The Press.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1865.

☞We can take no notice of anonymous communications. We do not return rejected manuscripts.

☞Voluntary correspondence is solicited from all parts of the world, and especially from our different military and naval departments. When used, it will be paid for.

TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS — HAS THE INQUIRER OVER "SIXTY THOUSAND CIRCULATION?"

We do not intend that the *Inquirer* shall escape the real issue of the present controversy. There are two facts to be settled before we proceed any further:

I. "*Circulation over* 60,000."

This has appeared in large type under the head of the *Inquirer* for years.

II. "THE CIRCULATION OF THE INQUIRER AVERAGES OVER SIXTY THOUSAND COPIES DAILY, BEING MORE THAN DOUBLE ALL THE SUBSCRIPTION AND THREE-CENT DAILY PAPERS IN THE CITY COMBINED."

This has appeared under the editorial head of the *Inquirer* for many months.

This is the case of the *Inquirer*, and upon the truth of these statements we renew our proposition of Thursday, with one modification. We shall not ask the *Inquirer* to advance a dollar, but we shall double the amount of our proposition, and place in the hands of Mr. BINNEY, of the Sanitary Commission, and Mr. STUART, of the Christian Commission, the sum of ten thousand dollars, to be distributed to both of these institutions on these terms:

TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS if the *Inquirer* has over "sixty thousand circulation."

FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS if the *Inquirer* has over fifty thousand circulation.

TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS if the *Inquirer* has over forty thousand circulation.

ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS if the *Inquirer* has over thirty thousand circulation.

We make this offer in good faith, and propose that the month of December shall be taken as the test, and Mr. BINNEY, Mr. STUART, and any third party the *Inquirer* may name, shall take affidavits of clerks and pressmen. We cannot make this offer more conclusive and comprehensive. *If the Inquirer has not persistently published an untruth for years, let it make good its own assertions and thus aid two most deserving charities.*

With this proposition, which we leave open to the *Inquirer* to accept whenever it pleases, we now propose to close this discussion. Before doing this, let us congratulate our readers upon having practically accomplished the object we had in the beginning. On Tuesday morning the first article on this subject appeared in THE PRESS. On Tuesday morning, at the head of the *Inquirer*, was this phrase: "*Circulation over* 60,000." On Wednesday the *Inquirer* hurriedly hauled down its "flaunting lie," and now a meaningless phrase occupies the place. At the same time, it withdrew its long-continued announcement that "the circulation of the *Inquirer* averages over sixty thousand copies daily, being more than double all the subscription and three-cent daily papers in the city combined." Why is this? Why does the *Inquirer* abandon this long-published pretension? On last Tuesday its circulation was "over sixty thousand." For years it has been "over sixty thousand." *When did it fall?* Let our contemporary frankly confess that this declaration was withdrawn in obedience to THE PRESS, and in dread of the very exposure we have been called upon to make. We knew that the *Inquirer* had been deceiving the people; we entered this discussion determined that all the world should know it. We little thought, however, that the *Inquirer* would so frankly confess the deception.

The *Inquirer*, in response to our challenge, uses the following language:

At the same time, *The Press* does not offer to give any evidence as to its own condition. This is a variance from our challenge, which is upon the respective circulations. It would give to-day, first-class, high-priced, and *flush* cotemporary the advantage of exposing our business while it concealed its own. *Facts are to be taken in by* such thinly-varnished trickery. If there is to be any *showing of hands* we are not willing that our neighbors shall conceal *his knave*.

We have a difficulty in understanding this paragraph, because certain words, which we place in italics, are obscure. Such phrases may be familiar to the *Inquirer*, but our own associations have never given us an opportunity of hearing them, and their meaning is therefore vague. Translated into decent English, however, we presume the *Inquirer* means to say that, while we wish it to expose its business, we at the same time object to expose our own. This would be a reasonable complaint if it had any merit; but let us look at it. We do not ask the *Inquirer* to expose its business. *It has made its own exposure. For years it has told every reader that it had over "sixty thousand circulation."* THE PRESS has made no such boast. When a customer asks us we show him our books, and he can see for himself. The *Inquirer* may as well understand that when we print a declaration at the head of this newspaper we mean to sustain it against any challenge, and shall not meanly endeavor to change the issue. The question is not what does THE PRESS, nor how many advertisers has THE PRESS, nor what is the circulation of THE PRESS—for we make no pretensions. *These questions are answered over the counter every day in the ordinary course of business, and if any customer is not satisfied with our answers he can go elsewhere and suit himself.* The only question is this: HAS THE INQUIRER "OVER SIXTY THOUSAND CIRCULATION?" When the *Inquirer* answers this question we shall be willing to answer any new controversy it cares to make. Already it admits it has not. *Already it declines a proposition which would have given to the Sanitary and Christian Commissions one thousand dollars, provided it could show even twenty thousand circulation.*

We regret the necessity of this exposure, but we were driven to it by a high sense of duty. It was time that this great deception should cease, and it has ceased! It was time that the respectable journals of this city should not be insulted and misrepresented and their business assailed by this newspaper bully; and we think we have stopped that thing forever. It was time that the honest merchants of Philadelphia should be told that in spending money to find "sixty thousand" readers for their business, they must avoid the *Inquirer*. The *Inquirer* may well feel satisfied if the matter ends with THE PRESS exposure. If a merchant contracts for "sixty thousand" circulars to be printed and circulated, and not one-half are done, the person so contracting could be indicted for obtaining money under false pretences and sentenced to imprisonment. What defence could the *Inquirer* make if any advertiser for six months should institute criminal proceedings against the *Inquirer* for claiming to print and circulate sixty thousand copies of his advertisements? We are very much afraid, if justice were done, the *Inquirer* would be at the mercy of the Governor CURTIN whom not many months ago it wantonly and shamefully slandered. For ourselves, we sincerely trust that none of our friends will find it necessary to take this course. We see evidences of contrition on the part of the *Inquirer*. It has confessed its sin by ceasing to sin, and if it only accepts the good advice of THE PRESS, so frankly and generously given, it may attain that position of respectability and dignity which it has so plainly forfeited.

We thus close our discussion with the *Inquirer*. *That newspaper can reopen it only whenever it cares to accept the proposition we have made.* When it makes good its own daily declaration of years it will be time for us to speak of the other subjects it presents. At this time, however, our purpose is not to institute a comparison between the merits of the *Inquirer* and THE PRESS, but to tear off the mask and show how much deception has been heretofore hidden. And this, we think, has been most effectually done.

"A Daniel Come to Judgment."

In the Court of Exchequer, at London, a little before Christmas, a trial came off, and a decision was made, in which Mr. Baron MARTIN, the presiding judge, showed that a Daniel *had* come to judgment, though not in the sense of the words as applied to the disguised Portia, in the celebrated case Shylock vs. Antonio. In the London case, one party sued another for breach of contract. It appeared, on the opening of the case, that the contract related to the engaging a vessel to run the blockade at Charleston. On this, Baron MARTIN said that he did not think that the plaintiff could recover, *as the contract was illegal*. He was reminded, by plaintiff's counsel, that Mr. Justice WILLES had decided the other way, in the Court of Common Pleas (in another case), and that the judges of that court, sitting *in banco*, had sustained that decision. Baron MARTIN still adhered to his opinion, declaring that nothing could make him believe that an *illegal* could possibly be declared a *legal* act. He said that it was for the credit of England that all the parties engaged in this transaction were foreigners. In the end, a verdict for the plaintiff was taken by consent, subject to a decision, *in banco*, on a point of law. This decision will be curiously looked for, inasmuch as Sir FREDERICK POLLOCK, (Baron MARTIN'S father-in-law,) the Chief of the Court of Exchequer, notoriously sympathizes with "the so-called Southern Confederation," and showed his leaning that way by the palpable partiality of his charge to the jury in the case of the Alexandra, and by the manner in which he played fast-and-loose on the appeal against his charge and the jury's verdict, thereby literally jockeying the appellants out of a decision in their favor. Another noticeable feature in this case is that Sir SAMUEL MARTIN, of the Court of Exchequer, who holds that a contract for an illegal purpose—i. e., running the blockade—is necessarily illegal, and Sir JAMES S. WILLES, of the Court of Common Pleas, who decided otherwise, are the only Irishmen on the judicial bench in England. Sir WILLIAM SPEE, of the Court of Queen's Bench, though of Irish descent, and M. P. for a time, for an Irish county, is a native of England.

A European Protectorate of the South. The leading rebel papers foreshadow the possibility that the rebel States, rather than yield to the power of the Union, will offer themselves as *quasi* colonies to France or England. This event should not, if the European Powers are just, result in their recognition of the dissolution of the Union, for it would be a confession that the insurgents were unable to take the Southern States from the Republic, and, therefore, foreign interference could not have the least possible justification. Hitherto intervention has been demanded by the South, contemplated, it may be, by Europe, on the ground that the States in rebellion maintain a successful war. That ground fails beneath the feet of a demoralized army and a tottering conspiracy. France and England would not dare to violate international law, or the common justice of the world, by assuming a protectorate of the States which would thus acknowledge that they had no power of themselves to withdraw from the Union. "Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow." If the suggestions of the Richmond papers are to be adopted as the policy of the Richmond Government, the demonstration of the failure of the rebellion ought to be the destruction of the danger of European interference.

WE HAVE A RUMOR that England intends to largely increase her military force in Canada. This report was current several months ago, and is as likely to be false now as then.

IN THE WANT of a better victory, the rebels are reduced to exult over the destruction of the transports in the Roanoke river. The affair is a mere bagatelle. It has not the slightest influence on any part of the war.

WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, January 6.

MR. STEVENS' TOBACCO BILL.

Representative STEVENS to-day introduced a bill in amendment of the revenue laws, which requires all persons having tobacco on hand to make an immediate return of the quantity and kind to the district assessor, and forbids removal without permit of the assessor. It permits the establishment of bonded warehouses in the cities of New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Louisville, Paducah, St. Louis, and other places, under the custody of an officer of the Treasury. Permits may also be obtained for private warehouses under Treasury regulations. It allows tobacco to be exported without payment of tax, on packed and prepared for market by the owner, on his own premises, or sold on the premises without payment of tax, but it may not be manufactured until it has been stored in a bonded warehouse. The taxes to be imposed upon manufactured tobacco are left in blanks. The bill was referred to the Committee of Ways and Means.

MR. HASSON'S JOINT RESOLUTION.

The following is the joint resolution introduced by Representative HASSON to-day, and which was referred to the Committee of Ways and Means:

Resolved, That so long as the current rate of premium for exchange on London, when bought at New York with gold money of the United States, shall exceed sixty dollars per centum, payable for the printing of books, periodicals, and newspapers may be admitted at the custom ports of the United States from any foreign country free of duty, and the rate of exchange shall be ascertained and declared for the purpose of this resolution by the Secretary of the Treasury.

SENATE CONFIRMATIONS.

The Senate to-day, in executive session, confirmed the nomination of JAMES L. HOOD, of Illinois, to be consul at Bankok, Siam.

CONVERTED REBELS.

The mail boat, which arrived this morning from City Point, brought up seventy-five rebel prisoners and deserters, who have all taken the oath of allegiance.

XXXVIIIth CONGRESS—Second Session.

SENATE.

Vice President HAMLIN in the chair.

INDIAN LANDS.

The CHAIR laid before the Senate a communication giving information in relation to the sale of Indian lands, called for by a resolution some time since.

SOLDIERS' RATIONS.

Mr. FOSTER, of Connecticut, presented the petition of officers of the Connecticut Light Artillery, asking for an increase of the rations issued to soldiers. They state that the allowance of rice, potatoes, and bread is too small. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PAY OF OFFICERS.

Petitions from officers of the army for an increase of pay were presented by Messrs. POMEROY and WILSON.

SLAVERY.

Mr. SUMNER, of Massachusetts, presented the petition of citizens of Worcester, Massachusetts, for the abolition of slavery. Referred to the Committee on Slavery.

PETITIONS REPORTED BACK.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio, from the Finance Committee, reported back a petition asking for the remission of duty paid on the materials used in the manufacture of cannon by the Sisters of Charity, and asked that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the same. So ordered.

PENSION AGENTS.

Mr. TRUMBULL, of Illinois, offered a resolution, which was passed, calling upon the Secretary of the Interior for information as to the number of pension agents employed by the Government now and in each State, under what law they are employed, etc.

CRIMINAL TRIALS.

Mr. TRUMBULL called up the bill to regulate proceedings in criminal cases, relating especially to the punishment of the crime of treason, which was passed. It provides that where the offence charged be treason—a capital offence—the defendant shall be entitled to twenty and the United States to five peremptory challenges on a trial. For any other offence the United States shall be entitled to two peremptory challenges and the defendant to ten. The bill also prohibited treason of an offence against the United States shall be secured by imprisonment for a period longer than one year. It shall be lawful for the court by which the sentence is passed to order the same to be executed in any State prison or penitentiary within the district or district where such court is held the use of which prison or penitentiary is authorized by the Legislature of such State for such purpose, and the expenses attending the execution of the sentence shall be paid by the United States. The bill takes effect on the 1st of June, 1865.

UNEMPLOYED ARMY OFFICERS.

Mr. WILSON, of Massachusetts, called up the bill to provide for the relief of unemployed officers of the army. The report of the Military Committee on this subject recommending that the bill do not pass, was read.

Mr. WILSON moved that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. TRUMBULL was sorry that the Committee on Military Affairs had come to such a conclusion. He was not prepared to controvert the soundness of the position assumed by the committee, or to deny that the Executive has competent authority to dismiss officers from the service; but it was an authority which the Executive would be very slow to exercise. He believed it had always been customary in the history of the Government for Congress to legislate for the disposition of army officers. It was done in the wars of the Revolution and of 1812. If the precedent proposed by the committee were adopted, and the power left in the President's hands, Congress would have to surrender up its authority to reduce the army and discharge officers at the close of the present war. He would like to inquire of the chairman of the Military Committee whether we had not always been legislation to get rid of supernumerary officers that would not be necessary in time of peace. An act of Congress was passed to muster out such officers in 1816 or 1817.

Mr. GRIMES said that during the last war several regiments of the line were stationed regular infantry. At the expiration of the war it became necessary to reduce the army. That required legislation. But the volunteer officers had no power to muster them out of service of the war.

Mr. TRUMBULL could see no difference between regulars and volunteers in such a matter as this. If it was necessary after the war of 1812 to legislate on this subject it was equally so now.

Mr. GRIMES said there was no parallel between the two cases.

Mr. TRUMBULL understood that the report of the committee was upon the ground entirely that the President had authority to relieve the country of this evil. If idle officers, receiving pay from the Government and rendering no service, would the Senator from Iowa tell the Senate and the country why, if in 1815 or 1816 legislation was necessary to get rid of unnecessary officers, it was not so now?

Mr. GRIMES stated, in reply to Mr. Trumbull, that Congress created fifteen or twenty regiments in the last war with Great Britain. And the officers were appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They had neither been mustered out or had resigned, knowing they would be mustered out. The facts in relation to every officer could be put in possession of the President, and he could act upon them, and take the responsibility. He (Mr. Wilson) did not want this responsibility shifted upon the Congress of the United States. If the bill was passed as it came from the House it would leave it in the power of any commanding officer to secure the dismissal of his subordinates. By re-organization of brigades and divisions, officers might be thrown out of the service at the expiration of three months under this bill. There was more intrigue in the army among officers than in the most excited political canvasses among politicians. There was no competition between the officers and jealousies of army officers and of civilian men in the civil service, and he (Mr. Wilson) thought Congress or the country ought to increase the means for carrying out this rivalry, as it would by passing the House bill. When a general was out of service, it was the duty of the Executive to let the employment nor ought to be employed. If he was out of the service for cause, he ought to be dismissed; but if, as was frequently the case, he was out because of the jealousy or rivalry of a superior officer, the President should not be allowed to justify himself by the Legislature of such State for such purpose, and the expenses attending the execution of the sentence shall be paid by the United States. The bill was then taken