the subjects that may be involved in this discussion. But it is not merely the complaint as to delaying and trifling with the Senate that it will become my duty to notice. A great many things have been said, and among the rest an attempt has been made to stigmatize the President as a traitor to his party; as disgracing the position held by some of the most illustrious in the land; as a dangerous person; a criminal, but not an ordinary one, and as encouraging murder, assassination and robbery all over the Southern States, and, finally, by way of proving that there is but one step between the sublime and the ridiculous, as bandying ribald epithets with a jeering mob. My excuse for noticing these charges, which have been made here in the progress of this investigation, is that nothing has been said in vindication of the President from them. It will be my duty, Senators, to pay some attention to-day. We have borne it long enough, and I propose before I enter upon the investigation of the articles of impeachment to pay some attention to these accusations which have been heaped upon us almost every day from the commencement of the trial, and which have been passed unanswered and unnoticed on the part of the President of the United States. If it is true, as is alleged, that the President is guilty of all these things—if he be guilty of one tithe of the offences which have been imputed to him in the opening argument, and which have been iterated and reiterated in the argument of yesterday and to-day, then I am willing to confess that he is

> A monster of such frightful mien,
> That to be hated needs but to be seen.

I am willing to admit that if he was guilty of any of the charges which have been made against him, he is not only worthy of the censure of this Senate, but you should place

> A whip in every honest hand,
> To lash him naked through the land.

He should be pointed at everywhere as a monster to be banished from society, and his name should become a word to frighten children with throughout the land, from one end to the other; and when any one should meet him or see him

> Each particular hair to stand on end
> Like quills upon the fretful porcupine.

If he was, then I agree that neither I nor those associated with me can defend him. Mr. Nelson then, asking "Who is Andrew Johnson?" proceeded to sketch the President's early life and career, and passed a high encomium on his patriotism and public services, referring also to the fact that his neighbors, and those who like himself (Mr. Nelson) knew him best, sustained him and believed him innocent. Mr. Nelson felt he was not addressing merely Senators or politicians, but judges, whom he begged to rise above prejudice or party considerations and do impartial justice. Referring to the immense outside pressure which it was impossible to conceal unworthy persons and journals sought to bring to bear upon them, he said he was confident that they would repel it with indignation. If he could believe that the result of the trial was a foregone conclusion, humble individual that he was, he would scorn to address them. He asked them as far as possible to put themselves in the President's place, to judge of his feelings and motives and intentions—a privilege accorded to the meanest criminal. Continuing, Mr. Nelson said:—I agree that it requires an almost superhuman effort to do it—to divest yourselves of all preconceived opinions and place yourselves in his condition and place. Then as to his life as a politician—who is the President of the United States? Why, a democrat of the strictest sect and the most strict construction—an old Jackson-Jeffersonian democrat—a man who proclaimed his democracy in the acceptance which he wrote at the time when he was nominated for the office of Vice President of the United States; and you and the whole country were told that he was a democrat, and he endeavored to rouse the old democratic party to what he called the pure and correct doctrines of democracy and to stand by the country in the great conflict in which it was engaged. When we look at this and examine the records of Congress and the debates, and look at his record on every question in which the constitution of the United States was involved, where do you find the President? You find him, under all circumstances, a strict constructionist of the constitution, adhering with strict tenacity to the principles and spirit of the constitution and of that party faith in which he had been trained; and when you look at the great difference between him and the House of Representatives upon the great questions which agitate the country, I ask you, Senators, if he may not entertain an opinion different from your own without blame? Do accord to him something of that freedom of opinion which you accord to every man on trial. Accord to him something of the privilege which is accorded to the meanest criminal. Accord to him the presumption that he is innocent until he is declared guilty. Look at his motives. Look at the manner in which he has acted, and, if there has been an unfortunate difference of opinion between him and the Congress of the United States upon great constitutional questions, why, attribute that difference, if you please, to the training, to the education, to the habits of thought of his whole life. But do not attribute it, in the absence of proof, to unworthy, base, dishonorable, mean motives, as you are asked to do upon the other side. I beg leave, Senators, to remind you of the resolution to which I adverted a moment ago, for, in the view which I take of this case, that resolution furnishes a key to the whole conduct of the President in the controversy out of which this unfortunate prosecution has arisen. That resolution, adopted in 1861, declares that Congress, in the prosecution of the war for the suppression of the rebellion, will recollect only its duty to the whole country, that the war is prosecuted in no spirit of revenge, nor for the purpose of overturning any of the existing institutions of the country, but to defend the constitution and all laws made in pursuance thereof, and to preserve the dignity, equality and rights of all the States impartially, and that as soon as these ends were accomplished the war should cease. There is the chart which has guided the President of the United States in the discharge of his official duties. There is the platform upon which he has stood, and if he has not viewed it in the light in which others have regarded it, still I ask if it is not capable of being regarded in the light in which he has viewed it? If it is, then I claim that we shall remove from this prosecution all idea of improper motives, and I declare that in view of the testimony offered on the other side, in view of all that is known to the contrary, with the exception of one single instance, the President of the United States has stood up, in letter and in spirit, to what he believes to be the doctrine of this resolution, which was adopted with all but perfect unanimity by the two houses of Congress in 1861. In the progress of the war he felt it necessary for him to yield the question of slavery so far as he had any influence in the section of country in which he resided, and that he did yield. He went as far as the farthest in proclaiming emancipation in the State over which he was placed as Military Governor, and in other respects he has endeavored to carry out that resolution in the spirit in which it was introduced by the venerable Crittenden, whose memory will ever be respected by those of you who know him; and as long as America shall have a name, as long as talent, genius, independence, faithfulness and firmness shall be venerated, so long will the name of that great and good man be honored in our own and in other lands, who declared in the resolution which he offered that the war was prosecuted, not for the purpose of conquest or subjugation, but that the dignity and equality and rights of all the States should be impartially maintained. Do not misunderstand me, Senators, it is not my purpose to enter into any discussion upon the differences of opinion between the President and Congress in regard to the reconstruction policy which has been pursued by them. I only advert to it for the purpose of showing that there was a pledge of equality of rights to be preserved in 1860 and 1861, when the galleries of the Senate Chamber rang with the applause of the multitude, when "fair women and brave men" were not ashamed to express their admiration and gratitude for him who is now on trial before you for the course he then took. If he had advocated a doctrine which was exceedingly obnoxious to the Southern people, what was it? It was that the Congress of the United States had the power to compel obedience to the constitution and laws of the United States. He denounced the doctrine of secession and denied that any State had the right to withdraw from the Union without the consent of all the States. He insisted that the great power of the government should be brought into requisition to keep those States within the Union, and when the war was over, when Lee had surrendered, when the government of the United States was cast upon him suddenly and unexpectedly, in the sudden emergency in which he was called upon to act hastily and speedily so as to bring the war to a termination as soon as possible, what did he do? There was no time to call Congress together, no time to assemble the representatives of a nation, and such was the state of the country as to demand immediate and prompt action. What did the President of the United States do? The President undertook to carry out what he believed to be the policy of his lamented predecessor. He undertook this in good faith. He manifested no desire to segregate himself from the party by whom he had been elevated to power. He endeavored faithfully to carry out the resolution of 1861 to preserve the dignity, equality and rights of the States and not impair them in the slightest degree, and now the question is, Suppose he is wrong? Suppose the Congress is right? In the name of all that is great and good, I ask any one of you if he is a traitor to his principles or a traitor to the party that elected him? It is a mere difference of opinion, an unfortunate difference, a very unfortunate difference, between him and the Congress of the United States; but who can say, in the spirit of candor and truth, that he was not endeavoring and did not try in all his acts to carry out what he believed to be the policy of the party by whom he was elevated to power, and after he had taken his stand he did all he could to have the policy of the lamented Lincoln carried out in regard to Arkansas and Louisiana, believing that when Mr. Lincoln made his proclamation in regard to the restoration of the States he designed to restore them to the state in which they were before the war commenced. I ask who can say there was guilt in that? You may differ in opinion, you may think he was wrong (undoubtedly a large majority of this Senate believe conscientiously that he was wrong), but still do you believe you can deprive him of the claim of honesty and integrity? Is a judge to be tried because he mistakes the law in a charge to a jury? I need not turn to authority; I need not read law books to satisfy you that any man acting in a judicial capacity, from a simple justice of the peace to the chief justice of the highest court in the United States, is protected by the laws while in the faithful and honest exercise of the judgment which is conferred upon him. You hear a great deal about the doctrine of implied power, and I shall have occasion to speak of that further in another part of my remarks; but let me put one plain, simple question to this Senate and to the whole country—Can any man put his finger on any sentence or clause in the constitution which says who is to restore the relations of peace in the land when they have been disturbed by a civil war? You have the power to suppress rebellion, but the moment you go beyond the language of the constitution you make use of an implied power, and the moment you admit the doctrine of the implication then I maintain that that doctrine is just as applicable to the President of the United States as to any Senator or Representative. I ask this question again. I know whom I am addressing. I know the intelligence and the high respectability and character of this great tribunal, and I put the question with fearless confidence to every Senator, where does he find the power in the constitution to pass your reconstruction laws unless under the power to suppress insurrection? Where, unless under those general powers by which the war was carried on, and under which it is declared that the government has the inherent right to protect itself against dissolution, and in the name of law and justice that you inaugurate here in this chamber and inscribe over the doors that are the entrance here. I ask you in the law and order and justice where do you get this power if not from implication? The constitution is silent. It does not say that Congress shall pass laws to reconstruct States that have been in rebellion; it does not say that the President of the United States shall do this. You are obliged to resort to implication. He is the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy in

...

Senator YATES at four o'clock suggested that if the counsel desired it the court might adjourn.

Mr. NELSON intimated that he did feel somewhat fatigued, but would proceed if the court did not now desire to adjourn.

The Senators submitted the question and the court thereupon adjourned.

On motion of Mr. MORRILL the Senate then took up the bill to provide for deficiencies, impeachment expenses, &c., and concurred in the House amendments. The bill was then passed and the Senate adjourned.

AN IMPORTANT AND TIMELY SCRAP OF HISTORY.

The Confiscation of the President's Property in Tennessee and His Attainment by the Confederate Authorities as an Alien Enemy.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Press and Herald.]

The following is a correct transcript from the records of the District Court for the Confederate States in this district. The books are on file in the clerk's office of the District Court of the United States at Knoxville, and this entry can be authenticated at any time:—

DECEMBER 10, 1862.

Confederate States of America vs. The Estate of Andrew Johnson, an Alien Enemy.—Petition.—First Receiver's District.—In this case appeared M. T. Haynes, Receiver for the First district of East Tennessee, and moved that said Andrew Johnson be declared an alien enemy to the Confederate States of America, and the court direct that the matter be submitted to a jury; whereupon came the traverse jury, who had been summoned by the Marshal, and duly elected, empanelled and sworn to try all the causes and matters, civil and criminal, in the Eastern district of Tennessee, to be submitted to them during the present term of the court, to wit:—Robert Cravens, James Montgomery, John Rise, Joe Bowling, John G. King, Carrick W. Crozier, Samuel P. Ivins, Wm. S. Kennedy, Wm. B. Smith, Wm. Ray, E. W. Marsh and J. G. Blackwell; and the said jury having heard the testimony and the charge of the court, upon their oaths do say that the said Andrew Johnson is an alien enemy to the said Confederate States of America. It is therefore ordered by the Court that the said Johnson is an alien enemy, and all the property, rights and credits belonging to him, either at law or in equity, are sequestrated under the acts of Congress, and the Receiver for this district is directed to proceed to dispose of the same as provided by law.

For his unswerving devotion to the Union under the constitution Andrew Johnson, now President of the United States, was in 1862 attainted by the rebel authorities as an alien enemy, and his property ordered to be confiscated. For his continued devotion to the constitution and his official endeavors to preserve the Union under that constitution he is now sought to be attainted and removed from office—by whom? By the man who in 1860 voted fifty-seven times for Jefferson Davis in the Charleston Convention, and by every means in his power forwarded secession and the establishment of the Southern confederacy. Unless the radical revolution is checked—since a little more than five years have shown us the spectacle of one of the chief supporters of the constitution sacrificed on the altar of radicalism for his persistent adherence to the supreme law—may we not look in the next five years to see Butler, Phillips and Sumner fall beneath the avenging sword of Grant, now their tool, but soon to be their master?

OBITUARY.

Marshal Ramon Maria Narvaez, of Spain.

Don Ramon María Narvaez y Campos, Duke of Valencia and Marshal in the Spanish army, whose death is announced by telegram, was born at Loja, Andalusia, August 4, 1800, and was consequently in the sixty-eighth year of his age. After the return of Ferdinand VII. he entered the army as a cadet in the Walloon Guards. In 1822 he joined the liberal party, and, under the command of General Mina, he made the campaign of Catalonia against the *guerrilleros*. He took Castle Follit by blowing up one of the forts. Here he was wounded, and in presence of the French army was forced to seek retirement at Loja. There he remained until the death of Ferdinand VII., in 1832. Two years afterwards he took rank as a captain in the army sent against the Carlists in the Basque provinces. In 1836 he had risen to the rank of brigadier under Espartero. Having been commissioned to pursue the Carlist General Gomez, who had hitherto eluded all pursuit, Narvaez came up with him November 25, 1836, on the plains of Majaceite, near Arcos, and routed him. From that time Narvaez became so popular that he was regarded by politicians as a rival of Espartero. He next spent three months in rooting out the brigands from La Mancha, when he was made Captain General of Old Castile, then Commander-in-Chief of the army of reserve, destined to counterbalance the army of the North and the party of Espartero. This move was foiled by Espartero, who had General Alaix raised to the Cabinet. He had also been elected to the Cortés as member for Seville; and, on the formation in that city of a revolutionary junta by Cordova, he repaired thither to aid that general in his movements against Espartero, between whom and himself there existed a strong feeling of jealousy; but the insurrection was suppressed and Narvaez was compelled to seek refuge in France in 1840. He was joined there by the Queen Mother Christina. In 1843 he placed himself at the head of the Christinos, landed at Valencia, defeated General Seoane at Torrejon de Ardoz, July 22, 1843, and made his entry into Madrid, thereby overthrowing Espartero. Next year he became prime minister and was created field marshal, Count de Cañadas Altas and Duke de Valencia. The administration of Narvaez was a reaction against the liberals. He recalled María Christina and revised the constitution of 1837. The reform of 1845 blotted out the principle of the popular sovereignty, established a limited franchise, conferred on royalty the power to appoint Senators, restricted the liberty of the press and the freedom of municipalities. Riots were the consequence, but the iron hand of Narvaez put them down. However, his imperious ways irritated his own party, and a palace intrigue upset his power February 10, 1846. After having been ambassador at Paris he was recalled to power in 1847, but his quarrels with María Christina resulted again in his resignation. On October 20, 1849, he was once more recalled and confirmed in power in 1850 by the support of the majority of the people. The attitude of Spain toward foreign Powers began to assume greater dignity under the administration of Narvaez, who opposed the British government's attempts to interfere in Spanish affairs with a firmness that led to the withdrawal of the British Minister, Sir Henry Bulwer, and the interruption of diplomatic relations, until a reconciliation was effected by King Leopold of Belgium. His great influence in the government at length provoked the jealousy of the Queen and caused him to tender his resignation January 10, 1851, to become ambassador to Vienna. The revolutionary movements that agitated Spain from 1854 to 1856 allowed Narvaez no chance to assume a rôle. But just accordingly as the influence of O'Donnell gained on that of Espartero, so the popularity of Narvaez, who was appointed to the French embassy, became evident. Thus it happened that, after the counter revolution of July 14, 1856, Narvaez was called to power after O'Donnell's brief reign. Narvaez, however, did not figure in the principal rôle, as the Marques de Pidal was selected chief of the Cabinet. The concordat of 1851 with the Holy See, which had been modified on various occasions, was restored to its original character immediately after the advent of Narvaez to power, October 13, 1856. Among the members of this new Cabinet was the present Captain General of Cuba, Lersundi. Narvaez at once set to work to restore royal authority, blot out all traces of the revolution of July, 1854, purify the administration, impose greater restrictions on the press, and also the impediments that hampered all the action of the communes and provinces. The outbreak at Malaga, November 16, 1856, was put down by force of arms. A general amnesty to the Carlist rebels of 1855 and 1856 was promulgated April 8, 1857. Narvaez now impaired his popularity by strengthening the influence of the crown in the Senate, making the dignity of the Senator hereditary and admitting as members to it the dignitaries of Church and State. He also caused stringent laws to be enacted against the liberty of the press and introduced laws for the administration of municipal and provincial affairs after the French model. This alienated from him the sympathies of a considerable portion of the conservative party. He at length tendered his resignation, November 1, 1857, and his Cabinet was followed by that of Señores Armero and Mon, November 15, 1857. April 26, 1858, the unsold Church property was returned to the Church. Since then the places occupied by Narvaez need only be enumerated, as the events accompanying them are fresh in the memories of our readers. He succeeded the Marques de Miraflores as President of the Council and head of a new ministry in September, 1864; signalized his return to power by putting a stop to the invasion of St. Domingo in January, 1865; he made way for General O'Donnell in June, 1865, only to return to power in 1866.

The characteristics of Narvaez's policy were essentially Spanish. O'Donnell was prone to follow the French lead in international policy, Espartero the English; Narvaez was exclusive, and would probably have better suited an American or non-intervention policy. His influence in Spain is undoubted, and with a proper regard for the peculiar habits and ideas of a nation like the Spanish, that important and now valuable portion of European diplomatic society can easily be wrested from the influence of Western European diplomats. Narvaez was imperious and exclusive in his policy, wrong-headed in some things, but proud and noble in the main. The policy of England and France in the general polity of the world ill-accorded with the ideas of a hidalgo like Narvaez. Sooner than allow Spain to play second fiddle to England and France, the Duke of Valencia would be partner with a free and independent policy like that of the United States. Hence his memory, though now under a veil in this country, will probably receive justice at the hands of Americans within the memory of the present generation.

THE SPANISH FRIGATE GERONA.

Whether King Neptune issued a mandate that his subjects should create heavy winds and tempestuous seas, interposing barriers in the routes of the naval representatives of the nations of the earth, necessitating such a detour from their respective courses, or whether other circumstances intervened, has not transpired; but really some marine necromancy must have been in vogue to send so many foreign men-of-war to our port within a few days. The latest addition to the stranger fleet is the frigate Gerona, of her Majesty's navy, Queen Isabella of Spain, that arrived in our harbor yesterday morning, dropping anchor opposite pier No. 4 North river about noon. This vessel, registered as a first class ship of the line in the Spanish navy, by her formidable appearance attracted the attention of all in that vicinity.

The Gerona was constructed at Carthagena, a Mediterranean port, during the year 1863-64, and on the 22d of March of the latter year was wholly completed. She is of oak, &c., in hull, with fine architectural lines, denoting with her motive power great speed. Her length on deck is 267 feet; breadth of beam, 49 feet; depth of hold, 20 feet; tonnage, 3,000 tons. Height of vessel above line of flotation is about 29 feet; depth below, 21 feet; distance from the surface of the water to the lowest battery, eight feet; the main section of the vessel in the water is 245 square feet, while the whole volume of the frigate immersed is 12,820 square feet; displacement of hull, 13,092 square feet. Her motive power consists of two trunk engines, built by Wm. Penn, London, having two cylinders, each forty inches diameter by three feet six inches stroke of piston, with a nominal power of 600 horses. These are supplied by four tubular boilers, having a natural draught. Her propeller is eighteen feet in diameter.

This vessel left Cadiz during the month of August, 1866, and sailed direct to Havana, where she has been cruising until the 16th instant, when she left for a run at sea, but because of dry weather and a desire to effect certain repairs came to this port. Her armament in position on the upper and main decks consists of 48 guns of various calibre, divided as follows:—34 guns, each capable of throwing a ball 7.88 inches in diameter; 8 of rifle bore, 5.23 inches in diameter of ball; besides these there are 8 smaller guns of 3.94 inches diameter of ball, exclusively for the boats.

After nearly three years' uninterrupted service, this frigate seems in excellent condition, and her interior denotes a high degree of discipline. Every rope is in its appropriate place, and every brass shines with peculiar brightness. The officers of the Gerona are as follows:—Commander, Don Francisco Navarro; Captain, Adolfo Joliff; Lieutenants, Rufino Gonzales Olivares, Simeon de Manzanos, Antonio Ferry, Enrique Paez, Emilio Fiol, José de Traola, H. S. H. the Prince Alberto de Monaco; Captain of Artillery, Francisco Dorah; Captain of Marines, José Manresa; Paymaster, Mauricio Montero; Surgeons, Juan Varquez, Francisco Elvira; Chaplain, Father Manuel Fernandez. These with one hundred and fifty marines and the men before the mast make up a crew of fifteen hundred and six persons.

Her officers during a sojourn of few days in our harbor anticipate passing many pleasant hours in the environs of the city. As this is the frigate's first visit here, it is hoped that her decks may be the scene of many genial and pleasant greetings, in which prominent New Yorkers may be a feature.

THE OCEAN STEAMER RACE.

A steamer which arrived a day or two ago reports meeting the steamers City of Paris and Cuba, which were said to be racing across the Atlantic, and also the St. Laurent, of the French line, which last steamer had the lead, although there was not twenty minutes difference between them.

FIRE IN WEST FIFTY-SEVENTH STREET.—At near seven o'clock last evening a fire occurred in a frame dwelling, owned and occupied by William [illegible], No. 210 West Fifty-seventh street. The premises were destroyed. Loss about [illegible]; insured.