New-York Tribune.

VOL. XXXII....No. 9,688. NEW-YORK, TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1872. PRICE FOUR CENTS.

WASHINGTON.

THE NAVAL INVESTIGATION.

TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY ROBESON—A DISCOURAGING VIEW OF THE NAVY-YARDS—EXPENSIVE ENGINES WITHOUT SHIPS, AND GOOD SHIPS WITH WORTHLESS ENGINES—THE SECRETARY'S FINAL DEFENSE.

[GENERAL PRESS DISPATCH.]

WASHINGTON, April 22.—The Naval Investigating Committee met to-night. A few evenings ago some interest was excited to ascertain the cause of the discrepancy between the warrant for $52,000 allowed by the Navy Department for the loss of the steamer Governor and a check of Paymaster Stewart for that amount less $500. The Paymaster, in his testimony to-night, said that, at the request of S. P. Brown, he drew two checks, which made the full amount, the $500 check being in favor of A. G. Riddle, a lawyer of this city. S. P. Brown was recalled, and testified that he paid the $500 to Riddle, to transferred to a coal company, to which he was indebted. The witness testified as to his drawing money, and, in reply to Secretary Robeson, said that ex-Senator Cattell was not in the office when the money obtained on account of the Governor was divided in his office among parties interested in the claim; and in further contradiction of a former witness, Mr. Butler, witness said he did not send $20,000 of the money by the hands of Butler to be deposited in the savings bank. In response to Mr. Peters, witness said that Cattell was in no respect, to his knowledge, interested in the claim for Governor.

Austin Brown, son of S. P. Brown, testified that Cattell was not in his father's office when the money for the Governor was paid; Cattell paid him $2,500 on a due bill held from a firm in Philadelphia; it was a private matter, and had nothing to do with this investigation; this was on Dec. 6, and not in November when the Governor's money was paid.

By Mr. Archer—Witness has one half interest in the live oak contract with the Navy Department; has never paid any official in that Department any money or valuable thing to favor him in the matter of the contract.

Ex-Senator Cattell was recalled and testified as follows: Had no interest whatever in the claim for the Governor; did not know when it was settled; had been frequently at Brown's office, as Brown was his agent in procuring him a house; Mr. Archer of Philadelphia sent him the money to pay a draft in the hands of Brown; had no interest in the matter; what he did was merely a friendly act; was not present at the time the money for the Governor was paid; was certain of this, as the Civil Service Commission, of which he was a member, showed he was absent at the time.

By Mr. Peters—Never heard of the case of the Governor until this investigation was commenced. Mr. Cattell remarked he had been a merchant for thirty-six years, and was six years a United States Senator; he had held public and private trusts, involving millions upon millions of dollars, and this was the first time his integrity had been questioned.

Mr. Sargent requested Secretary Robeson to take the stand, and he was accordingly sworn. Mr. Sargent then directed the witness's attention to charges against him in *The New-York Sun*. The witness said he never employed ex-Senator Cattell or his brother to purchase supplies for the navy; never told any Paymaster or Chief of Bureau to favor anybody; never recommended them or their firm; never employed them, directly or indirectly, in any business with the Navy Department proper; they had, to his knowledge, no interest in contracts; never heard the Cattells had an interest in the iron-plate for the torpedo boats; on the contrary, both the Cattells and Pennock told him the Cattells had nothing to do with the contract with Pennock & Co.; witness had no interest in it; he never saw Pennock, nor Boyd, who is interested in the Eureka Works, until the latter appeared here as a witness; was never at their works; had no share in the profits; witness also denied that every pound of coal was contracted for with Cattell without competition. As to John Roach, witness never was at Chester except to pass through the place on his way to and from his home in New-Jersey; he had never seen John Roach, except on business at the Navy Department; did not know him in any other relation; he had not the slightest interest in Roach's business or property; never had an interest in Roach's contract or in any other; witness then gave a long account of the circumstances under which the contract with Roach was made for putting new compound engines in the steamer Tennessee, remarking incidentally that we have a number of good ships as to their hulls, but which were inefficient on account of their bad machinery. He was influenced by the consideration of trying an experiment which promised favorable results in securing good speed, economy of coal, convenience of officers' room, and, as a starting point, to secure an efficient navy. He wanted, not John Roach's bond, but a result.

In reply to Mr. Archer, witness said the law which requires materials and supplies to be advertised for, does not apply to engines; he held in his hand orders for $1,800,000 worth of machinery since 1867, and before the coming in of the present administration, including the incumbency of Mr. P. Sherwood, as Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, without advertisement; he did not, however, say all these orders were for engines, but some of them for engineering supplies; the same conversation passed between witness and Mr. Archer as to the construction of the law which requires supplies to be obtained by contract after advertisement, the witness quoting authorities to sustain him in this construction of the act of Congress. Referring to the subject of contracts with John Roach, witness said it would be more expensive to build engines in than out of our navy-yards; although in our navy-yards good machinery can be built, good vessels cannot be guaranteed.

Mr. Blair—"Why do you not employ efficient engineers." Witness—"The men employed at the Navy-Yards are men to run engines rather than build them; besides the first order of skill cannot be secured at prices now paid by the Government. We have in our Navy-Yards 50 engines occupying much room, and which never will be used. The machinery, too, is set up in every Navy Yard. There were no ships in which to put the engines built by Mr. Isherwood, costing millions of dollars; the attempt to put any of those engines into the Tennessee would cost more than the John Roach contract.

In reply to Mr. Sargent, witness explained that live oak contracts were given to Brown and Pearson about a year ago, after regular advertisement, they being the lowest bidders. Nobody in the Navy Department, nor the Cattells, had anything to do with these contracts. On being asked about the shipment of bricks to California, he said he knew nothing of it till he saw mention of it in the newspapers. As to the steamer Worcester, she was coaled, as he was informed by the Commandant of the Charlestown Navy-Yard, with coal bought in 1868.

Mr. Sargent then read to the witness an extract from *The New-York Sun*, in which witness was charged with corruption in the matter of the payment of the Secor claims, and of having participated in the payment. Witness said he had no interest of any kind or shape, manner or form, in the payment, neither was he promised, nor did he expect to receive any money or other consideration, either express or implied.

Witness read a letter from John Lenthall, addressed to him, protesting there was not a word of truth in the statement of *The Sun*, that he had, in reply to witness, protested against reopening the Secor claims; the Secretary did not order him to reopen them.

Secretary Robeson then read a long statement with regard to the Secor claim of $93,000. Of this amount a portion was for work and materials extra to their contracts, actually due, and furnished by order of the Department. This work was actually done and accepted by the Government. Similar debts for large amounts for like work had been allowed and paid to the contractors, and the Department has given a general direction that the contractors should be all treated alike in reference to their bills. These particular claims had not been finally passed upon but had been laid aside for further consideration; while matters were in this position, and while this debt remained due but unpaid, other contractors having been already paid, as witness had said, claims of an entirely different character, namely, for allowance for losses growing out of the increase of the cost of the labor and materials incurred by the contractors by reason of the delay occasioned by changes and alterations in the plans, &c., of the Iron-Clads, which were of necessity. Somewhat experiments at first, were pressed upon Congress by the contractors, and Congress on March 2, 1867, passed an act for the relief of certain contractors authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to investigate their claims for the for the purpose of ascertaining what amounts should be allowed each for the increase of expense incurred by them respectively, by reason of the alteration in the plans, &c., and the delays consequent thereon. After further discussing the question, the Secretary says:

The question was what claims were to be regarded as discharged under the last clause of the act of 1868; were they all claims against the vessel, or only all claims upon which the Board made the allowance? Or, the same thing, all claims under the act of March, 1867? Both of these qualifications are used, and they are clinched by the special reference to their report, which is a report, not upon the vessels, but a report upon and allowance of certain special claims. The only question is whether, in the collocation in which they are placed. They are descriptive of the claims referred to or are not. The entire facts of the case, and if manifest justice require such a construction and reading the act as supplementary to that of 1867, which it evidently is. It is undoubtedly the necessary construction; the fact that the payment of this claim was made from the proper appropriation is also clear and easily understood by any one familiar with the nature of the appropriations made for the bureaux of the Departments and with the course of legislation upon the subject, previous to the act of July, 1870, which separated the appropriations, and provided that the money appropriated for each year should be used only for the expenses and liabilities of that particular year. The amount of the appropriation to the credit of each bureau was made up not only of the money appropriated for the current year, but also of the balances of all former appropriations which remained unexpended.

The Secretary enters into the general question, saying, "The claim then appearing to be and remain a bona fide and just debt, owing to these parties from the Department on their direct engagement for which no payment or allowance had been made to them, though the other like claims had been paid to others, and the payment not seeming to me to be barred either by the letter or spirit of any law, I directed that the report of the Board be confirmed, and the amounts found by them to be due be paid, and that they were paid accordingly. The witness was further examined as to the allowance of pay for the steamer Governor and other subjects.

Mr. Sargent called witness' attention to the statement in *The New-York Sun* that he had made a great deal of money since he came into the Department. Mr. Robeson replied he is not worth as much to-day as when he came in; that he has never made a dollar beyond his salary since he came in, and that he has spent his salary, his private income, and a little more, during his administration of the Navy Department. Secretary Robeson said, in view of the fact, that no charge of corruption had been proved against him in this investigation, but on the contrary, each charge had been followed up and shown to be false, by the months of witnesses cognizant of the transactions; he had a right to expect from the Committee and every honest man, whatever might be their differences of opinion, as complete a vindication as the charges against him had been gross and outrageous.

The Committee, at 1:30 p. m., adjourned until Wednesday night.

SOUVENIR OF THE REBELLION.

INTERESTING SUPREME COURT DECISION—THE RIGHT OF SECESSION HELD IN QUESTION.

[GENERAL PRESS DISPATCH.]

WASHINGTON, April 22.—The following decision was made in the Supreme Court to-day:

White agt. Hart et al., error to the Supreme Court of Georgia.—This was an action on a note given for the price of a slave. The defense pleaded that by the new Constitution of the State the Court was prohibited from taking any jurisdiction of a case involving the validity of such a contract. The judgment of the Court was for the defendant, and it announced the following propositions:

Fifth: That when the Constitution of 1868 was adopted, Georgia was not a State in the Union; that she had surrendered her connection as such, and was a conquered territory wholly at the mercy of the conqueror, and that, hence, the inhibition of the States by the Constitution of the United States to pass any law impairing the obligation of contracts had no application to her.

Second: That her Constitution does not affect the contract, but only denies jurisdiction to her courts to enforce it.

Third: That her Constitution was adopted under the dictation and coercion of Congress, and is the act of Congress rather than of the State, and that, though a State cannot pass a law impairing the validity of contracts, Congress can, and that, for this reason also, the inhibition in the Federal Constitution has no effect in the case, this Court reverse this judgment, and in substance say:

The subject presented by the first proposition has been considered incidentally several times by this Court, and its former decisions, in respect of it, need only be reaffirmed. The National Constitution created not a Confederacy of States but a government of individuals. It assumed that the Government and the Union which it created, and the States which were incorporated into the Union, would be indestructible; and, as far as human means could accomplish such a work, it intended to make them so. The Government of the nation and of the State each are alike independent and absolute in their respective spheres of action, but the former is as much a part of a government of the people of each State, and as much entitled to their allegiance and obedience as their own local State Governments, the Constitution and laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof, being in all cases where they apply the supreme law of the land. The doctrine of secession is the doctrine of treason and practical secession is practical treason, seeking to give itself triumph by revolutionary violence. The late rebellion was without any element of right or sanction of law, and the duration and magnitude of the war did not change its character. The States in rebellion were never out of the Union, and never absolved from the duties, liabilities, and restrictions always incumbent upon them. On the second point, it is said that without the remedy the contract may not be said to exist. The ideas of validity and remedy are inseparable, and are both parts of the obligation which is guaranteed by the Constitution against invasion. Hence the denial of the remedy by the State was not valid because it annihilated the contract. The third of the propositions is said to be clearly unsound. Congress authorized the State to frame a new Constitution, and she elected to proceed within the scope of the authority conferred. The result was submitted to Congress, as a voluntary and valid offering, and was so received and recognized in the subsequent action of that body. The State is estopped to assail it upon such an assumption. Upon the same grounds she might deny the validity of her ratification of the constitutional amendments. The action of Congress upon the subject cannot be inquired into. The case is clearly one in which the Judiciary is bound to follow the action of the political department of the Government, and is concluded by it. It is added that if Congress had expressly dictated and expressly approved the proviso in question, such dictation and approval would have been without effect. Congress has no power to supersede the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Justice Swayne delivered the opinion, as also in the case from Arkansas, No. 42, Osborn agt. Nicholson et al. In that case there was a warranty that the slave was sound, and that he was a slave for life. The Court say that such a warranty does not extend to the exercise of the sovereign power of the State, by which the slave was emancipated, and that the thirteenth amendment of the Constitution does not affect the question; the contract, being valid when made, was enforcible in all the courts, and that subsequent legislation, either by statute or constitutional provisions, could not render it invalid. The Chief-Justice dissented, and stated that he would give his grounds in an opinion to be filed hereafter.

CURRENT TOPICS AT THE CAPITAL.

A NEW FINANCIAL PROPOSITION—THE ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS—MYSTERIOUS DISAPPEARANCE OF ARMY RECORDS—THE SENECA STONE INQUIRY.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

WASHINGTON, Monday, April 22, 1872.

Fernando Wood introduced to-day, for reference, a bill to prevent contraction and expansion of the money market, and to give elasticity to the currency, which provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall set apart $20,000,000 in coin, and issue $25,000,000 in legal tender notes in denominations of $1,000 each, and distribute these sums to the Assistant Treasurers as follows: At New-York, $14,000,000 in coin and $15,000,000 in currency; at Chicago, $2,000,000 in coin and $5,000,000 in currency; at Philadelphia, $2,000,000 in coin and $3,000,000 in currency; at Boston, $2,000,000 in coin and $2,000,000 in currency. The money is to be loaned by the Assistant Treasurers to corporations or individuals on security of United States bonds, to be deposited by them. The gold is to be loaned to the amount of 90 per cent of the face value of the bonds so deposited, and the greenbacks to the amount of 80 per cent, and the interest to be charged is fixed at not less than eight per cent. Mr. Wood's idea is that this measure would prevent any such corner in the money market as that recently attempted in New-York.

Gen. Butler has prepared a resolution for the final adjournment of Congress on the 29th of May, and wanted to introduce it to-day for passage under the two-thirds rule. The contested election case occupied the whole time, however, and gave him no opportunity to do so. It is understood to be the desire of the Administration to have Congress adjourn without fail before the assembling of the Philadelphia Convention, and to accomplish this it is deemed important to have both Houses agree as soon as possible upon the date, in order that the necessary business may be hurried forward. It is understood that the Senate will agree upon any day prior to the 6th of June which the House may fix.

The proceedings of the House, to-day, possessed scarcely a single feature of interest. Only a small number of bills were introduced, the greater part of the morning hour being occupied by the reading of Mr. Kelley's Tariff bill, which was demanded by the Democrats as a means of taking up the time and preventing a vote on the Civil Rights bill. Immediately after the expiration of the morning hour, Mr. McCrary called up the Indiana contested election case of Gooding agt. Wilson, and the rest of the day was spent in debating the matter, the result being that Mr. Wilson was declared entitled to retain his seat by a strict party vote of 105 to 64. This is the only case of the present session upon which the Elections Committee and the House have been divided by party lines. Mr. Wilson was elected by a majority of only four, and a subsequent recount of the votes gave to Gooding a small majority, but, as this recount was unofficial, and as there was no security that the ballot-boxes might not have been tampered with in the interim, the majority of the Committee decided to reject it as evidence. Just before the adjournment, Mr. Cox, from the Committee on the Rules, offered a resolution to amend the rules so as to admit ex-members to the floor only upon their declaring, upon their honor, that they have no interest in any legislative measure pending before Congress or any of its committees. The House adjourned without voting upon the resolution, which is a measure urgently demanded, for the reason that it is a well-known fact that a number of ex-members have established themselves as lobbyists in this city, and abuse their privilege of entrance to the floor by pushing their schemes in the most barefaced manner.

The Senate spent nearly an hour, to-day, in debating whether it would take up the North Carolina contested election case or the Tea and Coffee bill, deciding finally to go on with the former. Mr. Pool spoke about two hours in favor of admitting Mr. Abbott, and then the Senate took a recess until this evening, when the Postal Code bill was taken up. By common consent no action was to be taken on the bill to-night.

The remarkable disappearance from the files of the War Department of the entire record of the proceedings of the Court of Inquiry in the case of Major-Gen. Don Carlos Buell is likely to lead to an investigation by the Military Committee of the House. A resolution to give the Committee power to send for witnesses and ascertain, if possible, who is responsible for the loss, was prepared by a member of the Committee, and would have been offered in the House to-day had an opportunity been afforded. Gen. Buell has endeavored for many years to procure a copy of the proceedings of the Court, which, he claims, would, if made public, clear up his military record in the eyes of the country. He has uniformly been refused. He had recourse finally to Congress, and some weeks ago the Military Committee of the House addressed a letter to the Secretary of War, requesting a copy of the record. The Secretary replied that it was so voluminous that he had not clerical force sufficient to copy it. The matter was not allowed to rest here. Shortly after Gen. Swann, a member of the Military Committee, put a resolution through the House calling for the record. To this the Secretary replied last week as follows: "A careful search among all the records and files in this Department fails to discover what disposition was made of the proceedings of the Commission and the papers annexed thereto, and no record indicative of the nature of the report of the Board or the conclusion reached by it can be found other than are contained in the accompanying papers." This total disappearance of the most important historical record in the possession of the Government, relating to the operations of the Western armies from the battle of Shiloh to that of Perryville, is the more remarkable from the fact that the War Department is exceedingly careful of its archives. It is whispered about that there are two persons in high authority whose reputations would suffer were the record of the Buell court to see the light. The affair is certainly suspicious, and calls for investigation. Secretary Belknap explains the apparent discrepancy between his letter to the Military Committee, in which he spoke of the great volume of the record, and his statement to the House that no record whatever could be found, by saying that his letter to the Committee was based upon his knowledge of how extensive the record of such a court must be, and not upon an examination by himself or any subordinate of the document itself, the absence of which he says was only made known to him when he directed that it should be produced from the files.

The House inquiry into the alleged misuse of Seneca sandstone in the new State Department building will probably be closed on Friday next. Testimony continues to be largely in favor of the stone, and the report of the Committee will undoubtedly exonerate Mr. Mullett, the supervising architect, and declare that he did not overstep his authority in its use. It was intended by some of the members of the Committee, to which the subject was referred, to take testimony with reference to Gen. Grant's and Gen. Dent's stock in the Seneca Quarry, how much was paid for it, if anything, and all such matters relating to the Company, which an investigation would elicit, but a careful examination of the resolution creating the investigation shows that the scope is not broad enough for that purpose. The whole inquiry has been such a failure that it is possible there will be a unanimous report of the Committee, although it is not certain but a minority report of one will be presented by a Democratic member.

A Southern Republican member of Congress remarked to-day that Charles Sumner held the key to the political situation. If Congress should adjourn without passing his Civil Rights bill, and if he should declare for the Cincinnati nominees, the member was confident that a large part of the colored vote would be hopelessly lost to Grant, and that every Southern State would go against him.

The subject of the Postal Telegraph was before the Appropriations Committee of the House to-day, and Mr. Hubbard was heard on his plan which proposes to organize a company to do the telegraphing business of the country, under such directions as the Government may impose, a policy similar to the present Post-Office system, stamps being required to be placed upon each message, and to be supplied by the Government the same as postage stamps. Mr. Orton, the President of the Western Union Company, was expected to-day, but did not arrive. He will be the next witness before the Committee, in advocacy of continuing the present system, which seems to be entirely satisfactory to the stockholders of his company. Mr. Lines, a Government employé, also desires to be heard in advocacy of the Washburne plan, which is for the Government to buy and operate all lines now in use in this country, under restrictions to be imposed by statute.

A meeting of the Judiciary Committee, to investigate the serious charges made against Judge Delahay of the United States District Court of Kansas, has been held for the purpose of determining the truth of the charges, with a view of reporting a resolution of impeachment to the House. It was in testimony that he was what is called an "habitual drunker," and that he has been repeatedly drunk upon the bench. An instance was given of a case which occurred in Leavenworth, wherein the Judge, in sentencing a prisoner, said, in substance, that the prisoner had turned out very badly, that he was not the man he ought to be, that he had at one time a bright future before him, but that he had not taken advantage of the opportunities offered him, and had gone astray. He then informed the prisoner that it was within his (the Judge's) power to sentence him to six years in any Penitentiary which he might choose, but that, in consideration of his personal knowledge of the prisoner, he had decided to sentence him to the Alton Penitentiary for three years, and he informed the prisoner that the warden of the Penitentiary was a very good fellow, and that he (the Judge) knew him well, ending by assuring him that he would write to the warden in the prisoner's behalf, and that the warden would treat him like "a perfect gentleman."

The two months time allowed to Mr. Clarke (whose seat, as a member of Congress from the Third District of Texas, is contested by Mr. Geddings,) to collect evidence to establish his claim to the seat, expired on March 30, and the Election Committee have notified to him that he must appear to-morrow before the Committee; his counsel will ask for a further extension of time. Thus far Mr. Clarke has filed nothing except a few *ex parte* affidavits, and nothing relating to his case has been printed by the Committee. Mr. Geddings, on the other hand, has his testimony all in and printed, and it appears to show a majority in his favor of about 4,000 votes.

Mr. Ely of New-York, to-day, introduced a bill to repeal the section of the Revenue law of 1868, which compels cigar manufacturers to give bonds before commencing business. At the time of the passage of the act the Internal Revenue Department gave to the cigarmakers packages of revenue stamps, to be paid for when used, and the bonds were necessary to guarantee payment. But during the past two years the department has exacted payment in advance for all stamps, and consequently the bonds are no longer necessary for the protection of the Government.

[GENERAL PRESS DISPATCH.]

The British and American Mixed Commission met today, and, with the exception of extending the time for taking testimony in one or two cases, no business was done, and the Commission adjourned until to-morrow. Mr. Gurney, the British Commissioner, will leave this country on Saturday, and will resume his duties in the House of Commons, but will return to this country about September.

The May interest on the Public Debt will be paid on and after the 24th inst., without rebate.

The President has prepared another veto returning to the House without his signature the bill granting a pension to Richard P. Crawford, for the reason that Crawford is now drawing a pension as a private soldier, the wound on account of which he was pensioned having been received before his promotion to a lieutenancy.

The article commercially known as tin plate has not been touched in the new Tariff bill, but remains at 25 per cent ad valorem. It is the article of tin and iron plates, galvanized or coated with any metal, by electric batteries or otherwise, which has been placed at 2 cents a pound, and which is now 2½.

THE LEGISLATURE.

DULL SESSIONS IN BOTH BRANCHES.

ALBANY, April 22.—The proceedings of both the Senate and Assembly were exceedingly uninteresting this evening. During the last hour of the Assembly not over thirty members were present. The Senate ordered to a third reading the bill permitting the Avenue C Railroad to run an additional line connecting the Grand and Christopher-st. ferries. The same bill has already passed the Assembly.

The Governor will devote Thursday of this week to the hearing of persons who may have arguments to present for or against the New-York City Charter.

WILL THE CHARTER BE VETOED?

ALBANY, N. Y., April 22.—It is thought the Governor will veto the New-York City Charter on constitutional grounds, in which case it is regarded as doubtful whether the necessary two-thirds vote to pass the bill can be obtained.

[GENERAL PRESS DISPATCH.]

SENATE....ALBANY, April 22.

The Senate met at 7:30 p. m. A remonstrance against an elevated railroad on Third-ave., New-York, was read. The bill to declare the day for holding the general State election a public holiday was passed. Adjourned.

ASSEMBLY.

The Assembly met at 7:30 p. m. On motion of Mr. ALVORD, the Governor was requested to return the bill to pay counsel aiding the Attorney-General in prosecuting New-York officials, for the purpose of correcting the same.

The following bills were ordered to a third reading:

Providing for a new State Prison, and the removal of the prisoners at Sing Sing; to incorporate the New-York and South America Contract Company; to authorize the New-York Produce Exchange to sell its property; concerning crimes, their punishment, and proceedings in criminal cases. This bill defines crimes, fixes their punishment and regulates proceedings in criminal cases. A long discussion ensued, and without disposing of the bill the Committee rose and reported progress when the House adjourned.

AN INSECT PLAGUE.

JACKSON, Miss., April 22.—In this and adjoining counties bordering on Pearl River the insects commonly known as buffalo gnats have attacked farm horses and mules, and are so numerous and severe that many hundreds of animals have died within the past few days. The insects cause great apprehension on the part of the farmers, many of whom have no team with which to cultivate their crops.

STRIKE IN THE IRON TRADE.

POTTSVILLE, Pa., April 22.—The puddlers employed by Messrs. Atkins Brothers and Benjamin Haywood are on a strike, demanding an advance of wages. This action of the puddlers, who are 125 in number, throws out of employment 700 iron workers.

CRIMES AND CASUALTIES—BY TELEGRAPH.

....John Merrill of Hampton Falls, N. H., a well-to-do farmer, hanged himself in the woods on Saturday.

....The Chenango House in Binghamton was damaged by fire on Sunday to the extent of $5,000. Insured.

....The steamer Neva has been wrecked on the coast of the island of Banca, in the Malay Archipelago. Her crew and passengers were saved.

....A convict in the Auburn State Prison stabbed one of the keepers in three different places, yesterday, but not fatally. The keeper after he was stabbed shot the convict through the arm; the other keepers then rushed in and secured the convict.

FOREIGN NEWS.

THREATENED CRISIS IN THE BRITISH CABINET.

PROBABLE DEFEAT OF THE CABINET ON THE EDUCATIONAL QUESTION IN IRELAND—EFFECT OF THE ANNOUNCEMENT ON THE FINANCES.

LONDON, Monday, April 22, 1872.

The Daily News to-day states that it is possible that before the close of the next week the present Gladstone Cabinet will be dissolved and be succeeded by a Conservative Ministry, and that a general election for members of Parliament will take place during the latter part of the Summer. *The News* also says it is certain the Government will be defeated in the House of Commons when a division occurs on Mr. Fawcett's bill relative to the University of Dublin, which has been made a Cabinet question.

Two theories are advanced concerning the political prediction in *The News* of this morning. The one is, that the Ministry will really resign if defeated on Mr. Fawcett's Dublin University bill; the other is, that this announcement has been given out for the purpose of filling the Liberal benches at the session to-night. The announcement that the dissolution of the Ministry was possible has flattened the financial market. A meeting of the Privy Council was held at Windsor Castle to-day. Her Majesty the Queen presided. The members of the Cabinet were present.

AN ALLEGED COMPROMISE.

From The World of to-day.

LONDON, April 22.—The Government will not resign. They have agreed to promise not to endow a Catholic University in Ireland. This will satisfy the Secularists and Ultra-Protestants, and secure a majority against Fawcett's bill.

THE CAUSES WHICH ENDANGER THE POSITION OF THE CABINET.

The action of the British Cabinet upon the bill relative to the University of Dublin is another evidence of the want of decision which has characterized Mr. Gladstone on several important questions. Trinity College, which is really the University of Dublin, was founded for disseminating instruction on the basis of the Protestant religion. In 1792 it departed to a certain extent from its exclusive character and allowed Roman Catholics to be admitted to the course of instruction and to take degrees. Nevertheless, that class still remains excluded from competition for the highest prizes and from the government of the institution by tests which leave none eligible but members of the late Irish Church. Upon the disestablishment of that Church the excuse for these restrictions ceased. This was readily conceded by the authorities of the institution, and they agreed to an arrangement by which greater latitude should exist than either at Oxford or Cambridge. A bill was accordingly drafted to meet the views of the authorities by Mr. Henry Fawcett, Member of Parliament from Brighton, a Liberal of considerable distinction, who was educated at King's College, London, and Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and who, in 1863, was elected Professor of Political Economy at Cambridge.

Mr. Fawcett has maintained that the object of his bill was two-fold: It abolished completely and at once all religious tests, and it reconstituted the government of Trinity College and the University of Dublin, so as to gradually admit persons of all religious opinions to share in the government. As regarded the first object, the bill would be complete and instantaneous in its operation; it was, in this respect, a far more complete and effective measure than the University Test act passed for Oxford and Cambridge. With regard to the second object, the University and the College had previously been governed by a board consisting of the Provost and senior Fellows; he proposed to introduce a representative character into both College and University, and that both should be governed by representatives from the junior Fellows, from the Professors, and from the graduates. It was said that this plan would not admit at once a due proportion of Catholics and of Presbyterians to share in the government; but Mr. Fawcett said religious inequality had existed for centuries, and it was impossible immediately to efface all its traces.

The essential point of this plan is that it will perpetuate the system of mixed education in Ireland. But this point, which is the greatest merit of the bill with a majority of liberal-minded men, is the stumbling-block of the Roman Catholics. Mr. Gladstone accepts the clauses of the bill which abolish tests and acknowledges them as a useful and weighty reform; but he refuses to accept the bill as affording any settlement of the University question in Ireland, denying that the establishment of a system of mixed education can be regarded as solving the question of Irish education. In this Mr. Gladstone has been represented as being willing that Trinity College should accept the results of Disestablishment by voluntarily surrendering all exclusive privileges, but he will give no guarantee that the object for which this frank offer has been made shall be secured. When Mr. Fawcett, about a month ago, moved that his bill should be read a second time, Mr. Gladstone said he would vote for the abolition of the tests, but he distinctly declared himself against the principle of the bill, which, as Mr. Fawcett asserted, is affording State aid solely to united education. Mr. Gladstone then recalled his pledges, which have made so wide a breach between himself and the Nonconformists, who favor complete secular education throughout the United Kingdom. He said he was pledged to the belief that it "is an extreme hardship on that portion of the population of Ireland who do not choose to accept an education apart from religion, that they should have no University open to them in Ireland at which they may obtain degrees."

This was a virtual recognition of the demand of the Roman Catholics for separate educational institutions, and was consistent with the course of the Government on the educational questions in England and Scotland. Consequently, the defection of the Nonconformists, which was anticipated on the Scotch Education bill of the Government, could scarcely be expected to remain dormant when the Government failed to conform to their requirements on the question of Education in Ireland. Although the foregoing dispatches are somewhat vague in their tenor, it may be pretty safely assumed that it is such a defection of the Nonconformists from the Liberal ranks as is here indicated that has endangered the position of the Cabinet.

SPAIN.

THE CARLISTS AGAIN ACTIVE—DON ALPHONSO ORDERED TO LEAVE FRANCE.

MADRID, Monday, April 22, 1872.

The Carlists have again commenced their demonstrations against the Government, and are active in the provinces of Toledo and Navarre, where bands under the command of priests have appeared. Demonstrations in other portions of the kingdom are imminent. The Government authorities have arrested many persons in the cities of Madrid and Valladolid, and elsewhere, whom they suspect of complicity in the Carlist movement.

MARSEILLES, Monday, April 22, 1872.

Don Alphonso, the brother of Don Carlos, having arrived in this city, the French authorities have given him formal notice that he cannot be permitted to approach the Spanish frontier. The notice was accompanied by a request that he would leave France and go to Switzerland, with which the Prince has complied.

There is great excitement in Pampeluna, the capital of Navarre, 20 miles from the frontier. Don Carlos has promised his friends to appear there in person. Reënforcements are hurrying to the city and the volunteers are assembling under arms.

PARIS, Monday, April 22, 1872.

Don Carlos is reported to be at Annecy, on his way to Spain.

ACCIDENT TO THE STEAMER OCEAN QUEEN.

KINGSTON, Jamaica, April 22.—The English mail steamer from Aspinwall, just arrived, reports the American steamer Ocean Queen went ashore in the harbor of Aspinwall and sprung a leak. Her injuries are severe. She was announced to sail on the 20th inst., if her repairs were completed by that time.

FRANCE.

PROCEEDINGS IN THE ASSEMBLY—SPREAD OF REPUBLICANISM.

PARIS, Monday, April 22, 1872.

The adjourned session of the National Assembly was resumed this afternoon. The House discussed the order of business. President Thiers wanted the taxes to be disposed of first, then the formation of a Council of State might be taken up, but he hoped the discussion of the Army bill would be deferred, for grave political reasons. The Assembly, however, decided to consider first the scheme for a Council of State, and next the Army bill, leaving the tax question to an indefinite future.

The Radicals are rejoicing over evidences of the growth of Republican ideas in the Departments.

MEXICO.

ARRIVAL OF RE-ENFORCEMENTS AT MATAMOROS.

MATAMOROS, April 21.—The steamer Tobasco arrived at the mouth of the Rio Grande, at 11 o'clock to-day, from Vera Cruz, with Gen. Cevallas, 500 men, 40 officers, and two pieces of artillery. They embarked on a river steamer, at 2 o'clock, for this city, and are expected here to-night. The steamer Tabasco immediately left for Tampico, to bring 300 more troops, and money. The revolutionists have not yet appeared before the city, but are expected in force to-morrow. General satisfaction is expressed among the better classes at the timely arrival of reënforcements.

THE TRIAL OF STOKES.

COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENSE DISAGREE—WITHDRAWAL OF MR. BARTLETT FROM THE CASE—THE DISTRICT-ATTORNEY TO ANSWER THE BILL OF COMPLAINT TO-MORROW.

It has been rumored for several days past that one of the counsel of Edward S. Stokes, now in the Tombs awaiting trial for the murder of James Fisk, jr., committed nearly four months ago, had abandoned his case. On inquiry, it was ascertained that Mr. Bartlett had withdrawn in consequence of a disagreement of counsel as to the management of the defense. It was at first resolved by the united counsel, Messrs. Graham, McKeon, and Bartlett, to make public all the circumstances of the murder, by which it is deemed by the defense that an entirely different state of affairs from that which the public know would have been proved. This was to have been done on the examination before the Coroner, but the evidence for the prosecution led to other tactics. The examination of one of the hall boys disclosed, as the defense is said to claim, rank perjury, it having been since established, by the boy's own admission, as well as the testimony of numerous employés of the Grand Central Hotel, that, instead of seeing the murder as he had sworn, he was really in a different part of the hotel, and was first informed that Fisk had been shot by the murderer himself. It was found further that a lawyer employed by the Erie Company, and Fisk's former real estate agent, were on the Coroner's Jury, and these facts led Messrs. Graham and McKeon to resolve on withholding their evidence for the trial. To this Mr. Bartlett is understood to have demurred, but the counsel of the others prevailed, and the line of defense resolved on is still a mystery.

Stokes, on being asked in regard to this rumor, refused to converse upon it at all, except to assert, in a nervous, excited manner, that perjured evidence of the most villainous character had been used against him, and that more has been used and doubtless will be used against him. Suddenly checking himself, he refused to converse further on this point, but said he would like to have a denial of reports in various newspapers, that Miss Mansfield had visited him in the Tombs, or that he had ever begun any suit in common with her against Fisk. Stokes is greatly reduced by his close confinement, and his hair has turned gray.

The District-Attorney will reply to the bill of complaint on Wednesday before Judge Cardozo. The reply is almost as voluminous as the complaint itself, and will doubtless add to the entanglement into which this case has fallen, probably causing several months more of delay in the trial of one of the most important criminal cases known in this city for many years. Thus far, after four months of delay, Stokes has not even pleaded to the indictment.

XLIId CONGRESS—SECOND SESSION.

SENATE......WASHINGTON, Monday, April 22, 1872.

The Deficiency bill was taken up, the pending question being on the amendment offered by Mr. MORRILL (Rep., Vt.) restricting the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims in suits for captured and abandoned property to cases commenced within two years after the suppression of the Rebellion, and when the claimants prove to the satisfaction of the Court that they never gave aid or comfort to the Rebellion. Mr. BAYARD (Dem., Del.) opposed the amendment.

At the expiration of the morning hour Mr. LOGAN moved to take up the North Carolina contested election case.

Mr. SCOTT (Rep., Penn.) opposed the motion, and said that if it should be defeated, he would then move to take up the House bill for the repeal of the duty on tea and coffee.

Mr. LOGAN (Rep., Ill.) insisted that the Senate should stand by its agreement to consider the North Carolina case to-day.

Mr. MORRILL (Rep., Vt.) objected to take up the Tea and Coffee bill because of the absence of the Chairman of the Committee on Finance (Mr. Sherman), and also because he thought it ought not to be considered until the Committee on Privileges and Elections should have reported on the question of jurisdiction between the two Houses in relation to the Tariff bill.

Mr. THURMAN (Dem., Ohio) said that the Committee would report on Wednesday morning.

A message was received from the President transmitting a copy of the counter case of the United States against Great Britain.

Mr. SUMNER (Rep., Mass.) opposed taking up the Tea and Coffee bill in the absence of the Chairman of the Committee on Finance, and argued in favor of proceeding with the North Carolina case.

After further discussion, the North Carolina case was taken up by a vote of 35 to 22.

Mr. POOL (Rep., N. C.) then addressed the Senate in favor of giving the seat to Mr. Abbott. The question at issue was a question of law, and in deciding it the law and not the persons concerned should be considered. The desire of the people of North Carolina was that the law should be executed as the Senate might find it, and from them no complaint would be heard, no matter which way the case might be decided. There seemed to be some misapprehension as to the action of the late State Convention in North Carolina. That body had not memorialized or attempted to instruct the Senate on this subject. It had merely adopted a resolution expressing its views—a resolution intended for the people of North Carolina and not for the Senate of the United States.

Mr. STOCKTON (Dem., N. J.) argued briefly against the claim of Mr. Abbott.

Pending action on the question, the Senate at 4:20 o'clock p. m. held a brief Executive session, and then took a recess until 7:30 p. m., to meet then for the consideration of the postal code only.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Under the call of States a large number of bills were introduced and referred. Among the bills introduced was the following:

ANOTHER FINANCIAL SCHEME.

Mr. WOOD (Dem., N. Y.)—An act to prevent the contraction or expansion of the money market, and to give elasticity to the currency.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted, &c., that the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to set apart of the coin on hand in the Treasury, at the passage of this act, $20,000,000, and to issue in legal-tender notes of a denomination of not less than $1,000, a further sum of $25,000,000, which $45,000,000 shall be distributed and held exclusively for the purpose hereinafter stated.

SEC. 2. The $45,000,000 to be issued and reserved according to the first section of this act shall be placed in the hands of the Assistant Treasurers at New-York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Boston, to be loaned by them on the pledge of United States bonds, under the conditions and stipulations hereinafter stated, viz.: To New-York, coin, $14,000,000, legal-tender notes, $15,000,000; to Chicago, coin, $2,000,000, legal-tender notes $5,000,000; to Philadelphia, coin, $2,000,000, legal-tender notes, $3,000,000; to Boston, coin, $2,000,000, legal-tender notes, $2,000,000.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Assistant Treasurer aforesaid to make loans of the legal-tender notes to be issued by this act, for any period not longer than one year, to any and all corporations or individuals who may apply for the same, upon the pledge of the bonds of the United States to the extent of ninety per centum of the par or face value of said bonds, and to charge as interest on said loan at the rate of not less than eight per cent per annum; and to loan of the coin set apart for the purposes of this act to any and all corporations or individuals who may apply for the same, on the pledge of the bonds of the United States to the extent of eighty per centum of the par or face value of said bonds; provided, that the difference between the market value of coin and legal-tender currency shall not be more than twelve per centum; but if more than twelve per centum, the Assistant Treasurer shall reduce his loan of coin on the bonds the pro rata difference.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make any regulations which, in his judgment, may be necessary to execute this act not inconsistent with its provisions, and all acts or parts of acts which in any way interfere with this act, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. This act shall take effect immediately.

A large part of the morning hour was consumed in the reading of a long Internal Revenue bill, introduced by Mr. MAYNARD (Rep., Tenn.), and which he said he would offer as a substitute for the internal revenue portion of the bill reported by the Committee of Ways and Means. Mr. Hooper's Supplementary Civil Rights bill was not reached during the morning hour.

Mr. FARNSWORTH (Rep., Ill.) presented the report of the Conference Committee on the bill to prevent straw bids for carrying the mails, and it was agreed to.

The House then took up the Indiana contested election case of Gooding against Wilson, the report of the Committee being that Wilson, the sitting member, is entitled to the seat. After discussion, the resolution giving the seat to Mr. Wilson was adopted—Yeas, 105; Nays, 64.

Mr. ELY introduced a bill to repeal the law which requires cigar manufacturers to give bonds.

On motion of Mr. BANKS (Rep., Mass.), a resolution was adopted calling on the President for correspondence touching the claims for indirect damages against Great Britain.

Mr. COX (Dem., N. Y.), from the Committee on Rules, reported a rule excluding from admission to the floor of the House ex-members of Congress who do not declare on honor that they have no personal or private interest in any legislative measure before the House or any of its committees, the object being to exclude ex-members who are engaged in lobbying. Without disposing of the resolution, the House adjourned.

TELEGRAPHIC NOTES.

....The deaths from small-pox in Baltimore for the past week were 23.

....The celebration of the anniversary of the Fifteenth Amendment in Richmond, Va., was the most successful affair ever gotten up by the colored people in that city. The procession was over a mile long, and was composed of 33 military and civic organizations. At the head of the line was an immense wagon filled with girls dressed in white, and representing the States of the Union. Everything passed off in an orderly manner.

THE ALABAMA CLAIMS.

PUBLIC SENTIMENT IN ENGLAND.

ENGLAND ADVISED TO WITHDRAW FROM THE ARBITRATION—PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT.

LONDON, Monday, April 22, 1872.

The Times of this morning devotes another article to the Alabama Claims difficulties. Alluding to the rumors prevalent on the one hand that the United States will withdraw their extraordinary claims, and on the other that they will maintain them, *The Times* says:

"Perhaps the policy of President Grant consists in keeping the Case unsettled until the 15th of June, the time for the reassembling of the Tribunal of Arbitration at Geneva. The duty of England under these circumstances is plain. She should proceed no further in the arbitration if the claims of the American Government for indirect damages are not withdrawn."

The Times strongly urges the adoption by Parliament of the motion Lord Russell intends to introduce for an address to the Crown, urging the suspension of proceedings on the part of Great Britain before the Geneva Tribunal until the American claims for indirect damages are withdrawn.

The Duke of Richmond in the House of Lords, and Mr. Disraeli in the House of Commons, gave notice to-night that they should question the Government to-morrow as to whether it was prepared to give Parliament and the country assurance that further proceedings before the Geneva Board for the Arbitration of the Alabama Claims will be suspended unless the claims for indirect damages are withdrawn and abandoned by the Government of the United States.

In the Upper House, Lord Oranmore wanted all the papers produced, and also the minutes of the conversations accompanying the presentation of the British counter case at Geneva. The record he believed would prove humiliating to the country. He declared it was degrading to ask the American Government any question as to the propriety of Great Britain presenting the counter case.

Earl Granville replied that there had been no degradation. He described his conversations with Mr. Schenck, the American Minister, as entirely personal. Mr. Schenck agreed to ask the Government at Washington its view of the propriety of the presentation by Great Britain of her counter case and accompanying document at Geneva. To this inquiry no answer had been received.

TEXT OF THE AMERICAN COUNTER CASE.

WASHINGTON, April 22.—The President to-day transmitted for the information of the Senate a copy of the counter case of the United States in the matter of the claims against Great Britain, presented to the Board of Arbitration at Geneva, as follows:

The fourth article of the Treaty of Washington permits each party, within four months after the delivery of the case, to deliver in duplicate to the arbitrators and to the agent of the other party a counter case and additional documents, correspondence and evidence in reply to the case, documents, correspondence, and evidence produced by the other party. Availing themselves of this right, the United States present this as their counter case, together with additional documents, correspondence, and evidence, in reply to the case, documents, correspondence and evidence submitted by Her Majesty's Government. In laying this counter case before the Tribunal of Arbitration, they deem it proper to premise that they do not consider it within the province of this paper to discuss all the propositions within the British case, which they regard as justly disputable or requiring argumentative discussion. So far as the positions taken by Her Majesty's Government in its case may vary from those which the United States had the honor to lay before the tribunal in their case, they respectfully refer to that document for an expression of the views which they regard as supported by sound principles of reason and by the acquiescence of other powers, and by the writings of publicists of authority. So far, too, as contestations of questions of fact raised between the parties on their respective cases, and the supporting evidence on either side, a mere renewal of the contest in the counter case would be superfluous; the United States, therefore, refer to their original case for their views and estimates of the contested matters of fact. It has seemed to them to be more in accordance with the spirit of the Treaty and with the convenience of the tribunal thus to reserve for the counsel the general analysis and discussion of these matters, so far as they shall prove important in their bearing upon the substantial controversy between the parties in the agreement, which will be prepared by them for submission under the fifth article of the Treaty, and in such oral arguments, if any, as the tribunal may express a wish to hear. Reserving, therefore, their rights and the freedom of their counsel in these respects, they ask the attention of the tribunal to the following observations upon some of the main points of difference between the case and other matter submitted on the part of Her Majesty's Government and those submitted on the part of the United States.

ERRORS IN THE BRITISH CASE.

Certain errors of sense which run through the case of Her Majesty's Government first claim attention:

First: It is assumed in that case that the Rebels of the United States were by her Majesty's Proclamation of May 3, 1861, invested with some undefined political attributes, but the United States have hitherto understood that Her Majesty's Government merely assumed to regard the persons who resisted the power of the United States as a body of insurrectionists, who might be recognized as clothed with belligerent rights at the discretion of neutral powers. They, therefore, think it ought to conclude that frequent use in the British case of language implying recognized political attributes in the insurrection is an inadvertence.

Second: Her Majesty's Government assume that the reclamations of the United States are to be confined to claims growing out of the acts of the Florida, the Alabama, the Georgia, and the Shenandoah. The claims growing out of the acts of the other vessels named in the American case are regarded by the United States as also embraced within the terms of the Treaty. They form part of the claims generally known as the "Alabama Claims." They are enumerated in the fourth of a series of five volumes printed by order of the Senate of the United States, which are part of the documents, correspondence, and evidence submitted with the case of the United States. These volumes, when thus collected and printed, were entitled, "Claims of the United States against Great Britain." It is believed that under that title they were in the library of the Foreign Office at London before Her Majesty's High Commissioners received their instructions. It may also be said without impropriety that, under the same title, they were on the table of the Joint High Commission during the negotiations which preceded the conclusion of the Treaty. The United States, therefore, while reasserting their construction of the language of the Treaty in this respect, feel that they have the right to ask the arbitrators to assume that Her Majesty's High Commissioners had notice of and acquiesced in that construction. The United States are at a loss to understand why several observations are introduced into the British case which apparently aim to limit the operation of the three rules of the Treaty. If, by the principles of construction which are suggested, Her Majesty's Government intend to ask for a modification or change in those rules, the United States cannot too strongly protest against it.

Fourth: It is averred in several places that some of the acts of which the United States complain were committed by American citizens. If these statements are introduced for the purpose of urging this fact as an excuse for the negligence of Her Majesty's officials, or for any other supposed relevant purpose, the United States will ask the tribunal to take note that the "American citizens" referred to were criminals in the eye of American law at the time when they were elevated to the rank of recognized belligerents against the United States by the act of Her Majesty's Government, an act in which the United States did not participate, and against which they have never ceased to protest. It would seem, therefore, to be impossible to impute to the United States any consequences of responsibility for the conduct of the persons thus described as "American citizens."

THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF NEUTRALS.

II. Her Majesty's Government has also stated, in terms, many propositions, some of law, some of fact, and some of mixed law and fact, for the convenience of the Arbitrators. The United States call attention to some of the leading points of difference between the two cases with the reservation heretofore made as to the points not noticed, and as to the rights of counsel.

First: The British case seems to concede that a belligerent who has wronged a neutral by violating its sovereignty, and by forcing it to take part indirectly in a war, may, nevertheless, by some subsequent act, such as commissioning without the jurisdiction of the neutral a vessel of war improperly constructed within its jurisdiction, deprive the neutral of the right of taking cognizance of the original offense. The United States suggest that such a right cannot be lost by the mere act of the offending belligerent.

Second: It appears to claim for vessels of rebels recognized as belligerents an exemption from national jurisdiction, which should be accorded, if at all, only to vessels of recognized sovereign powers, to which powers political representations can be made in case of violations of neutral sovereignty, and it ignores undoubted preroga-

See Eighth Page.