# WASHINGTON

## The Bill Removing Political Disabilities Rejected in the House.

## Defeat of the Wood Screw Patent Bill.

## Relief of Exporters of Rum and Alcohol.

## Congressional Report on the Regulation and Control of Railroads.

WASHINGTON, June 19, 1868.

**The Impeachment Committee Again at Work.**

General T. W. Egan was called before the Butler investigating committee to-day. He testified having bet a hat with General Logan that seven Senators would vote for the acquittal of the President. Butler asked upon what grounds he thought the Senators in question would vote for acquittal. The witness gave his reasons, which were principally based upon the character of those Senators.

**The Swiss Consul with the Chinese Embassy.**

The Consul General of Switzerland, Mr. John Hitz, called on the Chinese Embassy to-day, and invited them to visit the land of William Tell, of Switzerland and its people. The Chinese talked with surprising familiarity, and seemed quite appreciative of the skill which the Swiss have acquired in the manufacture of watches and delicate silk fabrics. It appears the trade in the former article is quite considerable between Switzerland and China, and that a peculiar class of timepieces is manufactured to suit the taste of the Chinese, which insists upon having two sets of watches for personal wear, one with an hour and the other a minute hand solely. Reference being made to the republican form of government of Switzerland, the Chinese claimed that China was a republic two thousand years ago, and that now it was republican to the extent of having the form of government desired by the people.

**Visit of Mr. Burlingame to General Grant.**

Mr. Burlingame paid General Grant a visit to-day, and had a long interview with him. On Sunday he expects to leave for New York.

**The Reported Resignation of Secretary McCulloch Denied.**

It has been ascertained from proper authority that there is no foundation for the report published here this afternoon to the effect that Mr. McCulloch to-day transmitted to the President his resignation as Secretary of the Treasury.

**Our Relations with Spain and the South American Republics.**

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and House Committee on Foreign Affairs have under consideration an important question, which has also been submitted to the Executive by citizens of New York, Philadelphia and Boston, relative to our commercial relations with Spain and South America. According to the law of nations belligerents are bound to prosecute their wars actively to a termination and results, and neutral nations are bound to avoid entering into commercial transactions which may serve to aid either party. From this statement of the law of nations inference may be drawn that if belligerents fail to prosecute their wars and discontinue active hostilities neutral Powers are relieved from their obligations of neutrality; but it seems this question has never been raised or acted upon, and the committees of Congress which have the subject before them will probably report at an early day such measures as will enable American merchants and shipowners to understand their rights and duties on this question better than at present. The war between Spain and the South American republics, which commenced in 1864, was prosecuted with some vigor for nearly two years; but since the 1st of May, 1866, when the Spaniards destroyed Callao and with it a large amount of American and British property, not a blow has been struck by either party. This cessation of war for nearly two years is held by many as strong presumption that the war is closed and that all commercial rights and privileges are restored to neutrals. This view is understood to be entertained by a majority of both committees of foreign affairs in Congress, and action will likely be taken accordingly.

**Application for an Extension of the Hoe Patent for Printing Presses.**

The Senate Committee on Patents has given a hearing to Colonel Hoe, of New York, on a proposition to extend his patent for printing presses, which is abbut to expire. The committee has under consideration the propriety of taking from the Commissioner of Patents the power to extend patents, and putting it in the hands of a board of examiners. It is alleged that the power now lodged with the Commissioner is too great and affords strong temptation to partiality and corruption.

**The New Indictment Against John H. Surratt.**

The first count in the new indictment against John H. Surratt charges him with conspiring with Booth, Paine, Harold, O'Laughlin, Arnold, Atzerodt and Mrs. Surratt to murder Abraham Lincoln. The second count charges him with conspiring to capture Mr. Lincoln and deliver him as a prisoner into the possession, custody and control of certain persons whose names are unknown to the Grand Jury.

**Government Clerks Wrathy with the Radicals.**

A very strong feeling of resentment has been aroused in the government departments against the radical party, in consequence of the tabling of the bill granting the continuation for another year of their additional twenty per cent. Since yesterday the conservative element in politics has gained a large number of converts.

The name of General Ketcham, of New York, was erroneously printed as voting in the House yesterday against laying on the table the clerks' twenty per Cent bill. He voted in the affirmative.

**The Question of Increased Pay to Army Officers.**

The House Committee on Military Affairs had under consideration to-day a bill proposing to give officers of the army thirty-three and a third per cent in addition to their pay. No action was reached. The subject will be resumed next Thursday. There is but little prospect of such a bill becoming a law.

**Affairs at the Executive Mansion.**

The usual large crowd of interviewers is gathered at the White House, waiting for the termination of the Cabinet meeting to get access to the President. The Cabinet assembled at noon, all the members present except Secretary Seward, the department having been represented by Assistant Secretary Hunter. The Cabinet had under consideration the bills for the admission of the Southern States and the bill regulating elections in this District. Before Cabinet session the President saw Senators Henderson and McCreery and General Rousseau.

**Animated Discussion Over the Whiskey Tax Question.**

The Ways and Means Committee is having an animated discussion to-day over the whiskey tax question, and also relative to the transportation of whiskey in bond. There is no prospect of the bill being reported before Monday.

**Land Grants Asked for a New Telegraph Line.**

Certain parties interested in the bill granting lands to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from Lawrence, Kansas, to the boundary line between the United States and Mexico in the direction of some ports on the Gulf of California, had a hearing before the Committee on Pacific Railroad to-day. As the project does not require money, but merely a grant of public lands, the committee is rather favorably disposed towards it.

**Memorial in Relation to Indian Affairs.**

Among the memorials presented to the Senate is one from John Beaman and others praying that all existing difficulties and unsettled accounts relating to claims for spoliations or for Indian treaties not carried out be adjusted by five commissioners appointed for the purpose by the President of the United States, and that such commissioners, as well as all persons officially employed in connection with Indian affairs, may be nominated by the United States Indian Peace Commission, consisting of representatives from the different churches and philanthropic associations in or near the city of New York. Mr. Beaman has engaged several Indians of prominence to attend a public meeting in New York in furtherance of the principles embraced in the memorial.

**The Equalization of Bounties.**

The House Military Committee authorized a report to be made equalizing bounties and giving heirs of deceased soldiers a right to bounties, which the law, as it now stands, fails to do.

**Circular of Instructions from the Land Office.**

Commissioner Wilson, of the General Land Office, has prepared a circular of instructions to surveyors general and registers and receivers of the land office, and establishing rules by which to separate mineral from agricultural lands, and providing means for fixing, by affidavits, the character of pre-empted lands in regard to their mineral or arable qualities.

**Congressional Report on the Regulation and Control of Railroads.**

The Committee on Roads and Canals, in their report on the regulation and control of railroads, say that it is impossible to state the value of the commerce among the States at the time of the adoption of the constitution. It was, however, limited to a few millions of dollars. In the year ending March 31, 1867, the value of freight transported across the State of Illinois by railroad, from East to West, was $411,000,000. The value of freight transported across the same State in the same year, from West to East, was $235,000,000.

Through freight westward for the year 1862:—

| | Tons. | Value. |
|---|---|---|
| Pennsylvania Railroad..... | 145,205 | $125,844,945 |
| Erie Railroad..... | 149,896 | 129,910,394 |
| New York Central Railroad.. | 161,013 | 149,544,600 |

These few statistics, selected because readily accessible, are given to show the immense value of inter-State commerce, which is without any adequate protection, unless it is within the power of Congress to protect it—a commerce which is being extended and developed with wonderful rapidity as the vast Territories of the United States west of the Mississippi are being settled and their resources developed. It seems impossible that the almost unlimited commerce which is destined to pass from the interior of the Continent to the Atlantic, or from ocean to ocean, and which in the near future may embrace the commerce between Asia and our own Atlantic coast, should be subject to the diverse and conflicting rules, regulations and limitations to be prescribed by each State over whose territory it will pass; that each State shall have power to say that such commerce shall be limited to a single route or a single track; that a change of cars should be made when any local interest would be benefited thereby; that competition should be prevented and power given to each State corporation to impose such charges upon the transportation of freight and passengers from State to State as should be oppressive and burdensome, and which would be impossible if competition were permitted; and yet all these things are not only possible, but nearly certain to occur, if this vast commerce is to be regulated only by State laws. It has appeared in evidence before the Committee, by the statement of the Postmaster General, that he has not been able to make a contract for the carrying of the mails between Washington and New York upon the conditions prescribed by law, and that the proposition that the railroad corporations forming the continuous line between said cities might refuse to carry the mails of the United States, has been frequently stated by the officers of said roads, and the committee see no reason why it is not in the power of the corporation to cut off all railway postal communication between Washington and New York. The report is as follows:—

The committee are of opinion that Congress has not the constitutional power to legislate in relation to railroads which do not form parts of continuous lines extending from one State to another. It has long been settled that Congress has power to prevent the obstruction of any navigable stream which is a means of commerce between any two or more States—(Gibbons vs. Ogden, 9th Wheaton, p. 191; Corfield vs. Coryee, 4th Washington, C. C. R., p. 378; Gilman vs. Philadelphia, 3d Wallace, p. 724)—but it is held otherwise in relation to a stream that is wholly within any one State and unconnected with the navigable waters of another State. (Veazee vs. Moore, 14th Howard, page 468; Wilson vs. Blackbird Creek Marsh Company, 2d Peters, page 251.) The Committee are instructed, if, in their opinion, Congress has the power, under the constitution, to provide by law for the regulation and control of railroads extending from State to State, to report a bill which will secure—First, the safety of passengers; second, uniform and equitable rates of fare; third, uniform and equitable charges for freight or transportation; fourth, proper connections with each other as to transportation of passengers and freight. The Committee respectfully report that they have not the power at the present time to report such a bill, for want of the necessary information upon which to act. They are not now advised what plan of constructing cars, what kind of material to be used in their construction, what mode of lighting and warming the cars, will best secure the safety of passengers, nor what specific charges should be made to secure a proper system of regularity and uniformity in their connections of the various roads; that, in the opinion of the Committee, such a bill should only be prepared after a full and careful investigation of the whole subject, and the examination of persons of competent skill and experience to give reliable information upon the subject. In the British Parliament the information essential to proper legislation in relation to the management of railways and the proper construction of engines and cars is sought by the appointment of select committees to make the necessary investigation and take the necessary evidence. The reports of these committees of Parliament have been the basis of the legislation upon the subject and have been the means of securing a much greater degree of safety for passengers and promptness and efficiency in the transmission of merchandise.

The minority of the committee, Messrs. Kerr and Barnum, conclude their report as follows:—

If Congress possesses omnipotent authority to impair and disregard the obligation of contracts, then what is the value of this prohibition? What safety exists for the supposed sanctity of the contracts and intercourse between man and man in society? If Congress may impair or disregard the obligation of contracts between a State and her citizens whenever in its judgment it becomes expedient for the regulation of commerce or for any other purpose, then how is the power of Congress over all such interests to be restrained? The power of the States over the most important and sacred interests of their citizens, for their regulation and protection, must then be exercised, subject to the pleasure of Congress. The right of the States to regulate their own domestic policy in their own way and to protect their own citizens in their domestic, personal and fireside rights, interests and contracts, which is the most exalted and invaluable office of civil government, becomes a myth. It cannot be that Congress possesses any more right to impair the obligation of contracts than the States. We, therefore, conclude that the measures referred to and proposed cannot be constitutionally enacted by Congress, and ought not to be entertained, and that if the power existed its exercise would be inexpedient.

**Report on the Alleged Fraudulent Sale of Iron-Clads.**

The joint select Committee on Retrenchment, who were by a resolution of the House of Representatives instructed to inquire into the alleged fraudulent sale by the Navy Department of the iron-clads Oneota and Catawba to Alexander Swift & Co. to-day reported all the facts and circumstances connected with the transaction. It appears that the contract price for each vessel was $460,000, in addition to which the Navy Department allowed for extra work and matters not included in the original contract $161,424 54, making the total cost to the government of each of these vessels $621,421 54. The committee, after explanations at some length, say that as soon as Swift & Co. obtained their grant from the Navy Department to buy these iron-clads, they proceeded at once to look out for a customer, and in the summer of 1867 made a contract with Marquez, representing himself to be an agent of the Peruvian government. It subsequently appeared that he had no authority to act for that government; so one of the firm proceeded to Peru and there made a contract with the Minister of Marine for the sale of these two vessels at the price of a million of dollars each. The report states that at the time the contract was made with the Peruvian government Swift & Co. had no right or title to the vessels, which were still the property of this government. Swift & Co. claimed to have had an understanding with the Navy Department that they should be allowed to take the vessels on paying a million and a quarter of dollars for the two. About this time a joint resolution was drawn up and passed by Congress authorizing the Navy Department to contract for the sale of any iron-clad for a price not less than the appraised value, to be fixed by a board of five naval officers. The Secretary of the Navy advertised for proposals, and the board in the meantime proceeded to New Orleans, where a number of other vessels of the same class were lying. Immediately on the receipt of a telegraphic despatch announcing the action of the board the Secretary of the Navy issued an advertisement, stating that sealed proposals would be received till the 2d of March for the purchase of these vessels, among others. A number of bids were received, which failed from one cause or another, and finally Swift & Co. offered to take the Oneota and Catawaba at $740,000. This offer was submitted to Mr. Lenthall, chief of the construction bureau, by the Secretary of the Navy, and on the former's report the vessels were turned over to Swift & Co. for $755,000. The committee say that it is evident there was an understanding between the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Merritt, and agents, and perhaps the Secretary himself, that Swift & Co. should have these vessels, and the whole matter seems to have been so arranged as to prevent other bidders from having an opportunity to obtain them. The committee conclude their report by saying:—Although in our opinion the Secretary had no power to sell these vessels under the joint resolution of February 3, except to some bidder who complied with the conditions of sale authorized by that resolution, yet a sale has actually been made by him at the appraised value, the money received and paid into the Treasury, and the vessels delivered to the purchasers. The ships now lie in the port of New Orleans; work is rapidly progressing upon them; they are receiving on board guns, provisions and munitions of war, and will soon be, if they are not at the present time, ready to sail for a cruise. As the matter now stands certain citizens of the United States have become the purchasers from their own government of two iron-clad war ships for the purpose of fitting up and turning them over to a foreign government in condition for service, under a contract previously made, that government being at peace with our own, but in a state of recognized belligerency with another nation, with whom we are also at peace. The officers of each department of our government and the representatives of both of the foreign governments are fully informed of the facts, and the question to be solved is as to the manner of delivering the ships to the agents of the government which has contracted to purchase them without rendering their present owners criminably liable for a breach of our neutrality laws, and without a violation of international obligations on the part of our own government. The present laws are sufficiently stringent to preserve all the obligations of our government, and to prevent and punish any infraction of the neutrality laws by our citizens, or others within our territory, and to protect the interests of the government against fraudulent combinations upon the part of its officers with other parties. The Executive Department is clothed with ample power to enforce these laws and to punish for their violation, and the questions seem to be such as to require the decision of that department in the first instance; but in the opinion of the committee, under existing circumstances, these vessels cannot be delivered to the Peruvian government without a violation of our neutrality laws. It is the duty of the Executive Department, being so clothed with authority in the premises, to see to it that all our obligations of neutrality, both under the statute and international law, be fully observed. The committee therefore submit the facts thus ascertained for such action as may seem demanded and ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

**Navy Bulletin.**

Surgeons Philip S. Wales and W. M. King, of the United States Navy, have been detached from duty connected with the physical examination of officers for promotion and placed on waiting orders.

# THE FORTIETH CONGRESS.

**Second Session.**

## SENATE.

WASHINGTON, June 19, 1868.

THE COAST SURVEY.

Mr. CATTELL, (rep.) of N. J., presented a petition from the Board of Underwriters of Philadelphia praying that no measures be adopted to lessen the efficiency of the Coast Survey. Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

DONATION TO THE WASHINGTON ORPHAN ASYLUM.

Mr. FESSENDEN, (rep.) of Me., called up the joint resolution donating to the Washington City Orphan Asylum the iron railing taken from the old hall of the House of Representatives, which was passed.

ELECTIONS FOR SENATORS.

Mr. EDMUNDS, (rep.) of Vt., from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported, with an amendment, the bill in relation to holding elections for Senators.

OFFICERS TO BE DROPPED FROM THE ROLLS OF THE ARMY.

Mr. WILSON, (rep.) of Mass., introduced a joint resolution to drop from the rolls of the army certain officers absent without authority from their commands. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIAL FROM INSURANCE COMPANIES AND NEW YORK MERCHANTS.

Mr. CONKLING, (rep.) of N. Y., presented a memorial from a number of insurance companies asking Congress to declare, so far as the United States is concerned, that a state of war between foreign Powers is at an end when hostilities have actually ceased for one year; though in the absence of any formal treaty of peace, as in the case of the South American republics. Also another of the same import from a number of merchants of New York. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE INDIAN BUREAU.

Mr. POMEROY, (rep.) of Kansas, introduced a bill to transfer the Indian Bureau from the Interior Department to the War Department. He said the purpose was to turn it over to the bureau known as the Freedmen's Bureau. Referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

UNITED STATES EXPRESS COMPANY.

Mr. MORGAN, (rep.) of N. Y., introduced a bill for the relief of the United States Express Company. Referred to the Committee on Claims.

CITIZENS' GAS COMPANY.

Mr. HARLAN, (rep.) of Iowa, introduced a bill to incorporate the Citizens' Gas Company. Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

UNATILLA INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. CORBETT, (rep.) of Oregon, called up the bill for the sale of the Unatilla Indian Reservation in Oregon, which was passed.

RELIEF OF EXPORTERS OF RUM AND ALCOHOL.

On motion of Mr. MORGAN, the adverse vote of yesterday on the bill for the relief of certain exporters of rum and alcohol was reconsidered.

Mr. COLE, (rep.) of Cal., after alluding to an extensive commerce springing up between the Pacific and the Amoor river, moved to include whiskey, on the ground that contracts similar to those that occasion this bill have been made there.

Mr. SHERMAN, (rep.) of Ohio, opposed the amendment as repeating the law of January last and thereby opening the door for fraud.

Mr. WILLIAMS, (rep.) of Oregon, opposed the amendment for the same reason.

Mr. SUMNER, (rep.) of Mass., explained that several vessels are now waiting with cargoes of rum for Africa at Boston and Salem, Mass., under contracts made before the act of January last. The men engaged in the African commerce were not engaged in whiskey frauds. He had letters from merchants of standing in Boston urging the justice of the exemption. He hoped the bill would not be endangered by attaching the other proposition to it.

Mr. COLE again insisted that it was just as important to enable the merchants of San Francisco to perform their contracts.

Mr. NYE, (rep.) of Nevada, withdrew his opposition to the bill on the representation of Mr. Wilson that this rum bill was all right. (Laughter.) He would support Mr. Cole's proposition at another time when it would not embarrass the bill.

Mr. HOWE, (rep.) of Wis., opposed the amendment, pointing out the immense frauds, and saying that this pretended exportation has been one of the most fruitful sources.

Mr. HARLAN asked how the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner) could justify the sale of spirits to savages in Africa when we forbid its sale to our own?

Mr. SUMNER replied that the bill simply proposes to repeal a law by which in January last the government interfered with the existing contracts. He read some letters from merchants of Boston on the subject.

After a few words from Mr. SPRAGUE, (rep.) of R. I., in favor of the bill, the amendment was defeated and the bill passed by a vote of 26 to 14.

THE OSAGE LAND TREATY.

The CHAIR laid before the Senate the resolutions passed in the House yesterday denouncing the land treaty with the Osage Indians, which was read.

Mr. SUMNER said that the resolutions related to a matter that should properly come before the Senate in executive session.

It was transferred to executive business and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD.

On motion of Mr. HOWARD, (rep.) of Mich., the bill in relation to the central branch of the Union Pacific Railroad was taken up, and Mr. EDMUNDS addressed the Senate in opposition.

Mr. HENDRICKS followed in favor of the bill, which was discussed until ten minutes after five o'clock, when, with the understanding that it will be again taken up on Monday next, the Senate adjourned.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WASHINGTON, June 19, 1868.

The SPEAKER presented several executive communications.

On motion of Mr. MYERS, (rep.) of Pa., the Senate bill for the relief of Samuel N. Miller was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. WASHBURN, (rep.) of Ind., from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill in relation to additional bounties, which was ordered to be printed and recommitted.

Mr. BANKS, (rep.) of Mass., presented resolutions from the State of Massachusetts in relation to a ship canal connecting Lakes Erie and Ontario, which was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals.

Mr. KETCHAM, (rep.) of N. Y., from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill providing for the appointment of a commission to examine and report on certain claims of the State of New York, which was ordered to be printed and recommitted.

BILL TO REGULATE THE CARRIAGE OF PASSENGERS ON STEAMSHIPS, ETC.

The bill reported by Mr. O'NEILL, (rep.) of Pa., from the Committee on Commerce, to amend the act regulating the carriage of passengers in steamships and other vessels, and which was under consideration when the House adjourned yesterday, came up as the unfinished business, and after some opposition by Mr. Brooks was passed.

THE WOOD SCREW PATENT.

The House then proceeded, as the business of the morning hour, to the consideration of the bill reported last Saturday by Mr. Myers, from the Committee on Patents, for the extension of the wood screw patents of Thomas W. Harvey, the question being on the motion made by Mr. Stevens of Pennsylvania to lay the bill on the table.

Mr. MYERS withdrew the demand for the previous question in order that an explanation might be made in regard to the bill. He said he had been instructed by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Patents to report the bill, and that there was perhaps more merit in it than in any other bill ever reported for the extension of a patent.

The SPEAKER remarked that in the absence of Mr. Stevens the motion could not be withdrawn.

Mr. GARFIELD, (rep.) of Ohio, said that if it were withdrawn he would renew it.

Mr. FARNSWORTH, (rep.) of Ill., demanded the yeas and nays, saying that this bill had been killed three times already.

Mr. MYERS suggested his understanding that Mr. Stevens was willing to withdraw the motion to lay on the table. When the bill was first reported it was defeated by the production in the House of a fraudulent paper stating that the extension sought for was not to enure to the benefit of the widow and heirs of Harvey. That statement was false, as the last assignment did not assign any further extension of the patent. He went on to state facts showing that Harvey had derived but comparatively small benefit from his invention, and that the extension of the patent would have really the effect of breaking up the monopoly in the manufacture of wood screws.

Mr. WASHBURN, (rep.) of Mass., argued against the bill, and stated facts in connection with it. He remarked that when the bill was last before Congress, it was opposed by a screw company corporation in his own district, having $500,000 capital invested, and by the Union Screw Company of Providence, R. I. But neither of those companies now appeared to oppose this bill. Why? Because the American Screw Company, of Providence, R. I., which owns the patent, had bought up the interest of the Union Screw Company for $161,000, with a condition in the agreement that the Union Screw Company would not oppose the extension of the patent. If the American Screw Company had no interest in the extension of the patent, as stated by the chairman of the Committee on patents (Mr. Myers), how did it come to make such an agreement? He had asked that question of a gentleman who knew all about the proceedings and received the reply that it was the expectation of the American Screw Company that it would derive the benefit of the extension. The reason why there was not a corporation appearing to oppose the extension was that they had all been bought up or had arrangements made with them by the American Screw Company. That company was making a profit of from fifty to seventy-five per cent on every gross of screws, and when there was danger of having screws imported from abroad the company managed to get the tariff on screws put so high as to be prohibitory.

Mr. MYERS contested the statements made by Mr. Washburn, and repeated that the extension of the patent would be a breaking up of the monopoly, because, if not extended, the American Screw Company, with an immense capital and its four thousand machines, would be able to put down all competition. The people of his (Mr. Myers') district were just as largely interested in it as the people of any other district.

Mr. GARFIELD suggested that it would be better to make a direct appropriation out of the treasury for the benefit of the widow and heirs of Mr. Harvey than thus to tax the people for their benefit.

Mr. MYERS intimated that Mr. Garfield had made that suggestion two or three times before, and declared that the effect of the bill would be not to tax the people, but to confer a blessing on them.

Mr. SHELLABARGER, (rep.) of Ohio, opposed the bill.

Finally, debate being closed and the question being on the passage of the bill, Mr. WASHBURN, of Mass., demanded the yeas and nays, remarking that he wanted the country to know what members favored this bill.

The vote was taken and the bill was rejected—yeas 65, nays 71, as follows:—

YEAS—Messrs. Adams, Anderson, Archer, Axtell, Banks, Beck, Blair, Cake, Chanler, Clarke of Ky., Coburn, Cornell, Dixon, Donnelly, Eldridge, Ferris, Getz, Galladay, Gravely, Grover, Haight, Haisey, Higby, Hill, Holman, Hotchkiss, Humphrey, Jenckes, Johnson, Kerr, Kitchen, Knott, Koontz, Lincoln, Logan, Mallory, Marvin, Maynard, McClurg, McCullough, Mercur, Miller, Moore, Morrell, Mullins, Myers, Newcomb, Niblack, Nicholson, O'Neill, Peters, Poisley, Pomeroy, Robertson, Robinson, Scofield, Stewart, Stokes, Taber, Trimble of Tenn., Van Aernam, Van Trump, Ward, Windom, Woodbridge—65.

NAYS—Messrs. Allison, Ames, Ashley of Nevada, Bailey, Baker, Baldwin, Beaman, Beatty, Benton, Benjamin, Bingham, Boutwell, Buckland, Butler, Churchill, Clark of Ohio, Cobb, Cook, Covode, Culiom, Dawes, Delano, Eckley, Eggleston, Ela, Eliot, Farnsworth, Field, Garfield, Glossbrenner, Harding, Hooper, Hubbard, Hulburd, Judd, Julian, Keisey, Lawrence, Loughridge, Lynch, McCarthy, Moorhead, Orth, Phelps, Pike, Pile, Plants, Price, Randall, Raum, Sawyer, Schenck, Shellabarger, Smith, Spalding, Starkweather, Stevens of N. H., Stone, Taylor, Trowbridge, Twitchell, Van Wyck, Washburn of Wis., Washburn of Ind., Washburn of Mass., Welker, Williams of Pa., Williams of Ind., Wilson of Iowa, Wilson of Ohio, Woodbridge—71.

THE BILL REMOVING POLITICAL DISABILITIES.

The morning hour having expired, Mr. FARNSWORTH, from the Conference Committee on the bill removing political disabilities from certain persons in the Southern States, made a report in favor of striking out the names of George S. Houston, of Alabama, and George W. Jones, of Tennessee.

Mr. BECK, (dem.) of Ky., of the minority of the committee, opposed the report and spoke of the high character of the two men who were excluded by it. He knew no reason for it if it were not that Mr. Jones might probably be regarded as a dangerous competitor for Congress in the district in which he lived.

Mr. FARNSWORTH defended the report. He said that when the Senate amendment was referred to the Committee on Reconstruction that committee naturally consulted the members from Tennessee as to the present condition of Mr. Jones' mind, and came to the conclusion from what they said that until Mr. Jones asked to be relieved from disabilities it was not worth while for Congress to tender amnesty to him. He did not inquire into the politics of a man proposed to be relieved, but he did inquire as to whether he was acting with the loyal people of the United States or was acting with the rebels of the South.

Mr. BECK asked Mr. Farnsworth whether he did not know that every republican Senator had voted to relieve Mr. Houston and Mr. Jones?

Mr. FARNSWORTH said he did not know that, but he did know that all but two republican Senators had voted for the report of the conference committee. He would relieve a hundred brigadier generals of the rebel army who had fought gallantly and well, who had been original secessionists, but who now put their shoulders to the wheel to support the government, rather than relieve any of these Janus-faced men who stood by the Union until the last moment, and then went off to the rebels, and were with them still.

Mr. STOKES, (rep.) of Tenn., stated that a note of inquiry had been sent to the Tennessee delegation, and that the reply given was that George W. Jones was a rebel; that he went into the rebellion and was connected with it, and that if he had repented of it they did not know it; besides he did not know whether Mr. Jones wanted to be relieved or not. He made substantially the same statement as the two members of the conference committee. He had no personal feeling against Mr. Jones. If that gentleman had sent a petition to himself, or any member of the House or Senate, asking to be relieved from disabilities he would be in favor of relieving him.

Mr. MULLINS, (rep.) of Tenn., in speaking of democrats in connection with the late rebellion, said according to the official report they have run on for four long bloody years; they have strewn the South with human graves, and the loyal bones of the men of the North lie rotting upon the hills of the South without Christian burial to-day; and while they were thus running riot in blood and in triumph over human life and assailing the Stars and Stripes and civil, political and religious governments, they were overtaken and crushed out; and when they have been crushed out they come up and state that "we surrendered." We surrendered! That is not the term used. They said they submitted, they never surrendered only when they were captured by the armies of the republic that were for the perpetuation of the government of our fathers and to perpetuate the right of all beings to stand before the burning eye of God, accountable to Him who died for them, that the will of man should be free. That is the power that brought them down—that stood here under the Stars and Stripes—that waved over the bloody fields of 1776 and rode the storm against the British lion. (Laughter.) I met the Southern Anak and negro God and made it bow. The democratic party, as its figure head, that had been reveling in blood, plundering the public treasury of the United States and beggarded it; that ravaged the public arsenals, carried away the arms and captured the whole seacoast and every vessel in every harbor, and now, after doing that, "let us alone," they say, "while we are pulling the apples from the tree. Do not you throw rocks at us. (Laughter.) Just let us alone. "We use some few gentle words and they only deified us and mocked at us. Now we come in, counsel together and take to our bosom an old man called Abraham. (Laughter.) Aye; and he saw there Dives, who had driven the negro from his table and would not give him even the crumbs; and he saw a figure coming up with his garments dyed in blood. Who is that I see on the black horse with the sword drawn against the rainbow of hope and promise of the world—the Stars and Stripes? (Laughter.) It is Death riding under the ensign of the democratic party of the South in open war against human liberty and human rights. Then, O my soul! look down and wonder at them coming up, as Dives, holy and never having stained their hands in blood. (Laughter.) Now we ask to be forgiven." O yes.

Mr. BROOKS, (dem.) of N. Y., said he had intended to reply to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Farnsworth), but the intervention of the very eloquent speech of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Mullins) had quite disturbed him. He warned the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bingham) that if he did not look out for his laurels he would soon find that in all matters of rhetoric and poetic imagery the star of Tennessee would outshine the fame of the honorable gentleman from Ohio. (Laughter.) For his own part he was in favor of going into the pardon business wholesale and retail.

Mr. MULLINS asked Mr. Brooks whether he was in favor of pardoning unrepentant rebels?

Mr. BROOKS said he was for mercy and pardon for all. The two bills on the subject contained some twelve hundred names. Did the eloquent gentleman from Tennessee know many of them?

Mr. MULLINS—Very few.

Mr. BROOKS—Do you know whether they are repentant or unrepentant?

Mr. MULLINS—I have not said that I would vote for the bill.

Mr. BROOKS—But you will vote for it, and it will go through. As to the definition of loyalty laid down by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Farnsworth)—namely, the support of the reconstruction measures of Congress—if that were the test, it would exclude six hundred thousand democratic voters in the State of New York (seven hundred thousand, he expected, in the coming election), thousands of republican voters, the Executive of the country chosen by the republican party, and the Supreme Court of the United States, created by Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. COBURN, (rep.) of Ind., gave his views on the subject of removing political disabilities. He opposed the bill as premature, the number asked to be pardoned is large, and no report showing their condition had been made of the facts. The fourteenth amendment to the constitution was a safe rule, and for the present should be adhered to. The men who claimed to be the ruling class of the South were not so meritorious as the poor laboring men of the South, who were faithful and who ought to rule the country, for labor develops mind and character as well as the physical powers. If the barrier was broken the danger would be that all the rebels would break over it. Good men at the South should wait longer for a measure of this kind. A law should be passed regulating the business. The proper method to relieve men would be by a petition alleging certain facts, showing the condition of the applicant to be now loyal, showing his character as a citizen and the necessity to his own community of the relief prayed for as well as to him personally. Such a measure was judicial rather than legislative. Reconstruction was not yet complete; the South was yet in turmoil. Secret societies were organized for the destruction of the Union. Maryland and Kentucky showed what the condition of the South would be if it were restored to rebel rule. Better would it be to trust Union men. Such a law was without a parallel. It proposed to make rebels rulers, and not merely to grant amnesty. Personal feelings could have nothing to do with the matter. When the country was pacified it would do to grant such relief, and only then.

Mr. BUTLER, (rep.) of Mass. said there were two classes of men in the South who should receive the early attention of Congress. Those who had stood firmly by the Union at all times, and those who, having joined secession from an honest belief that it was right and having fought for it with valor, energy and fortitude, and fought to the end, had accepted the verdict of war, and had since been true Union men. He mentioned as one of the latter class General Longstreet, who, having been a paymaster in the United States service before the rebellion, had settled all his accounts fully and satisfactorily.

Mr. PAINE, (rep.) of Wis., member of the Conference Committee, sustained the report. For himself he would have been glad to include in the bill Mr. Jones and Mr. Houston, but he was satisfied that to do so would meet with strenuous opposition in the House, and it was therefore judged better to have their names put in a separate bill.

Mr. SHELLABARGER, (rep.) of Ohio, made some remarks in justification of the vote which he proposed to give against the bill. He found on the list the name of one of the authors of the rebellion—one of the men on whose soul more blood rested than on the soul of any other man connected with the rebellion except Jefferson Davis. He referred to General Longstreet, and yet the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Butler) had got up and made an apology for him which could be made for every criminal—to wit, that after he had been defeated he had become sorry for his crime.

The question was taken on concurring in the report of the conference committee, and it resulted yeas 78, nays 55, as follows:—

YEAS—Messrs. Allison, Ames, Ashley of Nevada, Bailey, Baker, Beaman, Beatty, Benjamin, Benton, Bingham, Blaine, Blair, Buckalew, Butler, Cake, Churchill, Cook, Cornell, Dawes, Delano, Driggs, Ela, Eliot, Farnsworth, Ferriss, Ferry, Fields, Garfield, Gravely, Griswold, Haisey, Harding, Hill, Hubbard of W. Va., Hulburd of N. Y., Judd, Keisey, Ketcham, Koontz, Lawrence of Penn., Logan, Loughridge, Marvin, McCarthy, Mercur, Moore, Moorhead, Morrell, Myers, Newcomb, O'Neill, Paine, Peters, Pile, Plants, Poland, Polsley, Pomeroy, Raum, Robertson, Sawyer, Schenck, Smith, Spalding, Stewart, Stokes, Taylor, Trowbridge, Upson, Washburn of Wis., Washburn of Ind., Washburn of Mass., Welker, Wilson of Iowa, Wilson of Ohio, Windom, Woodbridge and the Speaker—78.

NAYS—Messrs. Adams, Archer, Baldwin, Brooks, Broomall, Cary, Clarke of Kan., Cobb, Coburn, Covode, Culiom, Eckley, Eggleston, Eldridge, Getz, Glossbrenner, Golladay, Haight, Hawkins, Higby, Holman, Hotchkiss, Humphrey, Johnson, Jones, Julian, Knott, Loan, Mallory, McClurg, McCullough, Miller, Mullins, Niblack, Nicholson, Orth, Phelps, Pike, Price, Pruyn, Robinson, Shellabarger, Starkweather, Stevens of N. H., Taber, Taffe, Trimble of Tenn., Van Aernam, Van Trump, Van Wyck, Ward, Williams of Pa., Williams of Ind. and Woodward—55.

The SPEAKER announced that as the bill in its terms required a vote of two-thirds of each house, the conference report, not having received a two-thirds vote, was rejected.

Mr. BROMALL, (rep.), of Pa., having changed his vote for that purpose, moved to reconsider the vote rejecting the conference report.

Mr. FARNSWORTH made an appeal to the House as to the necessity of passing the bill. If Congress did not remove political disabilities from white men in the Southern States the consequence would be that there would be a white man's party, and a black man's party there, and the black man's party would go to the wall. There would be an end of all reconstruction in those States, an end of all constitutional government, and a perpetuation of military government.

Mr. GARFIELD remarked that in several of the States the passage of this bill was absolutely essential to the establishment of the reconstructed governments, and that to defeat this bill was virtually to say that reconstruction as approved by Congress was broken down, and that those States should be remanded to the anarchy out of which Congress had been trying for three years to rescue them. If this were so he asked the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Farnsworth) whether it was not better to postpone the bill for a few days that the House might know more fully the importance of the measure.

Mr. FARNSWORTH said that that was true. Those States could not organize unless this bill passed.

Mr. BROOMALL remarked that he believed the bill was not understood by the House, and that a delay of a day or two would satisfy three-fourths of the members of the House that it ought to pass. He therefore moved to postpone the consideration of the motion to reconsider till Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

BUSINESS ON THE SPEAKER'S TABLE DISPOSED OF.

The House then proceeded to the business on the Speaker's table and disposed thereof as follows:—

The Senate amendments to the House joint resolution for turning over damaged ordnance for the Lincoln monument.

On motion of Mr. GARFIELD the amendments were agreed to.

The Senate amendments to the House bill to amend the act of March 25, 1864, providing for carrying the mails from the United States to foreign ports.

After remarks in favor of concurrence by Messrs. Cavanagh, of Montana; Chilcott, of Colorado; Clarke, of Kansas; Ashley, of Nevada, and Bashford, of Arizona, the amendments were concurred in.

The Senate amendments to the House bill to continue the Freedmen's Bureau were concurred in.

The Senate amendments to the House bill to extend the boundaries of the collection district of Philadelphia, so as to include the whole consolidated city of Philadelphia, were concurred in.

The Senate amendment to the House bill relating to the Supreme Court of the United