CONGRESS.

Sympathy With the Sufferers by the War in France.

Senator Hill, of Georgia, Admitted to His Seat.

Passage by the Senate of the Consular and Diplomatic Bill.

ABOLITION OF THE TEST OATH.

Noisy and Excited Discussion of the Bill in the House.

Sunset Cox, Ben Butler and Van Wyck Versus Virginia and Kentucky Chivalry.

SENATE.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 1, 1871.

REMONSTRANCE AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. BUCKINGHAM, (rep.) of Conn., presented a remonstrance from the women of New England against female suffrage, protesting against the impositions upon them of burdens legitimately belonging to the sterner sex.

TERRITORY OF OKLAHOMA.

Mr. NYE, (rep.) of Nev., from the Committee on Territories, submitted a written report with a substitute for the bill organizing the Territory of Oklahoma.

THE BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. EDMUNDS, (rep.) of Vt., introduced a bill to amend the act establishing a Bureau of Immigration. Referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

SYMPATHY WITH THE SUFFERING PEOPLE OF FRANCE AND GERMANY.

Mr. POMEROY, (rep.) of Kansas, offered a substitute for his resolution of yesterday, expressing the sympathy of the American people with the suffering people of France and Germany.

Resolved, That in obedience to that Christian charity which seeketh good of all nations and ministers to all human distresses, we heartily commend the sufferings of belligerent nations in Europe to the American people, and recommend that a generous system of organized charity, seeking out and providing first for their most pressing necessities, be speedily inaugurated for their relief.

The resolution was preceded by a preamble reciting the prospects of peace between two great nations, each entitled to the friendship and good will of the American people, and depicting the devastation and suffering caused by war, and particularly the existing destitution in the republic of France.

Mr. SHERMAN, (rep.) of Ohio, moved, as an amendment, an additional resolution requesting the President to communicate to the French government the profound sympathy of the American people for the people of France, who were now suffering under an unexampled misfortune, and to extend to them every encouragement and support consistent with the laws of the United States and our treaties with other Powers, in establishing upon a firm basis a republican government.

Mr. COLE, (rep.) of Cal., opposed the amendment. He said his own sympathies were no greater for the French than the Germans. He disliked to see anything that looked like a discrimination in favor of one as against the other. Our only assurance of peace was a mere rumor, and yet we were asked to pronounce in favor of the French.

Mr. SHERMAN denied that his amendment expressed any preference, and argued that the unprecedented misfortune which had overwhelmed the French people, in view of the traditions between France and the United States, was a sufficient reason for an expression of American sympathy.

Mr. HOWE, (rep.) of Wis., desired to know in what manner the encouragement and support of the government was to be made available in helping to establish a republican government in France.

Mr. SHERMAN thought that a simple expression of kindly feeling on our part to a sympathetic people like the French would have the effect of cheering them up.

Mr. WILLIAMS, (rep.) of Oregon, favored the original resolution upon charitable grounds, while objecting to Mr. Sherman's proposition as having political complexion. He thought beyond all question that the people of this country sympathized with the people of France in their attempt to establish a new republican form of government; but there might be a question elsewhere as to the propriety of a declaration to that effect by the Senate at this time. He preferred that the resolution should stand in such shape as to commend itself to the assent of the American people of all classes and shades of opinion, so that they could all unite in relieving the sufferings of these two nations. He suggested the withdrawal of the amendment and its modification.

Mr. POMEROY urged the propriety of separate action on the subject of Mr. Sherman's amendment and its consequent withdrawal for the present.

Mr. SHERMAN then withdrew and subsequently introduced his amendment as a separate resolution, when it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

On motion of Mr. SAULSBURY, (dem.) of Del., the preamble was stricken out.

The resolution, amended to make it a concurrent resolution, so as to require the action of the House, was then agreed to.

THE UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER.

Mr. THAYER, (rep.) of Neb., introduced a joint resolution to authorize the Union Pacific Railroad Company to issue bonds to complete the bridge across the Missouri river at Omaha. The resolution authorizes the company to issue such bonds and to secure the same by morigage as it may deem needful to construct and maintain said bridge and provides such guards as may be required to perfect the same. Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RED RIVER VALLEY RAILROAD.

Mr. FLANAGAN, (rep.) of Texas, introduced a bill to incorporate the Red River Valley, Oklahoma and Santa Fe Railroad. Referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AT SAG HARBOR.

Mr. WILSON, from the Military Committee, reported with amendments the bill for the sale of land belonging to the United States at Sag Harbor, New York.

THE SENECA INDIAN LANDS IN NEW YORK.

Mr. FENTON, (rep.) of N. Y., presented a joint resolution of the New York Legislature in favor of such legislation as may secure a treaty from the Seneca tribe of Indians in New York for the sale of their lands. Referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SOUTH AMERICAN AFFAIRS.

On motion of Mr. SCHURZ, (rep.) of Mo., the President was requested to communicate to the Senate despatches from Mr. Blow, United States Minister to Brazil, upon the culture of cotton in Brazil, trade between that country and the United States, the Paraguayan war, &c.

THE GEORGIA SENATORS—ADMISSION OF SENATOR HILL.

The unfinished business, being the resolution for the admission of Joshua Hill as Senator from Georgia, was taken up, and Mr. SAULSBURY, entitled to the floor, yielded to Mr. STEWART, (rep.) of Nevada, who continued his opposition to Mr. Hill's admission on the ground that he had received less than a majority of the votes of the legal members of the Legislature.

Mr. Stewart's motion to substitute the name of Henry P. Farron in place of Joshua Hill in the resolution of the majority of the Judiciary Committee was then rejected—yeas, 19; nays, 38.

A resolution admitting Mr. Hill was then adopted, and that gentleman appeared and took the oath of allegiance as Senator from Georgia.

Mr. A. G. THURMAN, (dem.) of Ohio, then offered and asked the present consideration of the joint resolution prescribing the oath of office to be taken by H. B. M. Miller, Senator elect from Georgia.

Messrs. STEWART and EDMUNDS objected.

Mr. THURMAN, obtaining unanimous consent, proceeded to answer the objection that Mr. Miller was ineligible to a seat because his disabilities had never been removed. If consistent, the Senate could not reject the claim. Mr. Miller had served as a surgeon in the rebel army, but was a non-combatant.

Mr. EDMUNDS, in advocating the reference of the resolution to the Judiciary Committee, remarked that he would never again vote to relieve disabilities where the sole purpose was to allow a man to hold an office to which he was not eligible when elected. The practice tended to corrupt elections.

Mr. TRUMBULL, (rep.) of Ill., argued that Mr. Miller had already been decided to have been duly elected. Mr. Hill had been declared by the Senate to have been duly elected, and had been sworn in, whereas Mr. Miller received seven more votes than did Mr. Hill. Messrs. Farron and Whitely, whose admission was pressed by the minority of the Judiciary Committee, were both in the rebel army, while Mr. Miller's only offence was in acting as surgeon to a rebel regiment. He gave notice that he would offer a resolution declaring Mr. Miller duly elected, and if that was adopted he would follow it up with a concurrent resolution prescribing a form of oath to be taken in the case.

Mr. Thurman's resolution was then referred to the Judiciary Committee.

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Mr. WILLIAMS then moved to proceed with the Steamship Subsidy bills.

Mr. SHERMAN said that, notwithstanding only four weeks of the session remained, but one appropriation bill had passed the Senate. He warned the Senate against wasting time upon subsidies in such a condition of things.

Mr. KELLOGG, (rep.) of La., in support of Mr. Williams' motion, urged the importance of the bill in aid of a line on the Gulf of Mexico, from New Orleans to Mexican ports, which was the first of the steamship subsidy bills in order. He spoke of the vital interests of the measure to the people of the whole Mississippi valley, as shown by the resolutions on that subject by the chambers of commerce of the cities of that valley.

Mr. RAMSEY, (rep.) of Minn., favored immediate action as a means of apprising parties engaged in steamship enterprises of the disposition of the Senate upon the general policy. Governmental action was necessary to prevent our commerce from dwindling to less than that of a third rate Power.

Mr. SPRAGUE, (rep.) of R. I., demanded the ayes and noes on the motion, so that the Senate might settle now whether it would enter upon the policy of subsidizing steamship lines.

Mr. COLE, acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the absence of Mr. Morrill, of Maine, insisted that action should be had upon the appropriation bills.

After further discussion Mr. WILLIAMS temporarily withdrew his motion, and the Senate, on motion of Mr. COLE, took up

THE CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CASSERLY, (dem.) of Cal., stated the total expense under the bill at about $9,000,000, and that there was a growing feeling throughout the country that the civil service should be thoroughly overhauled and the number of our foreign ministers and consuls reduced. There were of the former double as many as were necessary. Though the present bill was not particularly objectionable he took occasion to call attention to the matter.

After unimportant amendments the bill passed.

WEST POINT APPROPRIATION BILL.

The West Point Appropriation bill was also considered, amended and passed.

THE STEAMSHIP SUBSIDY BILLS AGAIN.

Mr. WILLIAMS then renewed his motion to take up the first of the Steamship Subsidy bills, being that relating to a line in the Gulf of Mexico.

A discussion ensued as to the understanding upon which the bill was to be taken up, whether for the specific purpose of allowing the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Kellogg) to address the Senate in support of the bill, in accordance with previous notice to that effect, or for decisive action.

Mr. CONKLING, (rep.) of N. Y., while disposed to accommodate his friend (Mr. Kellogg), did not wish his consent to take up the bill construed as an indication that he favored it. He made this statement in consequence of the singular course of newspapers in charging every Senator who introduced a subsidy bill with favoring the measure. For one he had not yet seen one of these bills that he could vote for; yet because, by request, he had introduced one of these measures, he had been charged by the Chicago *Tribune* with an attempt to engineer a job through the Senate.

Mr. NYE, (rep.) of Nev., was not at all sensitive to newspaper criticism, and would favor the taking up of the measure, not as a question of courtesy, but as an assertion of public policy. He regarded the rebuilding of our commerce as the most important question before Congress, and that the whole subject would be presented by the proposed subsidy legislation.

Mr. DAVIS, (dem.) of Ky., thought the main object of the subsidies was to enrich a few interested parties. He suggested, as the most effective means of restoring American commerce, the purchase of iron steamships abroad, duty free.

At this point an informal understanding was effected that Mr. Kellogg should have leave to address the Senate on the subject at the expiration of the next morning hour. Without a vote on the pending motion the Senate went into executive session and subsequently adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 1, 1871.

THE TAX ON TOBACCO.

Mr. JONES, (dem.) of Ky., presented a petition of the manufacturers of and dealers in tobacco, snuff and cigars of Covington, Ky., against the special tax and the tax on sales.

ACTS OF CONGRESS.

On motion of Mr. POLAND, (rep.) of Vt., the Senate amendments to the House bill prescribing the form of the enacting and resolving clauses of the acts and resolutions of Congress were non-concurred in, and a committee of conference asked.

RELIEF FOR PRE-EMPTION SETTLERS IN CALIFORNIA.

Mr. SARGENT, (rep.) of Cal., introduced a bill for the relief of pre-emption settlers in California. Referred.

THE TEST OATH.

The House resumed the consideration of the Senate bill, passed on the 22d of April last, prescribing an oath of office to be taken by persons who participated in the late rebellion, but are not disqualified from holding office by the fourteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States. The bill provides that such persons shall take the oath prescribed in the act of the 11th of July, 1862, prescribing an oath of office to be taken by persons from whom legal disabilities shall have been removed.

Mr. UPSON, (rep.) of Ohio, argued that the people, by adopting the fourteenth amendment to the constitution, had designated what persons should be disqualified from holding office on account of participation in the rebellion, and that, as the law now stands, it discriminated in favor of the greater against the lesser criminals by allowing the disabilities to be removed from those who had added the crime of perjury to that of treason, while it provided no mode in which those whose crimes were less aggravated could be relieved.

Mr. BINGHAM, (rep.) of Ohio, argued that the adoption of the fourteenth amendment in 1866 was a virtual repeal of the test oath act of 1862, and that to impose the test oath on persons elected or appointed to office, and who were not ineligible under that amendment, was to deprive the people of their right to elect men to office.

Mr. PLATT, (rep.) of Va., said that he would have preferred the entire repeal of the iron-clad oath, but as this bill in effect accomplished the same object he should vote for it, and he hoped that every member who desired to see peace restored to the South and to see the republican party triumphant would vote for it. He stood in the House, directed by the republican party of Virginia, to vote for the total repeal of all test oaths and disfranchising clauses. He repelled with indignation the suggestion of his colleague (Mr. McKenzie), who stated before the holidays that the republican party of Virginia had purposely expressed that principle in ambiguous terms, for that gentleman could never have been elected had he not taken a stand in favor of universal amnesty. The existing system of disfranchisement in the South was a delusion and a snare, and the true policy of government was to remove all disfranchising clauses and sweep away all test oaths.

Mr. LONG, the colored representative from Georgia, made his maiden speech in the House in opposition to the bill, claiming that the men whom it would relieve were leaders of the Ku Klux Klan. He declared that since the close of the rebellion more than five hundred loyal men had been killed in Georgia, and not one of their murderers had been brought to justice. He believed, therefore, that he was doing his duty to his constituents and to his country by voting against the bill.

Mr. MOREY, (rep.) of La., said he would vote for the bill, but would much rather vote for the total abolition of the test oath and the removal of all political disabilities. It was not by the maintenance of such measures that outrages in the South were to be prevented, but by the presence of an armed force.

Mr. MAYNARD, (rep.) of Tenn., argued against the bill, and presented a communication which he had received yesterday addressed to the gentleman who had reported the bill (Mr. Butler). The communication represented the Union people of Tennessee as being in a helpless and deplorable condition, under the complete control and at the mercy of the enemies of the government, and invoked the protection of the government. He expressed his belief that there were more men practically disfranchised in Tennessee to-day than there were at the close of the war, when the Union men got possession of the State government, the only difference being that then they were disfranchised by law, but now by violence. If there were to be a question whether it was the Union men or the rebels that were to be disfranchised, he would say, "Our friends first, and let our enemies be postponed." He condemned that miserable "namby-pamby" sentimentalism which was doing more to sap the foundations of the government and overthrow it than Lee and all his hosts.

Mr. DAWES, (rep.) of Mass., inquired whether the severe treatment meted out to the rebels had not had an effect contrary to that which was intended.

Mr. MAYNARD replied in the negative.

Mr. GARFIELD said he was unwilling that the vote which he should give for the bill should be construed to be a vote in favor of the Ku Klux in any State. He asked the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Maynard) whether the retention of the iron-clad oath, in the cases from which this bill proposed to lift it, would have the least possible effect in suppressing outrages in any of the Southern States. If not, then he begged to know by what process of logic the voting for the bill was to make Congress responsible for not stopping outrages in the South. He would prefer to vote for the total abolition of the test oath, but as there was no such proposition before the House he would vote for this bill.

Mr. SHANKS, (rep.) of Ind., opposed and argued against the bill, declaring his unwillingness to release any particle of the power which Congress held over the rebels of the South till they showed by their conduct that they were worthy of it.

Mr. PORTER, (rep.) of Va., opposed the bill, and denied the statement of his colleague (Mr. Platt) that the republican party of Virginia was in favor of universal amnesty. On the contrary, he asserted that ninety-nine out of every hundred of the republican party of Virginia were against universal amnesty until they were secured in their own rights, not only in freedom from the hand of violence, but till their civil and political rights were respected in the rebel courts of all the rebel States in the country.

At the conclusion of the ten minutes' allowed to Mr. Porter Mr. RANDALL moved that he be allowed to continue his remarks.

Mr. COX, (dem.) of N. Y., objected, saying that when he wanted to reply to a personal attack the other day in the matter of St. Domingo, the member from Richmond was the only man in the House mean enough to object.

Mr. PORTER retorted that the member from the Sixth district of New York was the only member of the House mean enough to make that remark.

Mr. COX added, in the midst of much confusion and calls to order, that "that man (meaning Mr. Porter) was not the man to attack him. He had no belligerency with that member, who was not a fighting man." (Laughter.)

Mr. PORTER—You had better try it, that is all.

Mr. VAN WYCK, (rep.) of N. Y., opposed the bill, and reminded the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Platt) how that last year at a republican meeting at Petersburg, at which he (Mr. Van Wyck) was present, rebels cheered for Lee and Davis.

Mr. PLATT admitted that, but said that the loyal element had cleared out that rebel crowd in about two minutes.

Mr. VAN WYCK remarked, sarcastically, that if the colored men in Petersburg had not had more courage than some of their representatives in the House, the rebels would not have been cleared out. (Laughter.)

Mr. PLATT, in the midst of much noise and confusion, the Speaker's gavel hammering the desk rapidly, attempted to make himself heard in reply, but his voice was drowned in the din. He was understood to say, however, that he had proved his courage on the battle field, which was more than the member from New York (Mr. Van Wyck) did.

Mr. BECK, (dem.) of Ky., said that nobody need be surprised at the scolding indulged in by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Maynard), as that gentleman had been scolding all his life. He would read to the House the scolding which that gentleman had given to the abolitionists of Massachusetts in 1858 in regard to Kansas matters (reading an extract from the *Globe* of that year).

Mr. FARNSWORTH, (rep.) of Ill., argued in favor of the bill, and remarked that when the two gentlemen from Tennessee (Mr. Maynard and Mr. Arnell) were declaiming against it, he almost fancied that it was the ghost of Hamlet's father crying, "Swear! swear! swear!"—(laughter)—as if the test oath were the great panacea for the woes that the South was suffering under. The intelligent white people of the country could not be dammed up by any such means. Sooner or later they would break down the dam. If the government of Tennessee had passed liberal laws and allowed the disfranchised people to come back into the fold and to vote and hold office they would not have had any of the trouble in that State which they now had. The great trouble in Tennessee had been caused by disfranchisement.

Mr. ARNELL, (rep.) of Tenn.—I deny it.

Mr. FARNSWORTH—It was so to a great extent in Missouri. There were disfranchisement and disqualification there, and you see the result; you see the revolution. There will be a revolution in every State where you attempt this thing. You cannot in a republican government prevent intelligence from having its voice in the affairs of the government. You cannot do it.

Mr. BUTLER, (rep.) of Mass., closed the debate. He said that he had reported the bill as the mouthpiece of the Committee on Reconstruction, but he could not support it. Every giving way that Congress had so far allowed had been the death knell of some black or white friend of the Union. That was the difficulty which he found in the way of this bill. He hoped that the iron-clad oath would never be repealed. It was a patent of nobility for royalty (referring to the Ku Klux outrages).

Mr. JONES, of Ky., interrupted and asked Mr. Butler in an angry tone of voice, "What do you mean, sir, by the Ku Klux? Answer me that!"

Mr. BUTLER, without noticing the question, went on to say that Congress was relaxing and giving way to the rebels all the time.

Mr. JONES, of Ky.—When did you ever give way, sir? I mean in the right direction.

Mr. BUTLER—We gave way when we admitted that gentleman to his seat. (Laughter.)

Mr. JONES—No, sir; but we gave way when we admitted you to your seat—a rebel to the constitution and the Union.

The SPEAKER (using the gavel frequently)—The gentleman from Kentucky is out of order.

Mr. BUTLER and Mr. JONES both attempted to make themselves heard, and the SPEAKER decided that they were both out of order.

The debate being closed, Mr. ARNELL moved to lay the bill on the table. Negatived.

The bill was then passed—yeas 118, nays 29—and it now goes to the President for his approval. The following is the

TEXT OF THE BILL:—

Be it enacted, &c., That when any person, who is not rendered ineligible to office by the provisions of the fourteenth amendment to the constitution, shall be elected or appointed to any office of honor or trust under the government of the United States, and shall not be able, on account of his participation in the late rebellion, to take the oath prescribed in the act of Congress approved the 2d of July, 1862, said person shall, in lieu of said oath, before entering upon the duties of said office, take and subscribe the oath prescribed in an act of Congress entitled "An act prescribing an oath of office to be taken by persons from whom legal disabilities shall have been removed," approved 11th of July, 1862.

BILLS REPORTED FROM THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE AND PASSED.

Mr. BINGHAM, from the Judiciary Committee, reported a bill for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General. Passed.

Mr. BUTLER, of Mass., from the same committee, reported a bill relating to the jurisdiction of courts in certain cases, authorizing the Attorney General to institute proceedings in the usual form in law and equity, to determine all questions wherein the rights and interests of the United States are concerned. Passed.

Also a bill to remedy certain defects in the judicial administration of certain customs revenue laws, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay judgments recovered against collectors of customs for money paid in excess of duties or fees on imported merchandise. Passed.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Conn., from the same committee, reported a bill to divide the State of Ohio into three judicial districts. Passed.

Mr. COOK, from the same committee, reported a bill for the relief of purchasers of land sold for direct taxes in insurrectionary States. Passed.

Also a bill providing that where a railroad company is operating in a State and has its offices there, it shall be deemed a citizen of the State in so far that it shall not be permitted to remove causes brought against it by citizens of that State from the State courts to the United States courts. Passed.

Mr. PETERS, (rep.) of Me., from the same committee, made a report on the memorial of Wm. McGarraban, that he is not entitled to the relief asked.

Mr. BINGHAM presented the minority report on the same subject.

The reports were ordered to be printed and recommitted.

Mr. PETERS, from the same committee, reported a bill giving to criers in United States courts the same compensation for travel and attendance as jurors are entitled to. Passed.

Also to allow the discharge of convicts sentenced to imprisonment and fine when the term of imprisonment has expired on their making oath before a United States commissioner that they have no means of satisfying the fine. Passed.

Mr. MERCUR, (rep.) of Pa., from the same committee, reported a bill to amend the Bankrupt act. Passed.

Mr. LOUGHRIDGE, from the same committee, reported a bill to allow claimants an appeal from the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court in all cases where the consent of the Court of Claims is given for such appeal. Passed.

Also relinquishing to the State of Michigan the title of the United States to the Fort Gratiot military reservation. Passed.

Mr. ELDRIDGE, (dem.) of Wis., from the same committee, reported back the Senate bill relating to the records of United States courts. Passed, with an amendment.

Mr. BUTLER, of Mass., from the same committee, reported a bill allowing parties in certain cases to testify, making the laws of each State govern as to the competency of witnesses in all criminal trials in the United States courts in such State, which was passed.

Mr. BINGHAM, from the same Committee, reported a bill to amend the act of 31st May, 1870, to enforce the rights of citizens of the United States to vote in the several States. The bill went over till to-morrow.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. LOUGHRIDGE presented the minority report on the memorial of Victoria C. Woodhull for woman suffrage.

Mr. BINGHAM asked to have the subject made a special order for the second Wednesday in February.

Mr. KELSEY, (rep.) of N. Y., objected.

THE KITTERY AND CHARLESTOWN NAVY YARDS.

Mr. LYNCH offered a resolution in reference to the consolidation of the Kittery and Charlestown Navy Yards, which was referred.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON THE BILL TO ABOLISH THE OFFICES OF ADMIRAL AND VICE ADMIRAL.

The Speaker appointed Messrs. Logan, Scofield and Butler, of Mass., the conference committee on the bill to abolish the offices of admiral and vice admiral.

The House then, at a quarter past four o'clock, adjourned.

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

The February Statement, Compared with That of the Corresponding Month of Last Year and with That of January, 1871—Decrease for the Past Year $120,834,048.

The statement of the public debt on February 1 has just been issued by the Treasury Department. We compare the figures with those of the statement made a year ago:—

DEBT BEARING COIN INTEREST.	*Feb.* 1, 1870.	*Feb.* 1, 1871.
Five per cent bonds.....	$221,589,300	$214,567,300
Six per cent bonds.....	1,886,349,900	1,714,776,400
Total bear'g coin int..	$2,107,939,200	$1,929,343,700
DEBT BEARING CURRENCY INTEREST.		
Four per cent cert's....	—	$678,362
Three per cent cert's....	$45,530,000	42,085,000
Navy Pension fund.....	14,000,000	14,000,000
Total bear'g cur'y int..	$59,530,000	$56,763,362
Matured not paid.....	4,053,056	4,036,902
DEBT BEARING NO INTEREST.		
United States notes.....	$356,110,258	$356,101,086
Fractional currency.....	40,063,512	40,479,593
Gold certificates.....	50,392,180	32,088,360
Total bear'g no int....	$446,565,951	$428,669,039
RECAPITULATION.		
Debt bearing coin int...	$2,107,939,200	$1,929,343,700
Debt bearing cur'y int...	59,530,000	56,763,362
Debt bearing no int.....	446,565,951	428,669,039
Matured debt not paid..	4,053,046	4,036,902
Total.....	$2,618,088,197	$2,418,813,004
Bonds to Pacific RR. Co.	64,457,320	64,618,832
Grand total.....	$2,682,545,517	$2,483,431,836
AMOUNT IN TREASURY.		
Coin.....	$101,600,730	$99,066,500
Currency.....	8,690,807	24,827,788
Sinking fund.....	25,716,080	—
Other purchased bonds..	71,336,304	—
Total in Treasury.....	$207,373,922	$123,894,289
Debt *less* cash in Treas..	2,475,171,595	2,354,337,547
Decrease of the national debt since February 1, 1870.....		$120,834,048

The following table compares the statement just made with the previous one of January 1, 1871:—

DEBT BEARING COIN INTEREST.	*Jan.* 1, 1871.	*Feb.* 1, 1871.
Five per cent bonds.....	$214,267,300	$214,567,300
Six per cent bonds.....	1,720,775,400	1,714,776,400
Total bearing coin int.	$1,935,342,700	$1,929,343,700
DEBT BEARING CURRENCY INTEREST.		
Four per cent certif's ..	$678,362	$678,362
Three per cent certf's...	43,550,000	42,085,000
Navy Pension fund.....	14,000,000	14,000,000
Total bear'g cur'y int.	$58,228,362	$56,763,362
Matured, not paid.....	7,315,822	4,036,902
DEBT BEARING NO INTEREST.		
United States notes....	$356,101,086	$356,101,086
Fractional currency....	39,995,989	40,479,593
Gold certificates.....	26,149,600	32,088,360
Total bear'g no int...	$422,245,175	$428,669,039
RECAPITULATION.		
Debt bearing coin int...	$1,935,342,700	$1,929,343,700
Debt bearing cur'cy int.	58,228,362	56,763,362
Debt bearing no interest	422,245,175	428,669,039
Matured debt not paid..	7,315,822	4,036,902
Total.....	$2,423,132,060	$2,418,813,004
Bonds to Pacific RR. Co.	64,618,832	64,618,832
Grand total.....	$2,487,750,892	$2,483,431,836
AMOUNT IN TREASURY.		
Coin.....	$107,802,280	$99,066,500
Currency.....	30,284,291	24,827,788
Total in Treasury.....	$138,086,572	$123,894,289
Debt less am't in Tre'sy.	$2,349,664,320	$2,354,337,547
*Increase of the national debt since January 1, 1871.....		$4,673,227

*In the above statement no mention is made of accrued interest, and the bonds issued to the Pacific Railroad Company are calculated as part of the public debt. According to the report of Secretary Boutwell, who adds accrued interest and ignores the bonds issued to that road, the total does not exhibits a decrease during the past month amounting to $4,040,986.

The debt of the United States, less cash in the Treasury, was as annexed at the undermentioned dates:—

March 4, 1861.	$66,180,855	Jan. 1, 1870..	2,462,418,783
July 1, 1861..	88,498,670	Feb. 1, 1870..	2,475,171,595
July 1, 1862..	502,921,404	March 1, 1870.	2,463,027,855
July 1, 1863..	1,093,464,090	April 1, 1870..	2,452,289,175
July 1, 1864..	1,721,847,934	May 1, 1870..	2,431,698,879
July 31, 1865..	2,757,253,275	June 1, 1870..	2,428,211,016
Sept. 1, 1865..	2,757,689,571	July 1, 1870..	2,400,208,363
Jan. 1, 1866..	2,716,851,536	Aug. 1, 1870..	2,399,423,466
Aug. 1, 1866..	2,633,029,276	Sept. 1, 1870.	2,383,604,030
Jan. 1, 1867..	2,543,323,172	Oct. 1, 1870..	2,369,407,257
July 1, 1867..	2,511,800,013	Nov. 1, 1870.	2,356,364,506
Jan. 1, 1868..	2,598,125,650	Dec. 1, 1870..	2,357,470,000
July 1, 1868..	2,508,915,192	Jan. 1, 1871..	2,349,664,320
Jan. 1, 1869..	2,540,707,201	Feb. 1, 1871..	2,354,337,547
July 1, 1869..	2,509,160,773		

THE HERALD IN CINCINNATI.

[From the Cincinnati Gazette, Jan. 30.]

SPLENDID JOURNALISM.

THE NEW YORK HERALD has made the European war the occasion of an enterprise and expenditure in the gathering and transmission of foreign news which is a remarkable stride in the progress of journalism in this country, and which, in the matter of telegraphic news, far surpasses any journal in Europe. Its special despatches from every part of the field of the war, from both the inside (with a balloon portage) and outside of Paris, from all the operations in the provinces and from the leading capitals of Europe, not occasionally, but daily make a scale of enterprise and expenditure that may justly be termed splendid. And it may be said in the HERALD's favor that it subordinates feeling and political ambitions to news. Its war specials are not tainted by partisanship. They give impartially the news. That is what journalists want, and is what wears best in the long run with the reading public.

THE FORGER "BROCKWAY."

The notorious forger and counterfeiter, Charles D. Vanderpool, alias Brockway, alias Seymore, Waterman and Pike, who was arrested at Detroit and brought to this city in charge of Detective Sampson on Tuesday, as stated in the HERALD, came up before Judge Dowling at the Tombs Police Court yesterday and desired to be allowed to go out on bail.

This was at once refused. Subsequently he said he had a great horror of the cells in the old prison, and desired to be sent back to Mulberry street, to police headquarters, where he had been lodged since his arrival from Detroit. After numerous remarks the Judge ordered him to be kept in the City Prison on the indictment found against him by the Grand Jury on a charge of forgery preferred by the Bank of North America for $11,200, and stated that the prisoner would find it much more difficult to obtain a pardon from Governor Hoffman than the trouble experienced in getting his freedom through the influence of the President of the United States on the counterfeiting charge on which he was convicted for ten years. His case will at once be undertaken by the District Attorney.

A WIFE BOUGHT AND SOLD.—Strange as it may seem a man in this city actually sold his wife to another man on Tuesday of this week. The "valuable consideration" was ten dollars in money, which sum was actually paid over. The couple, so lately divorced, have been husband and wife for a term of eight years, and have a son seven years old and one child younger. In the arrangement the father was to keep the older child and the new "pair" were to have the younger. The "purchaser" is a young man, and, after the transaction, he took the woman and went home with her, to take the place of the husband of the house, he having bought furniture.—*Providence (Colorado) Enterprise.*

A curious lawsuit has just been commenced against the Belleville and Southern Illinois Railroad. A lady, who was shortly expecting an addition to her family, was travelling on it, and was so jostled and troubled by the roughness of the road that the event occurred much sooner than had been expected. In the suit which she has brought against the company she lays the damages at $10,000.

THE STATE CAPITAL.

What Was "the Wisest Law Ever Made?"

A LEGISLATIVE CONUNDRUM.

How Carey Enjoys His Triumph.

WITNESSES IN CRIMINAL CASES.

PISTOLS AND COFFEE.

Overhauling the Children's Aid Society.

ALBANY, Feb. 1, 1871.

The question of "special legislation" formed the topic of quite an animated debate in the lower House to-day, and the score or more members who were detained in the Assembly Chamber a half hour longer than they desired, and who were thus prevented from attending an exhibition of fighting "dogs" in a certain part of this village, have to thank Mr. Prime, of Queens, and his resolution for the deprivation. These resolutions were, it will be remembered, offered last week. They called for the appointment of a committee of nine to see what could be done toward enacting general laws in such a way as to put an end to the immense amount of special laws which are accumulating in the statute books, to an extent that is making even the legal profession tremble. Mr. Greene advocated the passage of the resolutions in a speech, in which he cited the immense number of special laws passed year by year touching matters and things which could be covered by one general law. Mr. Littlejohn conceded that the generalization of laws so as to avoid special legislation was all very fine in theory, but it was impossible in practice. Mr. Nelson, of course, had his say in the matter. He wanted to know

"WHAT WAS THE WISEST LAW EVER MADE?"

Prince took this to be a conundrum at first, and was about to "give it up," when he was suddenly reminded of a passage in a religious tract he had read when a boy. This gave him his cue. "The wisest law ever made' came from on high," he exclaimed. "Do you mean to say, then," persisted Nelson, "that it is not necessary to make special laws to cover matters that the law from on high does not?" This was a perfect stunner to Prime, not so much that it indicated wisdom on the part of the questioner, but that it mixed little with great things in such an irreverent way that the member from Queens was left without a word of remonstrance. "I think," continued Nelson, "we need special laws for railroads and telegraphs, notwithstanding the law from on high. If it is sufficient for legislation why does it not suffice to keep the purlieus of Newtown in sanctity?" A roar of laughter greeted this sally, and Nelson sat down, as well he might, after this ebullition of nonsense. The discussion was then continued in a serious mood, and finally ended by the whole subject being referred to the Judiciary Committee.

"OLD BARRELS,"

Speaking of "special legislation" remind me that the question of old barrels is again destined to "raise Cain" in the lower House this session. It may not be generally known that there is a member from New York who goes by the name of Connolly. Well, Connolly, like all true legislators, tries to do his best to guard his own interests, no matter what other interests may be overridden in the meantime while he is doing it. One of his interests lies in the old barrel business. Last year, I believe, a bill was brought into the Assembly prohibiting the packing of wheat, flour and the like in other than new barrels, and that it cost Connolly a good round sum to have the thing smothered. Just imagine his horror, then, this morning, when his colleague, Mr. Flecke, one of the strongest

ANTI-LAGER BEER ADVOCATES

in the House, introduced a new bill to kill off the old barrel business. Flecke's bill, I understand, was drawn up at the suggestion of a large body of coopers, who make money by making new barrels, and who would make a great deal more if the bill becomes a law. But he will not, if Connolly knows himself. The Clerk had no sooner read its title than he was on his feet. "Mr. Speaker," said he, brandishing his right hand over his head as though he had a tomahawk in it ready to brain the trembling Flecke; "Mr. Speaker, I don't see the necessity of this bill. It has been coming up here during the past three or four years, and it never passes. It's only annoying us and taking up our time to consider it." The Speaker reminded Mr. Connolly that every member had a perfect right to offer any kind of a bill he pleased, and that the barrel member from New York could tell his tale of woe before the proper committee when the time came for its consideration. Connolly then sat down, and Flecke went over to his seat to explain matters in German.

BETTER LATE THAN NEVER.

There would at last seem to be some chance hereafter that witnesses in criminal cases are to be treated a little better than actual criminals. Everybody can conceive what a comfortable thing it would be for a respectable man who has the misfortune, by chance, to witness a murder or a highway robbery, to be shut up in the "House of Detention" for several months awaiting until tardy justice sees fit to place the criminal on trial. Indeed, more than one flagrant outrage could be cited where respectable parties have been held as witnesses in the House of Detention for many long months, while the men they were expected to testify against were enjoying their freedom, thanks to somebody's money given in form of bail. If Mr. Fleid's bill, introduced today, becomes a law, as it should, this state of things will be no longer a subject of universal complaint, and respectable parties who may know a little about certain crimes be no longer tempted to keep their knowledge to themselves lest they be virtually imprisoned until

THE REAL CRIMINAL GETS HIS DUES.

The bill provides that a witness cannot be held any longer than "fourteen days next" after the beginning of the court term following the commission of the crime of which he may have some knowledge of importance to the trial of the case. In this connection I may add that another bill, concerning imprisonment for debt, was also introduced today, which will, if successful in getting through both houses, work a most needful reform. The readers of the HERALD will remember the sad story of that unfortunate India rubber patentee who for infringing a patent right was thrown into prison, and, because he could not get the amount of his fine ($2,500), remained in Ludlow street jail for eighteen months, and would have probably remained there a lifetime had it not been for the "kindness" of certain individuals who finally concluded to extend to him a helping hand. It may be that the repeated offences of the individual I allude to called for severe punishment; but his case, for all that, shows how easily in this State a man could be imprisoned for almost a lifetime in default of payment of a few hundred dollars. It matters not now it may be argued that we have

NO IMPRISONMENT FOR DEBT,

for if a man in a civil action can be held in prison for years because his opponents refuse to yield an inch, knowing that the priso