Weekly National Intelligencer.

WASHINGTON: THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1863

Weekly National Intelligencer

BY GALES & SEATON.

JAMES C. WELLING, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

The subscription price of this paper for a year is TWO DOLLARS, payable in advance.

A reduction of 20 per cent. (one-fifth of the full charge) will be made to any one who shall order and pay for, at one time, ten copies of the Weekly paper; and a reduction of 25 per cent. (or one-fourth of the full charge) to any one who will order and pay for, at one time, twenty or more copies.

No *accounts* being kept for this paper, it will not be sent to any one unless paid for in advance, nor any longer than the time for which it is paid.

AMERICAN PRIZE COURTS.

It is known to our readers that during the pending war our Prize Courts have been repeatedly called to deal with questions of Admiralty law which were difficult as well by their novelty as their delicacy. These questions have naturally engaged in a large degree the attention as they have enlisted the solicitude of the Secretary of State, charged with the duty of interpreting to foreign Governments the decisions of our courts in matters of such lively interest to neutral commerce, and in which the decisions reached may give a new extension and development to a branch of law placed more than almost any other under the jealous scrutiny of commercial Powers. The present British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has taken repeated occasion to express his entire satisfaction with the manner in which the admiralty law has been administered by our courts during the present war, and which has resulted in the condemnation of so many British vessels seeking to break the blockade of the Southern coast

We observe that in the British House of Lords on the 19th ultimo the Marquis of CLANRICARDE thought it proper, in support of a motion calling for certain papers on the subject, to stigmatize the conduct of our Government as being so contrary to the recognised law of nations, in reference to the seizure of ships engaged in commerce, that it was absolutely necessary, in his judgment, for her Majesty's Government to take more decided action in the matter than they had hitherto done. At this moment it was impossible, he said, to effect insurance upon vessels trading to the Western hemisphere, owing to the constant seizures which are made by the United States cruisers. A vessel was seized, her cargo, worth probably £150,000, was locked up, and if the owners applied to the Government for redress, they were simply told that their case had been referred to Lord Lyons. If there was any hope that the present state of things would soon pass away, "or that the United States would evince a greater desire to respect the recognised law of nations," he should wish the Government to make every allowance, but these seizures had now gone on for a considerable time, and he saw no prospect of a more satisfactory state of affairs arising unless the steps taken by her Majesty's Government were of a more energetic and decisive character. The Marquis referred to the seizure of the Lebuan, the Adelia, the Springbok, the Dolphin, and the Peterhoff, and urged that in each case the capture was clearly illegal, and contrary to international law. He also complained of the course of procedure adopted in our prize courts.

It was in reply to such animadversions that Earl Russell spoke as follows:

"Earl RUSSELL said his noble friend had made a speech containing very grave charges against the American Government and prize courts. He had brought, in fact, a charge that the American Government and courts had set aside the whole international law of the world; that they had given orders inconsistent with international law, and that they had decided upon interrupting British commerce as far as they could. Now, so far from denying the law of nations, Mr. Seward, in all his communications, had completely acknowledged it, and had said over and over again that there must be a certain and legal cause of capture before a ship was taken. Admiral Milne had been instructed to send a ship or ships-of-war to the neighborhood of Matamoras, in order that British vessels might be protected from unjustifiable seizure. The port of Matamoras was crowded with vessels engaged in commerce, so that it would not appear that the proceedings of the United States cruisers could have had any effect in deterring those who were engaged in legitimate commerce from carrying on their ordinary business. He had referred to the law officers of the Crown almost every case in which there had been a complaint, and they reported that there was no rational ground of objection. As to the decisions of the prize courts of the United States, they were bound to believe that as the knowledge possessed by these courts of international law was very great, so their impartiality and their wish to do justice must be for the present unquestioned. There could be no doubt that many vessels built for speed were systematically engaged in breaking the blockade, and he was afraid that the moment one of them was seized her owners at once made their appearance at the Foreign Office, and, with all the airs of injured innocence, demanded redress. Referring to the case of the Alabama, the noble Earl denied that that vessel had been fitted out with the cognizance of the British Government, and said that there was no wish on the part of this country to interfere unfairly in the contest now going on."

The Earl of DERBY concurred in the remarks which had fallen from Earl Russell, and thought that the British Government ought not either rashly or hastily to impute to the American courts that they deliberately, and contrary to law and justice, set aside the law of nations. The British Government ought also, he thought, to make every allowance for the natural provocation the Americans must feel at seeing so large a portion of the commerce of this and other countries carried on, notwithstanding the blockade, to the Confederate ports.

After some remarks from Lord CRANWORTH, the motion was withdrawn.

GEN. HOOKER'S ENLARGED POWERS.

It is reported by the Washington correspondent of the Cincinnati Gazette that when Gen. Hooker next moves he will have command of all the forces in Virginia. The Suffolk and Norfolk troops, those lying at the extremity of the Peninsula, along the Orange and Alexandria railroad, and about the defences of Washington are to be alike subject to his call.

"ET TU BRUTE!"

"The Intelligencer's humor is more grave than gay. Its jokes are a little too severe and practical."

[*Washington Chronicle of May 18th.*

Our readers have been apprized, by the casual and incidental references made to it in our columns from time to time, that there exists in this city a paper under the name of the Morning Chronicle. It was established by its proprietor and editor for the avowed purpose of giving to the Administration, in all its departments and in all its measures, an "unquestioning support," and down to its issue of yesterday it has faithfully fulfilled, according to the best of its knowledge and ability, the function performed in the days of the Roman Empire by the class whom history has handed down under the not very fragrant title of *assentatores*. It has been the axiom of the Chronicle that this Administration, "in all its departments and in all its measures," is the best possible of Administrations; that all men in civil or military command—so long, of course, as they may be retained by the appointing power—are the best possible incumbents of place; and that all men removed from office are henceforward smitten with a demerit of the most obvious and incurable nature. If any thing be done by the "constituted authorities" it has always been done in the best possible way and at the best possible time. If any thing be left undone it has been equally accepted as the mark of infallible wisdom, and only the more confidingly because to unofficial minds the wisdom may have been inscrutable. In short, the Chronicle, we supposed, had found what Jerome Paturot, the hero of the French fiction, had so ardently but vainly pursued in his "search for the Absolute and the best possible of Republics."

So long as our youthful contemporary confined itself to daily prelections on the thesis that "whatever is (officially) is right," we had no occasion to do more than admire the wonderful patience with which, reduced as it was to play on an organ of so few stops, it stood up under the monotony of its own music. We confess to have always had a sympathy for the laborious grinders of the hurdy-gurdies who perambulate our streets, turning the dolorous crank with one hand and holding frisky Jocko in leading strings with the other, doomed all the while to lend an ear to their own mechanic melody. But we think their labor must be lightsome and merry compared with that of those called to endure the fatigues of official journalism, and who, like Polonius in the play, looking through the eyes of some office-bearing Hamlet, must see yon fleecy cloud assume now the shape of a camel, now of a weasel's back, and now of something very like a whale.

We do not greatly wonder, therefore, that our neighbor has found the satiety of "unquestioning support" greater than he could bear. Having already noticed the "deplorable defection" of the Philadelphia Press from the rule of duty prescribed to itself by the Chronicle of this city, we are now called to lament the ominous wavering of the latter journal, which in its issue of yesterday has actually had the audacity to declare that "nobody has ever pretended that the President has not committed mistakes." "Committed mistakes!" What "mistakes," we should like to know, has the President ever committed, that a journal pledged to his "unquestioning support" must needs make such an admission? We have never before seen in the columns of our neighbor the suspicion of any short-comings on the part of Mr. Lincoln, or of any body else charged with "high and responsible duties" at this crisis, and we submit that it is hardly less than gratuitous calumny to make such a charge, in the absence of any specifications to sustain it. And, then, how can a journal which avowedly supports the Administration without "question" arrive at the conclusion that any "mistakes" have been committed? Only those who have the spirit of inquiry are entitled to form judgments on this difficult point. The Chronicle should not exercise itself in such high matters.

But, as if it was not enough to bring this accusation against the President, the Chronicle of yesterday proceeds to say that there are two journals in the land—the New York World and the National Intelligencer—which, unlike the two unanimous journals that profess never to question where they always approve, seem to take a wicked delight in "exposing the weakness—if we may so call it—of the public servants, and in holding up daily pictures to the rebels of fancied corruption and exaggerated imbecility." "The weakness of the public servants!" Well may the Chronicle meekly add, with "bated breath," "*if we may so call it*," when daring to insinuate that there is any thing like "weakness" in our "public servants"—in a Stanton, a Halleck, or a Hooker, all men of war and of might, if there be any thing in the force of eulogy daily applied with forty goose-quill power in the pages of that paper. We imagine the consternation with which our "public servants" must have read this fling at their capabilities—all the more stinging for being incidentally bestowed. So the surgeon sometimes conceals his lancet in the sponge, and drives the cruel steel to the quick while professing only to soothe the patient with a flattering unction of soft-soap and tepid water.

We do not approve of these back-handed blows at the Administration, delivered in the guise of awkward adulation. Better a questioning support that knows what it is about than an "unquestioning support" which, from its very assiduity, is in danger of wounding the hand it seeks to lick. But what does our facetious contemporary mean by an "unquestioning support" upon rendering which it so greatly prides itself, while loosely talking about the President's "mistakes" and about the "weakness"—"*if we may so call it*"—of our "public servants?" What is the use of an "unquestioning support" which makes such concessions to the public enemy? Why claim the merit of "going it blind" and at the same time speak like a dragon of vigilance with an eye open to "mistakes" and "weaknesses" which the Chronicle does not deny to exist, but which it only proclaims to blink? Shame on such a dragon, which does not know how to be either more discreet or more honest!

As for ourselves, it is known that we do not profess to give any body, in the Administration or out of it, an "unquestioning support." We seek to address ourselves to the merits of all the "measures" and of all the "departments" of the Government. In so doing we are able to give to them each and all the support to which we think them entitled on grounds of law and expediency. When we approve, we have done so for reasons given, and we are not aware that the value of our support has been impaired by our efforts to base it on what the Chronicle has no use for—reason and right, as ascertained by candid and independent inquiry. When we disapprove, we have equally done so for reasons given, and if we have stated our views with the frankness of honest men writing for intelligent readers, the latter will bear us witness that we have never forgotten what was due to them or to ourselves in the animadversions we have felt it our duty to make on public men or public measures at this crisis.

We have never found it necessary to rail at the Secretary of State like some of his "political friends," nor have we aided or abetted Senatorial cabals to procure his removal from the high place he holds at the head of Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet. We have not given him an "unquestioning support," it is true, because we have often vindicated his conduct, in the light of free inquiry, and shown it to be unjustly assailed by Republican as well as Democratic cavillers. The Chronicle has allowed Republican abuse and Senatorial combinations against him to go unrebuked or unnoticed.

We have not given to Mr. Chase, in his Department, an "unquestioning support" because we have brought the light of financial discussions to the elucidation and enforcement of his judicious and successful revenue measures, but we have never heard that he felt our "support" was any less valuable for being inspired by a candid appreciation of his merits rather than by the *parti pris* of professional adulation.

Just as little have we given an "unquestioning support" to the present Secretary of the Navy, for at one stage of his administration we felt it our duty to inquire into certain charges brought not only against the efficiency but even the probity of his official management. We then defended him against these reckless imputations, and if we have had no recent occasion to defend him from fresh aspersions it is simply because the unostentatious but effective manner in which he discharges his duties has enabled him to *live down* censure, and thus enjoy, in addition, the inappreciable felicity of escaping even the inept flattery of the Chronicle.

As to the War Department, we have not given to it an "unquestioning support" any more than to any other branch of the public service. But since its distinguished head has been left free to confine himself to his appropriate civil duties, and no longer divides with the martial committee of Congress the responsibility of directing the conduct of the war, we have found in his administration nothing to condemn. If we do not approve of military arrests where they are made in violation of law, we know full well that we have the countenance and co-operation of Mr. Stanton in confirmation of our opinions on this topic, for we have never had occasion under this head to do more than reiterate the declarations with which he signalized his accession to the office he now holds.

As to the merits of the Generals retained in military command or dismissed by the President we have repeatedly expressed our opinion, not, it is true, in the way of giving an "unquestioning support" to any body, but after due examination made of the facts in the case. We have not discovered so many Napoleons in actual command as our more favored contemporary, the Chronicle, which draws its military inspirations doubtless from the highest sources, but just as little have we practised that art of military criticism which consists in trying to pull down military reputations by idle abuse, and to construct others by equally idle praise. Facts are facts, and as such we have treated them, whether we were discussing the movements of McClellan on Richmond, of Halleck on Corinth, or of Hooker on Chancellorsville. We have seen nothing very "Napoleonic" in any of these demonstrations

As to the Department of the Attorney General, of the Interior, and of the Postmaster General, we may have had little to say, but that little, we believe, has been said in the way of commendation, not because we are in the habit of giving praise like our professional neighbor, but because we deemed it due.

We wish it to be distinctly understood by the Chronicle that we claim no merit, such as *it* aspires to, on the score of what is called "conformity to the views of the Administration." We propose to ourselves a higher standard, however far we may fall below it, when we make all the ends we aim at "our Country's, God's, and Truth's." If there has been no *flagornerie* in our commendations, they have been none the less sincere for not being "unquestioning."

We have thus made it apparent, we hope, to the perceptions of the Chronicle, that it need not fear in us a rival for the distinction of giving the Administration, in any of its departments, "an unquestioning support." We leave to our neighbor an undisputed monopoly of all the honors it can cull in this field; and, in consideration of the arduous nature of the services performed, we hope the constituted authorities may find it in their hearts to reward these assiduities according to the zeal of the performer, rather than according to the value of the services rendered.

Thus much by way of pleasant discourse. It is hard to be severe on a paper like the Chronicle, which is evidently well-meaning enough, either when it essays to flatter or to denounce. If its flattery sometimes hurts worse than its censure, and if its denunciations sometimes redound to the praise of those whose conduct it fails to understand, this is due, we are persuaded, more to the infelicity of its position and the difficulty of its monotonous functions than to any other cause. It did not mean to be indiscreet when it spoke about the President's "mistakes" or the "weakness" of our "public servants," and just as little did it mean to be unjust to us in penning the following paragraphs, which have provoked our mirth so much that we think it proper to spread them before our readers, albeit we are assured there may seem some severity in thus exposing to their gaze the justice and comity of our neighbor. So long as we are reviled in the columns of the Chronicle, no particular damage is done to any body, for it passes with the readers of that journal as so much rhetorical objurgation to balance so much rhetorical praise; and if this antithesis gives any pleasure to the conductors of the Chronicle, we should be sorry to interfere with their enjoyment, as it certainly does no harm to us. We hope, therefore, it will not think that we are disposed to inflict on it (what the Constitution forbids) "a cruel and unusual punishment," if we give to our readers the opportunity of passing a judgment on its style of editorial animadversion, by laying before them the subjoined article in its number of yesterday. We are assured that our courteous contemporary would have been more guarded in its statements if it had supposed that we would take this summary vengeance on its indiscretion, but much as our heart relents at the severity of the exposure, we must make it, in the hope that when the Chronicle yields to the next temptation of saying hard things against the Intelligencer, its diatribes may be such as we can reprint for the amusement of our readers without bringing confusion to the writer by their transparent inaptitude. Let him, if he will, "stick to his pantomimes," but, for his own sake, let them not be such as shall provoke derision when he assumes to make grimaces at men who resisted secession before he was born, and who, in doing so, have been often brought, down to a very late period, into conflict with the present conductor of that sheet, while as yet he was in close political fellowship with the Southern leaders whose schemes were even then preparing the way for treason and rebellion, and in which, if he did not knowingly abet, it was only because he had not sagacity enough to perceive them. Lessons on modern "Loyalty," if addressed to us, might possibly come with better grace from another source.

From the Washington Chronicle of May 29th.

There is no better way to understand the embarrassments that surround the Administration of the Federal Government in this crisis than to read the National Intelligencer or the New York World. Considering the extraordinary character of the rebellion and the inestimable consequences depending upon its successful suppression, one might suppose that even an indifferent observer would feel constrained to withhold criticism, and to allow himself to be governed by common solicitude for the welfare and preservation of a great people. No one has ever contended that the President has not committed mistakes; but in both these journals he is rarely credited with the ordinary virtue of good intentions. They are more intolerant in judging of his actions than the public enemy, for he at least pays the Executive the tribute of sincere and manly hostility, and does not hesitate frequently to remind the rebel leaders that they might copy many valuable lessons from the vigor and perseverance of the Federal Government. Clamoring in favor of freedom of speech, these two newspapers, and the class they represent, abuse and scandalize the liberty they enjoy in constant attempts to weaken and destroy the power that protects them. In the face of such novel complications and under the burden of such novel responsibilities, decency, if not gratitude, ought to awaken the solicitude of every humane man and to inspire even the coldest hearts with patriotic co-operation to sustain our public authorities.

It is frequently said by the Intelligencer and the World that only parasites and placemen stand by the Administration in this crisis, and that he who gives it an unquestioning support deserves to be despised for his subserviency. But do these two journals and the gentlemen who manage them ever reflect that their conduct may be characterized by still harsher phrases, and that in clamoring for rights which they themselves habitually disregard they run so near to open treason that if they published their newspapers in Richmond or Charleston they would find approving readers in the ranks of the rebels themselves? It is one of the easiest things to find fault with the Government. This truth is always realized in times of peace, but when war convulses and distresses a great people those who have the conduct of it are infinitely more harassed and hampered by the men who will not believe them honest or capable than by those who assail them in the field. There is not a number of the National Intelligencer, for instance, that is not a reservoir of transferred calumnies upon the Government; not a number that does not contain articles that seem to have been copied with the determined purpose of poisoning the public mind, and of bringing the authorities into contempt. This treason is occasionally diluted by the presence of a loyal paragraph or speech, but the animus of the concern, its intense and ineradicable hatred of the general cause is shown by the eagerness with which it selects the complaints of captious and pretended friends, and by the satanic ability with which it debates what it regards as the shortcomings of the Administration. Now, this may be patriotism, but it seems to us that it is nothing more than base and callous ingratitude.

It is inconceivable how men who receive and prosper upon the patronage and the protection of Mr. Lincoln's Administration should refuse to give him the benefit, we will not say of an unquestioning or an unconditional support, but the benefit of that fair and impartial treatment which the honorable man always accords to his adversary. It has been said that there is no spectacle more touching than that of a brave man struggling with adversity. What shall we say of a great nation environed with perils, attacked front and rear—is not this a sight to awaken all our best feelings? Should it not impel us to forget enmities and envies, and postpone prejudices and party; to overlook for the time being that which may be universally or hastily done? But no such sentiments animate the class represented by the National Intelligencer and the New York World. They seem to delight in exposing the weakness—if we may so call it—of the public servants, and in holding up daily pictures to the rebels of fancied corruption and exaggerated incapacity. This may be a pleasing task, and they seem to be fascinated with it; but we predict that when the history of these times comes to be written nothing will be presented in a more odious light than the fact that in such a struggle as this there were men to be found in free and loyal communities who were blind to the issues involved in this struggle, and who seemed to revel in the occupation of misrepresenting and embarrassing those public authorities who had the war in charge."

A SKIRMISH NEAR PIEDMONT, (VA.)

We are informed that on Wednesday last, when near Piedmont station, (about thirty-six miles from Winchester, on this side of the Manassas Gap,) a squadron of the Thirteenth Pennsylvania Cavalry attacked a reconnoitering detachment of the Sixth Virginia Cavalry, putting the latter to flight and taking fourteen prisoners. Scouting parties are sent out every day in this neighborhood, and as a consequence slight skirmishes are constantly occurring

THE SENTIMENT OF BALTIMORE.

A subscriber in Baltimore sends us for publication the subjoined resolutions recently unanimously passed by the Councils of that city, and they are entitled to this respect at our hands as the representative expression of a great and important city on a question of public concern. In his note transmitting the resolutions, however, our subscriber remarks that dissatisfaction is felt by some of our friends in Baltimore that we "should say so much and publish so much in favor of Vallandigham." We beg to take issue with this remark, and to deny that we have said a word in justification of Mr. Vallandigham. Much as we reverence the constitutional freedom of speech, we have no further discussed the merits of his harangues than to regret their violence; but we have contended that he was entitled to a legal trial, to which every violator of law has a right. Treason itself is not to be tried by courts-martial; the law provides for that offence, as well as for all other civil offences, courts of another sort. It was not that we approved of his intemperate speeches that we objected to Mr. Vallandigham's being brought to the drum-head; but that the dignity and supremacy of the law were violated in his person in the mode of his trial, and not less in the mode of his punishment; for, had his guilt been legally ascertained, the punishment inflicted on him is an anomaly. Banishment is a penalty not known to any American statute; and the punishment of Vallandigham, therefore, is as irregular as his trial was illegal. The Councils of Baltimore, however, think otherwise; and it is not to dispute the unanimous sentiment of that enlightened body that we have said thus much, but simply to demur to the allegation with which our Baltimore friend accompanied the resolutions.

From the Baltimore American.

ACTION OF THE BALTIMORE CITY COUNCIL.—The following resolutions were presented in the First Branch of the City Council last evening by David Hoopes, Esq., of the Tenth Ward, and after being adopted unanimously in that Branch also passed the Second Branch with the same unanimity:

Whereas Clement L. Vallandigham, of the State of Ohio, has long been endeavoring in his public speeches to create dissensions in our country, poison the public mind, and give aid and comfort to those who are in rebellion against the Federal Government: Therefore,

Resolved by the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, That they have heard with pleasure of the arrest and transportation beyond our lines of Clement L. Vallandigham; and that in their judgment the best interest of the country and the preservation of the Government fully justified the proceeding.

Resolved, That, whilst they consider all measures of the Federal Government are subjects for just and fair criticism, they do not believe that at a time like this any man should be tolerated who is plainly, palpably, and notoriously endeavoring to create a factious opposition to the Government, thereby increasing the difficulties of putting down the rebellion.

Resolved, That the Hon. John Lee Chapman, Mayor of the city of Baltimore, be and he is hereby requested to transmit a copy of the foregoing preamble and resolutions to the President of the United States, and also to General Burnside.

THE BLOCKADED COAST.

The information furnished in the following official communication from the enlightened Superintendent of the Coast Survey will not only possess interest for all of our readers, but it affords an additional evidence of the great value to the country in this time of war of that branch of the public service—a branch which has often been decried by the ignorant and not always properly appreciated by the more intelligent:

COAST SURVEY OFFICE, MAY 26, 1863

ADMIRAL: I have the honor to send herewith, in compliance with your letter of April 3, 1863, the following statements prepared in this office, appended to the inquiries contained in that letter:

"1. The length of the coast of the United States now 'under blockade by our naval forces, beginning at the city 'of Alexandria, Virginia, and going down the Potomac 'river and Chesapeake bay to Cape Henry, and thence 'continuing along the outer line of the seacoast around 'the peninsula of Florida as far as the Rio Grande, this line 'to cross the rivers and harbors in the direction of the 'coast?"

The line thus measured is three thousand five hundred and forty-nine statute miles.

"2. The number of openings in this line of coast, 'whether rivers, bays, harbors, inlets, sounds, passes, or 'others?"

There are one hundred and eighty-nine openings in the line, of which the measure has just been given.

"3. The classification of these openings according to the 'depth of water on the bars at their entrance, under the 'three following distinctions—six, twelve, and eighteen 'feet curves as they are drawn on the charts of the coast 'by the United States Coast Survey?"

The classification of these openings is as follows:

At mean high water the number of openings under six feet in depth is	45
Between six and twelve feet in depth	70
Between twelve and eighteen feet in depth	42
Over eighteen feet in depth	32

Very respectfully, yours,
A. D. BACHE,
Superintendent U. S. Coast Survey.
Rear Admiral DAVIS, U. S Navy,
Chief of Bureau of Navigation.

THE REVOLT IN NICARAGUA SUPPRESSED.

NEW YORK, MAY 28—The steamer America, from Greytown on the 20th, has arrived. She brings a large number of passengers from California, and a confirmation of the total defeat of the revolutionary party in Nicaragua, under Jerez, by President Martinez. Jerez won the battle of the 28th of April, in which Martinez was slightly wounded. He then marched to Leon, where Martinez gained a complete victory. Jerez and twelve officers were all of his army who escaped capture. Chamorer, who held Fort San Carlos for Jerez, fled to Costa Rica. The revolution is thus entirely crushed.

FROM NORTH CAROLINA.

NEWBERN, MAY 24—Col. Jones, of the 58th Pennsylvania Regiment, made a reconnoissance from Newbern on the 22d instant, with Lee's brigade, and when about seven miles of Kinston surprised and captured some two hundred rebels belonging to the 58th North Carolina Regiment, with several officers, a field piece, arms, equipments, &c. A rebel captain and lieutenant were killed. None were killed on our side. Col. Jones is the hero of many daring exploits, and as a military man stands very high in this department. He will soon be promoted.

The schooner Sea Bird, of Philadelphia, while aground at the mouth of the Neuse river on the 20th instant, was captured and burned by the rebels, who went off to her from the shore in small boats, and took her captain and crew prisoners.

All the rebel troops in the State, including recent conscripts, have gone to Virginia.

Gen Foster is now on a tour of inspection to the different military posts in this department, which he is continually strengthening.

VIRGINIA ELECTION.—SUCCESS OF MR. SEGAR.

FORTRESS MONROE, (VA.) MAY 30, 1863.

To the Editors of the National Intelligencer.

In the absence of news from Vicksburg the residents of this vicinity have been congratulating themselves over a victory which, in a civil point of view, is nearly or quite as gratifying to them as the fall of the rebel stronghold would prove in a military point.

We have just received the full election returns from this district, and have the pleasure to announce the re-election of the Hon. JOSEPH SEGAR, our late Representative in Congress, by nearly nine hundred majority. The people may well rejoice over this result, as many had been led to believe his election doubtful on account of his stanch and undeviating support of the war policy of the Administration. His opponents had represented that he would receive but a fraction of the votes in the most populous counties in the district, viz. Accomac and Northampton, and had contended upon the hustings that his votes upon conscription, indemnity, and other bills would prove onerous upon the people. But the verdict of the Union men of those counties prove that they are in favor of a vigorous prosecution of the war, and fully endorse Mr. Segar's course as their Representative.

I enclose you a statement of the vote in the different counties for Congress. The vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Attorney General was unanimous. Messrs. Pierpoint, Cowper, and Bowden are gentlemen in whom the people have confidence, and who will undoubtedly reorganize the State Government upon a firm basis.

The Hon. L. H. CHANDLER was elected to Congress from the Norfolk district unanimously. Mr. C. has filled the post of U. S. Consul at Matanzas for the past two years, and returned from there to accept the position of U. S. District Attorney for the Eastern district of Virginia, to which he had been nominated by the President, but found, much to his surprise, that he had been nominated for Congress by acclamation, his former townsmen and the people of the district having determined he should serve them in that capacity. He therefore had to decline the more lucrative office and the honor conferred upon him by the President and accept the position assigned him by the *vox populi*.

Your correspondent attended the different election precincts in Elizabeth City county, and found, much to his surprise, very many returned voters who had been within the rebel lines until recently. They were invariably Union men, and unconditional at that. To cure the rebellious propensities of our people nothing is so efficacious as a twelve months' residence within the rebel lines. There is no doubt but for the destruction of Hampton and many of the dwellings and farm houses in the surrounding country, the people of this county would gladly return to the folds of the glorious old flag and the paternal care of our beneficent Government.

Yours truly,
VIATOR.

The following is the vote enclosed by our correspondent:

	Segar.	*Watson.*
Accomac	774	380
Northampton	276	21
Elizabeth City	221	20
York	41	00
	1,312	421

Segar's majority 891.

VIRGINIA ELECTION.

ALEXANDRIA, MAY 28.—In this city, forming a part of the Seventh Congressional district, Lewis McKenzie has received one hundred and thirty-eight votes, Kitchen fifty-nine, and Gallaher fifteen. In Fairfax county, at Accotink precinct McKenzie received fifty-eight and Kitchen five.

THE ARMY OF THE POTOMAC.

A special despatch to the New York Evening Post states that the council of war held at the Executive Mansion on Tuesday last was the "result of the last visit of Senators Wade and Chandler to the Army of the Potomac, and had reference to the offensive movements which the rebels in Virginia have been for some time threatening. General Hooker is said to express the opinion that the enemy are bringing up all their forces from Charleston, and probably North Carolina, for a desperate aggressive movement." This, however, though it may cause uneasiness in some quarters, does not receive general credence.

A letter to the Tribune, dated on the 27th instant, at "Gen. Hooker's Headquarters near Falmouth," says:

"The ominous movements of the rebels have been watched with interest from this side of the Rappahannock to-day. There has been marching and counter-marching of squadrons and battalions opposite the different fords, (United States, Kelly's, and Banks's.) In front of United States Ford the greatest activity has been displayed. In this vicinity new camps, in close proximity, as if a corps was massed for an offensive movement, have appeared. Bustle and confusion have been the order of the day. Drums have resounded, regiments have manœuvred, and exciting rumors come from our videttes that a demonstration is on the *qui vive*.

"Yesterday, accompanied by Col. Arrowsmith, of the 157th New York, your correspondent called on Gen. Hooker, and had quite a long conversation with the "fighting Californian." He looks upon the last movement with any thing but dissatisfaction in the grand result, and, said he, "Good people will cease to write me letters of condolence when my official report is published." The General has been receiving about fifty letters of condolence daily from people in the country since the battle. He said he cared more about crippling the rebel army than taking Richmond. He did not care about sacrificing the flower of the Union army in pushing the rebels toward the strongholds of Richmond only to encounter another fresh army from Suffolk."

THE WORK OF REBEL PRIVATEERS.

PHILADELPHIA, MAY 28.—The brig William M. Dodge arrived to day from Pernambuco, bringing Capt. Botter, of the ship Oneida, who reports that the Oneida, from Shanghai for New York, and barque Henrietta, from Baltimore for Rio, were burned by the pirate Alabama on the 24th of April, in latitude 14° 8', long. 29½ W. The Alabama and Florida were cruising together. They had previously destroyed the ship Louisa Hatch, from Cardiff for Singapore; the ship Nora, from Liverpool for Calcutta; the Charles Hill, from Liverpool to Montevideo; the whaling barque Lafayette; the brig Kate and the schooner King Fisher.

NEW YORK, MAY 28.—By the arrival of the America, from Greytown, we learn that the ship Commonwealth, of Boston, from New York for San Francisco, was captured by the Alabama previous to the 24th of April. The Oneida and the Henrietta were taken by the Florida and their crews transferred to the French barque Bremuntia, which landed them at Pernambuco. The Brazilian schooner Sergrofano, from the Island of Fernando de Noremba, arrived at Pernambuco, bringing about sixty men, crews of other vessels who had been placed on the island by the Alabama. The value of the Commonwealth, with her cargo, is estimated at four hundred thousand dollars, and that of the Oneida fully half a million. A majority of the officers of the captured vessels departed for the United States by the way of England.

BRAZIL AND THE REBEL PRIVATEERS.

The correspondent of the New York Merchants' Exchange writes from Pernambuco as follows:

"The Brazilian authorities have displaced the commander at Fernando de Noronha for allowing the Alabama to commit depredations in Brazilian waters.

"The new commander who was sent to the island protested against the Alabama remaining there, and ordered her to leave in a few hours Unfortunately he had no vessel of war to enforce his orders.

"Every satisfaction in the power of the Brazilian authorities to give had been tendered to the American Consul.

"It was supposed at Pernambuco that the Alabama sailed south on the 29th of April."