New-York Tribune.

VOL. XXXII.....No. 9,685. NEW-YORK, FRIDAY, APRIL 19, 1872. PRICE FOUR CENTS.

WASHINGTON.

THE CANVASS OF THE HOUSE.

SUMMARY OF THE GRANT STRENGTH—A FOOLISH FIASCO.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

WASHINGTON, April 18.—The lists of signers gathered in the House yesterday to the letters approving Grant's Administration, which were telegraphed to New-York, yesterday, and read in the Grant meeting last night, were in some cases incorrectly reported. It is scarcely a proper conclusion that all the signers are heartily for the renomination of the President, for, in some cases, the telegrams were modified so as to say nothing about renomination, in order to get signatures which would otherwise have been refused. Nor is it correct to conclude that all who did not sign declined to do so because opposed to Grant, or declined at all. Some were absent, and others thought the movement extremely impolitic. Among the latter were a few well-known partisans. The following are correct lists of the Republican members who signed the manifestoes and those who did not, either from opposition to Grant, belief in the folly of the attempted indorsement of him in advance of the Philadelphia Convention, or because they were absent from the House when the dispatches were prepared:

THE SIGNERS.

Maine—John Lynch, Wm. P. Fry, James G. Blaine, John A. Peters, Eugene Hale.
Vermont—Chas. W. Willard, Luke P. Poland.
Pennsylvania—Wm. D. Kelley, Ulysses Mercur, Glenni W. Scofield, W. Townsend, Leonard Myers, L. D. Shoemaker, J. B. Packer, E. McJunken, O. J. Dickey, James S. Negley, J. W. Killinger, A. C. Harmer.
Ohio—John A. Bingham, J. T. Wilson, Chas. Foster, James Monroe, E. A. Pecle, Wm. H. Upson, W. P. Sprague, John A. Smith.
New-York—Clinton L. Merriam, W. A. Wheeler, Wm. H. Lamport, Ellis H. Roberts, Walter L. Sessions, R. H. Duell, S. Wakeman, John E. Seeley, J. H. Ketcham, W. E. Lansing, W. Clarke.
Indiana—John Coburn, W. Williams, John P. C. Shanks, James N. Tyner, J. M. Wilson, Jasper Packard.
Illinois—C. B. Farwell, J. H. Moore, H. Snapp, John L. Beveridge, H. C. Burchard.
Wisconsin—Philetus Sawyer, J. Allen Barber, J. M. Rusk, G. W. Hazelton.
Missouri—S. S. Burdett, H. E. Havens, J. C. Parker.
Tennessee—Horace Maynard, R. R. Butler.
Georgia—J. S. Bigby, Thomas J. Speer.
Mississippi—L. W. Perce, G. C. McKee, George E. Harris, S. W. Barry.
South Carolina—Robert H. Elliott, Robert C. De Large, A. S. Wallace.
Alabama—Charles Hayes, C. W. Buckley, B. S. Turner.
Kansas—D. P. Lowe.

REPUBLICANS WHO DID NOT SIGN.

Massachusetts—James Buffinton, Oakes Ames, Ginery Twichell, Samuel Hooper, Benjamin F. Butler, Nathaniel P. Banks, George M. Brooks, George F. Hoar, Alvah Crocker, Henry L. Dawes.
Rhode Island—Benjamin T. Eames, James M. Pendleton.
Connecticut—Julius L. Strong, Stephen W. Kellogg, Henry H. Starkweather.
New-York—Milo Goodrich, H. Boardman Smith.
New-Jersey—Geo. A Halsey, J. W. Huzelton, John Hill.
Virginia—J. H. Platt, jr., Charles H. Porter, W. H. H. Stowell.
North Carolina—C. L. Cobb, C. R. Thomas.
Georgia—R. H. Whiteley.
Mississippi—J. L. Morphis.
Louisiana—J. Hale Sypher, Lionel A. Sheldon, Chester B. Darrall, Frank Morey.
Texas—W. T. Clarke.
Ohio—A. F. Perry, John E. Stevenson, John Beatty, J. A. Ambler, J. A. Garfield.
Illinois—J. F. Farnsworth, J. B. Hawley, John A. Hay.
Missouri—G. A. Finkelnburg.
Arkansas—O. P. Sawyer, Thomas Boles.
Michigan—Henry Waldron, Wm. L. Stoughton, Austin Blair, Wilder D. Foster, Omar D. Conger, Jabez G. Sutherland.
Florida—J. T. Wall.
Iowa—George W. McCrary, Aylett R. Cotton, William G. Donnan, Madison M. Walden, Frank W. Palmer, Jackson Orr.
California—Sherman O. Houghton, Aaron A. Sargent.
West Virginia—J. C. McCrew.
Nebraska—John Taffe.

The whole number of signers was 74, a little more than half the Republican strength in the House. There were probably about a dozen or twenty absentees. The whole project, it will be seen, absolutely failed, and it is doubtful if even 50 names could now be obtained in Congress to a paper declaring the first choice of the signers for the next President to be Gen. Grant. So the Administration seems to have lost considerable strength in Congress since the military Ring and their organ in this city attempted to make a list of 100 members in favor of Grant.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE IN THE HOUSE—THE PRESIDENT'S PARTISANS STILL STRENUOUSLY OPPOSING THE MEASURE—HOW THE REFORM WORKS IN ALABAMA.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

WASHINGTON, Thursday, April 18, 1872.

The Civil Service debate in the House was resumed at 2 o'clock to-day. Messrs. Potter and Holman on the Democratic side spoke first in favor of reform. Mr. Holman said he would be glad to try any experiment that promised a remedy for the gross abuses that now exist in the public service. He made a good point of the fact that the New-York Post-Office had been used to aid in getting up the Grant demonstration in that city by distributing, free of postage, circulars advertising the meeting. Mr. Sargent made the most significant speech of the day. He squarely took the position that the system of distributing offices as rewards for political services is right and proper, and ought to be maintained. "The offices belong to the majority," he said, thus paraphrasing the maxim, "To the victors belong the spoils." He also, in the capacity of leader of the renomination party in the House, which he has assumed of late, laid down the platform upon which the coming campaign is to be conducted. It ignored all the vital political issues of the present day, and the great questions affecting the welfare of the country, which all clear-sighted men recognize as looming up in the near future.

Mr. Butler, who may be said to dispute the leadership of the Administration party with Mr. Sargent, followed with an eulogy on the present Civil Service system as "the best in the world," and a good deal of abuse of those who see anything in it to reform. Reform was, he said, popular only with the "outs." He made the significant admission that every man in the Senate who was for Civil Service reform had announced himself as in favor of the Cincinnati movement, and that the members of the House who were for the reform had to give certificates that they were not going to Cincinnati to relieve themselves from suspicion. He said that the President had been forced by Congress to get up the system of rules and examinations which he had put in force, and he intimated that the whole thing was distasteful to the President, who had set it on foot only to take his revenge on the foolish Congressmen who had passed a law which was virtually a vote of want of confidence in him. Mr. Garfield asked Butler if he spoke by authority of the President, when he said the Civil Service rules were distasteful to him. Mr. Hoar prevented Mr. Butler from making any hasty reply, by instantly rising to a point of order that Mr. Garfield had no right to question Mr. Butler about the opinions of the President. This diversion gave Mr. Butler time to answer, at his leisure, that he did not claim to speak by authority. He said that if he were a leader of the House he should take care to learn the President's views, and be on his side. "Whether he was right or wrong?" asked Mr. Stevenson. "Yes," replied Butler; "for if he were wrong, I would try to set him right."

Mr. Lynch made a short speech in support of his substitute to Mr. Willard's bill, which provides that members of Congress shall make their recommendations to office in writing, to be open to the inspection of other members and be published every year. Mr. Blair of Michigan, in the ten minutes in which he spoke, said that boards and examinations would be no remedy for the demoralization which prevails in the Civil Service, and that if the country had an independent Executive, there would be no use for such machinery. He had no faith that any reform would come out of the President's Civil Service rules, but said, significantly, perhaps something may be done after the election. The House adjourned at 4:30, with the previous question seconded on the bill, and amendments and a motion to recommit entered by Mr. Butler, as a means of effectively disposing of the whole subject. There will be another hour of discussion to-morrow before a vote is taken, during which time Mr. Garfield will reply to Mr. Butler. The debate to-day made it clearer than ever, and beyond any further doubt, that, whether the President is sincere or not in advocating Civil Service reform, his partisans believe he has no heart in it, and are almost unanimous in their hostility to all rules, systems, or experiments tending to disturb the politicians in their possession of the spoils of office. Secretary Boutwell, who was at the Capitol to-day, remarked in conversation that, while he was in favor of examination, he was not in favor of a life tenure of office. He had noticed that every officer who has been discovered to be a defaulter has been in office more than five years.

The President ordered, yesterday, that the new Civil Service regulations be amended by striking out the fifth and eighteenth rules as published to-day. They are as follows:

Fifth: The heads of bureaus in the Executive Departments at Washington, except such as are excepted by name, shall be nominated by the President, or appointed by the head of the department, as the case may be, from persons within the department, who, in the judgment of the head of the department, are suitable and qualified for the position; but if no such person shall be found within the department, the appointment may be made at discretion.

Eighteenth: All communications in writing relative to employment, appointment, or removal from office, must be addressed to the proper department. Communications otherwise addressed will not receive attention, and personal application from those who desire appointments will not be entertained by the President or by the heads of departments.

The Alabama political squabble has broken out again. It may be remembered that last Summer a change was made in the Mobile Post-Office, and Mr. Lowell was appointed to please Senator Spencer. Warner and his friends protested against the appointment, but, as Spencer was in and he out, the President did not listen to him. No complaints have been made in regard to the management of the office; but, in December last, Lowell refused to submit any longer to an assessment of $10 a week for the support of Spencer's newspaper, *The Mobile Herald*. Spencer therefore went to the Postmaster-General and represented that Lowell's bond was not good, got it canceled, and then, without waiting to give Lowell notice of this action or giving him an opportunity to renew it, demanded his removal and the appointment of John J. Moulton in his place. Moulton, whose name was sent to the Senate yesterday, is reported to have been removed from a subordinate position in the Mobile Post-Office for incompetency, neglect of duty, and other causes, specified in documents now on file in the Post-Office Department, and unanswered. The Post-Office Committee will not act on this nomination for several days.

THE FRENCH ARMS SALES.

THE WAR DEPARTMENT'S SALES AND ITS EXPENDITURES—A DIFFICULT QUESTION IN BOOKKEEPING.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

WASHINGTON, April 18.—As was to be expected, the statement in Mr. Boutwell's report in regard to the $8,250,000 received for ordnance received during the French war, quoted last night, must be read backwards in order to be understood. It says that the expenditures of the War Department for the year were about $36,000,000, and then explains in a note that this is the net amount, after deducting $8,000,000 repaid into the Treasury as proceeds of sales of ordnance, &c., but the true expenditures were $44,000,000. According to Mr. Saville, Chief Clerk of the Treasury Department, who was before the French Arms Committee this morning, this does not mean that the $8,000,000 have been spent at all. The Treasury bookkeepers are not allowed by law to add the proceeds of sales to the cash receipts of the Government on their books, and therefore in order to make those books balance it is necessary to deduct them from the expenditures. The thing, as Mr. Sumner would say, is exactly the reverse of what it appears to be upon the books. The eight millions were actually receipts, and in any other system of bookkeeping would be found added to the debtor side of the cash account, but in the Treasury system it appears as a negative quantity among the expenditures—is, in fact, deducted from the creditor side of the cash account. In an almost vain attempt to make the Committee understand this, Mr. Saville explained, illustrated, repeated, and explained again for nearly two hours, and notwithstanding he displayed a wonderful familiarity with all the laws, decisions, and rulings affecting the Treasury Department from the foundation of the Government, and with the entire system of Treasury bookkeeping, and convinced every one present that he knew all about it himself, and that no law had probably been violated, it is doubtful if anyone present could say that he was himself sure of any of his knowledge on the subject. Gen. Franklin will be recalled to-morrow.

[GENERAL PRESS DISPATCH.]

WASHINGTON, April 18.—The Senate Arms Committee met this morning. James H. Saville, Chief Clerk of the Treasury Department was sworn and examined. Senator Hamlin asked him whether any of the money paid into the Treasury under the act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1871, was used by the War Department without a reappropriation. The witness responded that the act alluded to was passed July 12, 1870, twelve days after the fiscal year had commenced. It was therefore impossible to carry the act into effect from the 1st of July; but the Department did the best it could under the circumstances. The witness then gave an explanation of what was meant by "covering" moneys into the Treasury. It had always been decided that the proceeds of the sales of old materials, ordnance, condemned stores, etc., should be "covered" into the Treasury to the credit of the appropriations. Secretary Boutwell saw the bad effect of the usage and directed it to be discontinued in his Department; and, at his instance, a bill was prepared at the session following Mr. Boutwell coming into office, to remedy the evil. The bill was explained by the witness to the House Committee, but it was not acted on till the first session of the present Congress. It passed the House unanimously, but has not been acted upon in the Senate. The act of July 12, 1870, required that the appropriations should be subject to a requisition for the the settlement of proper accounts for two years, and that the unexpended balance for objects not continuous should be "covered" into the surplus fund of the Treasury. The fifth section of the act, however, provided that the law should not apply to permanent or indefinite appropriations.

Senator Schurz examined the witness at length regarding the law and the practice under it. The witness said a practice had long prevailed allowing disbursing officers to expend for one purpose money applicable to another; it was a dangerous power; out of 75 or 80 different appropriations, nevertheless, the money is thus used; finally, the accounts are adjusted under the proper head of expenditures; the use of money as above stated was for convenience, as the disbursing officer might not have immediately at hand the money to pay certain bills from one fund, but from another. Mr. Schurz called the witness's attention to the amount of money drawn from the Treasury by the War Department during the fiscal year ending July 1, 1871, namely, $44,000,000, which the witness said was the true expenditure on account of the War Department during that year.

By Senator Logan—The War Department expended $44,000,000; this amount was drawn on the requisition of the Secretary of War; taking out the $8,000,000 from the sale of arms, &c., would leave over $35,000,000; the amount appropriated by Congress might have been $50,000,000 for the War Department, and the gross amount expended was $44,000,000.

By Senator Hamlin—The Treasury Department charged the War Department for all moneys for which it makes a requisition against the appropriation. By this statement it appears that the War Department made requisition for $44,000,000; during the time the requisitions were made, the War Department paid into the Treasury $8,000,000, and in the settlement of yearly accounts was credited with this amount, and the deduction of this from the larger amount showed the net amount with which it was chargeable.

Senator Logan said to the witness that he understood the Secretary of War drew $44,000,000 out of the Treasury, and that credit was given him for $8,000,000, leaving $35,000,000 of net expenditure. Now where were the $8,000,000? Were they not added to the $44,000,000 drawn? The witness again explained that the $8,000,000 were placed to the credit of the War Department. When arms are sold, the Ordnance Officer pays the money into the Treasury, and the amount is put on the books to the credit of the appropriation for the War Department. It cannot be drawn except on the warrant of the Secretary of the Treasury, issued on a requisition from the Secretary of War. The Secretary of War did constructively receive the money for the sale of arms, and paid it into the Treasury.

Senator Logan asked a number of questions of the witness as to the practice of the Department, and was several times interrupted by Senator Carpenter. The witness, in answering Mr. Logan, said the Secretary of War did not have the money in his own personal hands, but the money was in the hands of the disbursing officers.

Senator Logan—Of course, I understand that, but the charge is made to the War Department.

Senator Carpenter—Well, let the witness go on.

Senator Logan—Now, Mr. Carpenter. I am trying to understand this matter, and I am asking questions myself. I have not interfered with this Committee much, but this matter I want to understand. I claim the same right here as any other member of the Committee, and will have it. I have not interfered with you, Sir, in questions you asked.

Mr. Carpenter—Well, if I am disagreeable I will take my hat any time and go home.

Senator Logan propounded other questions which were answered, which Senator Schurz asked whether $44,000,000 were not actually expended, and whether $8,000,000 did not constitute a part of the expenditure?

Witness replied: If the $8,000,000 had been drawn, the total amount drawn would have been $52,000,000, but the $8,000,000 went to the credit of the Ordnance appropriation, and was not drawn, but now remains to the credit of the appropriation.

The Committee then adjourned.

THE NAVAL INQUIRY.

[GENERAL PRESS DISPATCH.]

WASHINGTON, April 18.—The Naval Investigation Committee met to-night. B. F. Isherwood, Chief-Engineer, now stationed at New-York, being examined by Mr. Blair, testified that he was Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering for eight years. Witness gave an account of the action taken during the late war for building machinery for gunboats, &c., nearly all of which were given to the lowest bidders after advertisement. The specifications described every part of the machinery, not a bolt or screw having been left out.

Mr. Blair—Would it not be better to make a contract without specifications and provide for results, such as a certain rate of speed, saving of coal, &c.?

Witness replied by asking the question, Would the mere guarantee of 20 miles an hour make the vessel perform that rate of speed?

Mr. Peters—Suppose the contractor did not make good his guarantee, could not Government refuse to take the vessel?

Witness—Yes, provided the Government paid no money till the guarantee was performed. The witness further stated that all the navy-yards did not come up to the standard, while of the work done outside none of the guarantees were performed, but the contractors got their money; the work done by Paul S. Forbes for the Idaho was a most perfect failure, and the Department released him from his contract; he recollected the Algonquin, built by Forbes, which was also a total failure; he refused to make payment, and Secretary Welles rejected the bills. Witness then testified as to the machinery of the Saco, built by Corliss, which would not work; witness took out the machinery and put in that of his design; by the terms of the contract Corliss was to refund the money advanced, in the event of the failure of the machinery to work; witness called on him to do so, but received no answer; he therefore made an estimate of the amount of money Corliss was required to refund, and deducted it from the amount actually due to Mr. Corliss, and sent him the remainder; so the Government was no loser; he believes this was the only instance in which guarantees were exacted; as to the Secor claims, he found the Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering had settled, and it was a matter of congratulation that Congress had done so; with regard to the Fowler wheel, it has an advantage over the ordinary screw propeller for turning the vessel around on its axis when at rest; if speed is required, it is a poor wheel to use; it is uncertain whether economy can be claimed for compound engines; they are building generally in England, and people there believe they are the best, but many kinds of machinery heretofore built have been discovered not to be superior to others, and so it may be in this case; witness received an invoice of bricks while he was stationed at Mare Island; the bricks were sent by the Engineer in charge of stores in New-York, and were part of a requisition; this was about a year ago; the bricks were much broken; they could have been bought cheaper in California.

In reply to Secretary Robeson, witness said the 10,000 or 15,000 bricks sent to California would occupy a space between seven and eight feet each way, or equal to three cords of wood; he was sure the machinery of the Saco, when taken out, was stored in the Washington Navy-Yard.

Mr. Corliss here interposed and asked witness whether Construction and Mr. Faxon, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary Welles, say these claims were he did not recollect of his appealing to him to retain the engines, as reported on by a Board of Naval Engineers, and continue the experiment with salt water boilers, etc.; witness replied that he was always a friend of experiment, and if such a propostion had been made he would have accepted it, but he did not recollect such a conversation.

Witness was examined at length by Secretary Robeson as to contracts, economy in war vessels, &c. He said the Corliss machinery would not drive the Saco; he never saw Charles A. Dana until after this investigation was ordered; Dana made inquiry of him how contracts were given out, as to specifications, and the way business was performed; he showed him the contracts and gave him such information as he had given to the Committee to-night; he saw Dana here at his hotel several weeks ago; he did not prepare questions for Dana's lawyer; he saw Dana at Welcker's several times in the day, but not at night, as he recollected; he received a telegram from Dana, and came to the city sooner than he intended in consequence; he did not report himself to the Navy Department; he was not the author of the article in *The New-York Sun* signed "America," or any other article, nor did he give any information on which they were founded; he never wrote to any person connected with *The Sun*; Mr. Dana called on witness after his arrival here.

Secretary Robeson then read an extract from a letter written by the witness to John Roach, in which he said, both officially and privately, that the engines of the Tennessee were so faulty that no practicable modification could render them useful; that they never would have been accepted could he have prevented it; and that if the results which John Roach proposed were guaranteed the Government would have a successful vessel, and would have made a good exchange. Witness said he still adhered to the views therein expressed.

By Mr. Archer—The statements in *The Sun* were not got up by direction of witness, nor did he give information to persons connected with *The Sun*, for they were perfect strangers to him.

Mr. Sargent, after reading a paragraph from *The New-York Sun*, asked the witness whether he did not call upon him in February last and state to him the large price of the contract with John Roach. Witness replied that he did call on Mr. Sargent, and said in response to questions put by Mr. S. that he gave only a rough estimate of the worth of the old machinery, but he did not say the Government had been swindled.

Mr. Sargent remarked the witness's statement to him at that time was substantially as in *The New-York Sun*.

In response to Mr. Blair, he said the machinery in the Tennessee that could be retained in use is worth $175,000; the engines are worthless; the cost of getting the old machinery out would probably be $6,000 or $7,000; no machinery was better than Roach's, and very little as good.

Chief Engineer King recalled: Said he was before the Committee on Claims, of which Mr. Washburn was Chairman, and made a statement in relation to the Iron Clad bill, but did not say to Mr. Washburn that the Secor claims had been paid in full; an order was issued by witness to the Philadelphia Navy-Yard to ship surplus supplies on hand to Mare Island, Cal.; on receiving the invoice he discovered there was among them 10,000 bricks; when he saw this he endeavored to prevent them from going to California by writing to the commandant at the New-York Yard to retain them, but received a reply that as the bricks were already stowed away, it would cost too much to take them out; the bricks were worth $100, and the freight probably as much more.

CURRENT TOPICS AT THE CAPITAL.

AN EXCITING DISCUSSION IN THE HOUSE—PROPOSED REPEAL OF THE EIGHT-HOUR LAW—CATACAZY DISGRACED.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

WASHINGTON, Thursday, April 18, 1872.

The bill to enable a company of Gentiles to build a railroad through Utah, from Salt Lake City to the Colorado River, was passed by the House, to-day, after an hour's debate. Mr. Hooper, the Mormon delegate, and Clagett, the delegate from Montana, occupied most of the time in a lively discussion of Mormonism, which greatly amused the House and brought the members to their feet in a ring about the two contestants, giving to the assembly something of the look of a crowd at a prize-fight. The real question at issue was whether a California company should be given the right of way over a route along which the Utah people had already built 50 miles of road, and were ready to build 100 more this year; but the railroad was soon forgotten, the debate turning into a fiery assault upon Mormonism on the part of Clagett, and an excited but ingenious defense of the Saints by their representative. The more earnest the combatants grew and the harder the blows they gave, the more the crowd was delighted and the louder they laughed. Finally, Mr. Stevenson ended the farcical proceeding by making a speech seriously advocating the bill at last, but running into a funny vein at last, and bringing down the House in a general roar of laughter.

The Senate Naval Committee, which has been for the past few days examining the bill to make appropriations for the support of the navy, has agreed to recommend several important amendments. Among them is one to strike out of the bill a provision put in by the House, that "laborers shall be employed in the several navy-yards by the proper officers in charge, without dictation from political committees, and without regard to their political services. Another amendment agreed to makes the hours of labor in Government workshops the same as they are in the mechanical establishments in the same vicinity, thus practically repealing the Eight-Hour law.

Mr. Parker of the House Committee on Territories has prepared an interesting report in favor of the establishment of a Territorial Government for Indian Territory. The plan which will unquestionably be adopted by the Committee, and the one which is recommended by Mr. Parker, is not to interfere with the tribes in their local governments or land titles, but to permit them to continue under the superior authority of the Territorial Government—the reservation of each tribe being in some sense similar to a county. The most difficult question to deal with in all legislation for Indian Territory is the fact that certain railroad companies have grants of 21,000,000 acres of land in the Territory, contingent upon the extinguishment of the Indian titles to their reservations, or portions of them through which the railroads run. One of these roads, the Pacific and Atlantic, has been granted alternate sections in a belt of country 80 miles wide running across the entire Territory. The roads have already been built in great part, and the Companies claim that they have a vested right to their land grants which cannot be disturbed by subsequent legislation of Congress. The only way to make much progress in civilizing the Indians is obviously, Mr. Parker says, to get them to agree to abandon their system of holding lands in common as reservations, and induce them to accept titles in fee simple to homesteads. But the great obstacle in the way to such a course is that the railroads stand ready to seize upon the land the moment the reservations are broken up. There are 43,000,000 acres in the Territory, and if the railroads get all they have been granted there would not enough good land remain to furnish each Indian with 160 acres. There is reason to apprehend, it is said, that the railroad companies having a direct interest of nearly $60,000,000 in getting the reservation system broken up, will foment trouble with the tribes for the purpose of inducing the Government to abrogate the treaties. It appears clear that some more efficient government than that furnished by tribal organizations will be necessary to protect the Indians from the greed of the railroad companies, and at the same time protect the roads and the travel and the traffic that will pass over them from the natural hostility of the Indians. The view generally taken in Congress appears to be that the time has come for the establishment of a territorial government, and that this can be done without interfering with the rights guaranteed by treaty to the tribes, while affording better protection for both Indians and whites.

The Banking and Currency Committee are in consultation with the Solicitor of the Treasury in reference to the violation of law on the part of the officers of the Tenth National Bank of New-York, in assisting to lock up $4,000,000 of the currency in that city recently. The testimony already taken by the Committee will be referred to the Solicitor, who will give an opinion to the Committee whether under the statute of Feb. 19, 1869, the charter cannot be taken from the bank in question.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs agreed, today, to report Minister De Long's bill to authorize the education, at the expense of the United States, of two American students to be employed as interpreters after four years' study, and also to authorize the payment of $6,000 for the annual rental of a building for use as the American Legation House, court-room, and jail, in Japan.

Mr. Conkling still insists that Congress will adjourn in May, and objected, to-day, to fixing the 8th of that month for the consideration of the Amnesty bill. It is feared that the strength the Administration party would gain by passing an Amnesty bill would be more than balanced by the harm that it would receive from remaining after the Philadelphia Convention.

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Richardson having resigned his office of Judge of Probate in Middlesex County, Mass., Congressman Brooks will probably be appointed to that position, and Gov. Claflin elected to fill Mr. Brooks's seat in the House.

[GENERAL PRESS DISPATCH.]

Authentic information has been received in Washington from St. Petersburg to the effect that Mr. Catacazy's justification of himself has been considered attentively in the Council of the Empire. He is utterly disgraced, and has left St. Petersburg for Paris, with a pension of 3,000 rubles per annum. This pension is so settled that it will be withdrawn if Mr. Catacazy makes any publication or gives new cause of offense.

FOREIGN NEWS.

THE ALABAMA CLAIMS.

SYNOPSIS OF THE BRITISH COUNTER CASE—THE CLASS OF CASES UPON WHICH THE AWARD OF THE ARBITRATORS MUST BE BASED.

LONDON, Thursday, April 18, 1872.

The following is a synopsis of the counter Case presented at Geneva by the agent on the part of Great Britain.

Part I. begins by announcing that to the American imputations of hostile motives and insincere neutrality, no reply whatever will be offered. England distinctly refuses to enter into a discussion of those insinuations, because it would be inconsistent with her self-respect, irrelevant to the main issue, and tend to inflame the controversy. England's governing desire is to fulfill, even exceed, her international duties. Nor will any reference be made to the claims for indirect damages, as correspondence with regard to them is pending between England and the United States. England assumes that the claims are limited to losses occasioned by the Florida, Alabama, Georgia, and Shenandoah, but does not object to the introduction of the names of nine other Rebel cruisers added to the list by the American Case. She calls attention to the fact that none of these vessels had previously been mentioned. No award is possible for the depredations of the Boston and Sallie, which are in the list, but are not mentioned elsewhere in the Case of the United States, and were probably inadvertently included. The Board of Arbitration is reminded that its conclusions must be formed on proofs, not allegations; and the evidence must be sifted. The statements of American Consuls are credible when made with regard to facts within their personal knowledge, but they are untrustworthy when dealing with rumors. The Consuls of the American Government, zealous to indiscretion, shared the irritability generated by the war, and erroneous views throughout the struggle colored their reports. England rejects as evidence the papers captured on the Richmond, their authors being unknown.

Part II. deals with the American argument. It disputes the proposition that a neutral Power is bound at the request of a belligerent to enforce its municipal laws and add to them if they are insufficient. It admits that reparation is due for an appreciable injury resulting from a clear violation of international duty, but is unable to attach distinct meaning to some of the twelve propositions of the American Case, and demurs to the exceptionally rigorous application made of these propositions to England. It urges that, at the time of the Confederate war, the mere sale and delivery of a vessel adapted for war to a belligerent was not a violation of neutrality; nevertheless, on this point it accepts the rules of the Treaty of Washington, not with the overstrained construction put upon them by the Government of the United States, but according to their obvious purport. It regrets that the United States should see fit to strain the interpretation of these rules to the uttermost, instead of accepting them in a fair and reasonable sense. It argues that England was bound to receive the Alabama as she would a vessel of war of any sovereign State, and concludes by quoting from Ortolan, the eminent French authority on international law, to show that the principles for which the United States contend were never heretofore seriously asserted or recognized in Europe or America.

Part III. treats of the precedents adduced in the American Case and replies thereto with others, such as the filibustering attacks of Lopez on Cuba, and Walker on Mexico and Central America, and the Fenian raids on Canada. History on this subject is the history of unlawful enterprises originating in America and with American citizens. American privateers have, from time to time, harassed England, Spain, Portugal, Mexico, Central America, Cuba, and Canada.

Part IV. considers the various complaints made of the traffic in munitions of war with the South, blockade-running by British ships, &c.

Part V. gives the history of the cruisers Sumter and Nashville; complains of being required to meet demands in regard to which the sole difficulty is to treat them as serious.

Part VI. gives an account of the Florida and Alabama, with the details of their escape. It seeks to show that the time which elapsed between Mr. Adams's application and the Alabama's departure was too short to justify the charge of negligence, and claims that in this respect England cannot be charged with any failure of duty.

Part VII. is devoted to the history of the Shenandoah and Georgia.

Part VIII. relates to the other vessels, and repudiates the responsibility of Great Britain for their depredations.

Part IX. treats of the reception of Rebel cruisers in British ports, and seeks to defend the conduct of Great Britain by comparing it with that of other nations.

Part X., after recapitulating the facts and arguments of the preceding parts, declares the claim for interest on the damages awarded from July 1, 1863, untenable. The losses which the Arbitrators may take into account are, at the utmost, those directly arising from the capture and destruction of ships and property.

After describing the situation of anxiety and insecurity in which neutrals would be placed in time of war, should the doctrines presented in the American Case as to their duties prevail, the counterplease concludes with the expression of a hope that a frank, open statement of facts will effectually remove every misunderstanding between nations allied by innumerable ties.

The London Times describes the British counter Case as conceived in a grave and statesmanlike spirit. While the American Case reads like an advocate's speech to the jury in a trial for assault and battery, England's reply is like the utterance of a judge. *The Daily Telegraph* says: "Americans studying with impartiality our counter Case will find reason to fear not only for their indirect claims, but for something more. Instance upon instance of overstatement and inconsistency is brought against them, until their great fabric of laborious ingenuity trembles to its foundation." None of the other city journals have articles on the subject.

PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT.

LONDON, Thursday April 18—Midnight.

In the House of Commons, to-night, through the active exertions of the party "whips," the benches were well filled. Exciting debates on the course of the Government at Geneva, and on the Ballot bill, were expected, and the galleries were also crowded.

Both members and spectators were disappointed in the first case, as the attempt to draw Mr. Gladstone out on the Alabama Claims failed.

The Hon. Mr. Wyndham, member for West Cumberland, asked the Government why the British counter case was presented at Geneva without a condition that the claim for indirect damages should be withdrawn by the American Government.

Mr. Gladstone simply replied that he doubted the policy of answering the questions while the Government was waiting for a note from America which would probably form an epoch in the affair.

THE NEW DOMINION AND THE WASHINGTON TREATY.

THE CORRESPONDENCE ON THE QUESTION OF THE FISHERIES—RELATIONS BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND CANADA.

OTTAWA, Ontario, April 18.—The fishery correspondence to be laid before Parliament to-day will disclose that the Dominion Government notified to the Imperial Government that Canada would not assent to any sale of the fisheries without her consent, and that Great Britain replied that Her Majesty's Government never had any such intention; that as the negotiations for the Treaty of Washington proceeded, the Canadian Government urged the including of the Fenian claims, and also the obtaining of commercial trade advantages in return for the temporary use of the fisheries by the Americans. On these views not being included in the Treaty, the Canadian Government strongly remonstrated, and after the Treaty was concluded the British Government appealed to the Canadian Government to carry out the Treaty in the interest of the Empire, and allow Americans to fish in Canadian waters. The Canadian Government declined to grant this latter proposition, and placed on record their disapproval of the terms of the Treaty as regarded the fisheries and Fenian claims. The British Government rejoined, and eventually the Canadian Government proposed that in lieu of the Fenian claims against Great Britian, and to meet the anxious desire of the British Government, they would be ready to submit the Treaty for the favorable consideration of the Canadian Parliament, provided the British Government would guarantee a Canadian loan of £4,000,000 sterling, to be applied to the construction of a great Canadian Pacific Railway, and the extension of the canal system. The British Government replied, offering to guarantee £2,500,000, and the Canadian Government accepted the counter proposal, in view of the vast Imperial and Canadian interests involved, and in view of the importance of the association of the British Government with the Canadian Government in the construction of the Pacific Railway and Canal.

FRANCE AND GERMANY.

THE REPORT OF COMPLICATIONS REITERATED IN LONDON—IT IS DENIED IN PARIS.

LONDON, Thursday, April 18, 1872.

The Daily Telegraph, in an editorial article this morning, asserts in decided terms that its statements made a few days since, relative to the precarious condition of the relations between France and Germany, are founded upon undeniable facts. *The Telegraph* says:

We deem it our duty to declare the certain and solemn fact that upon President Thiers's decision this week depends the fate of France. We are not speaking rhetorically; we measure anxiously these most grave and momentous words. On Monday, Count von Arnim, the German Embassador to France, carried the ultimatum to President Thiers. The purport of this ultimatum is that Germany sees in the French Army bill and the speeches of President Thiers menaces of vengeance, and a programme for the eventual repudiation by France of her indebtedness to Germany. Prince Bismarck therefore demands that the armaments of France be reduced and the war estimates diminished, or the alternative will be the reoccupation by German troops of the evacuated French territory and war if necessary.

The Paris *Constitutionnel* positively contradicts the statements made by *The London Daily Telegraph*, that serious differences had arisen between France and Germany.

JAPAN.

FURTHER PRIVILEGES TO FOREIGNERS—EFFECT OF THE WELCOME TO THE EMBASSY.

YOKOHAMA, March 26—via SAN FRANCISCO, April 18.—Political affairs are exceedingly quiet. The first Japanese fair under the direction of the Government will take place at the sacred City of Kioto on April 10, and will last 50 days. Foreigners are allowed to visit it and the suburbs for a period of 64 days, enabling them to show their manufactures. This is considered the virtual abandonment of their exclusive policy, and one of the results from the visit of Iwakura to America. The reception of the news of the hearty welcome given the Japanese Embassy in California by all parties there, is highly appreciated by natives and foreigners alike. Several severe earthquakes have occurred in Japan recently. Gen. Williams and 40 Japanese students leave for America to-day; among the latter are some near relatives of the Mikado.

Although Japanese merchants are granted facilities and licenses for business, Van Reed's Rice Exchange at Yedo is still debarred from the same privileges. This action of the Government toward foreigners creates much comment. For the tea season just over, the exports were 1,600,000 pounds less than for the same time last year.

Two Japanese men-of-war leave here April 1 for Europe, via Suez Canal, to meet the Embassy returning via New-York and San Francisco. Great fears are entertained at Yedo of the loss of the Japanese steamer Kinsie Maru, formerly the American steamer Ta-Kiang, which left Yedo for Kobe Jan. 5, and has not since been heard from.

MEXICO.

SALTILLO OCCUPIED BY THE GOVERNMENT FORCES—AN ATTEMPT TO REENFORCE CORTINA.

MATAMOROS, April 18.—A rumor prevails that the Revolutionists received a courier, last night, from Camargo confirming the report that Saltillo was occupied by the Government forces under Gen. Zapuda, Governor of the State of Coahuila, on the 13th inst., and that he threatens Monterey. The Revolutionists evacuated Nuevo Laredo on the 11th and proceeded toward the interior, it is supposed, to reinforce Monterey. This leaves the ports of Guerro and Nuevo Laredo, on the Rio Grande, in possession of the Government. An effort will be made by Gen. Ayala to march out of this city with 800 National Guards, join Cortina's command, 600 strong, and give battle to Trevino and Quiroga's forces, near Reynosa, occupy Camargo, and force them back from the frontier to deprive them of the means of obtaining supplies across the Rio Grande, which they now possess.

REPUBLICAN CONVENTIONS.

VIRGINIA.

THE TEMPEST ALLAYED—GEN. GRANT'S INSTRUCTIONS TO CONVENTIONS—HE DOES NOT OBJECT TO OFFICE-HOLDERS AS DELEGATES.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

RICHMOND, April 18.—After two hours' filibustering, a vote was obtained at a quarter before 1 o'clock this morning, and resulted in the election of the Hon. Jas. H. Platt. This result was a transfer of the control of the body to a more liberal party than that which effected the temporary organization; but the subsequent proceedings show that it was still ruled by Federal office-holders. Indeed, the anti-Grant men were so overawed that they had to abandon all hope of doing anything within the Convention. The Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions was United States District-Attorney Hughes; another member was a Collector of Internal Revenue, and still another Postmaster. In one thing only were the office-holders beaten, and that was in the adoption of a resolution declaring it inexpedient to send office-holders to the Philadelphia