FROM WASHINGTON.

Message from the President.

He Attempts to Justify His Removal of Secretary Stanton.

(By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 24, 1868.

The President to-day sent to the Senate the following message, which was read in secret session, laid on the table, and ordered to be printed. The Senate removed from it the injunction of secrecy.

To the Senate of the United States:

I have received a copy of the resolution adopted by the Senate on the 21st instant, as follows:

"*Resolved*, The Senate have received and considered the communication of the President, stating that he had removed Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War, and has designated the Adjutant General of the Army to act as Secretary of War *ad interim*, therefore,

"*Resolved*, by the Senate of the United States, that under the Constitution and laws of the United States the President has no power to remove the Secretary of War, and designate any other officer to perform the duties of that office *ad interim*."

This resolution is confined to the power of the President to remove the Secretary of War, and to designate another officer to perform the duties of the office *ad interim*, and by its preamble is made expressly applicable to the removal of Mr. Stanton, and the designation to act *ad interim* of the Adjutant General of the Army. Without, therefore, attempting to discuss the general power of removal as to all officers, upon which subject no expression of opinion is contained in the resolution, I shall confine myself to the question as thus limited, the power to remove the Secretary of War.

It is declared in the resolution "that under the Constitution and laws of the United States the President has no power to remove the Secretary of War and designate any other officer to perform the duties of that office *ad interim*." As to the question of power under the Constitution, I do not propose at present to enter upon its discussion. The uniform practice from the beginning of the government, as established by every President who has exercised the office, and the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, have settled the question in favor of the power of the President to remove all officers, excepting a class holding appointments of a judicial character. No practice or any decision has ever excepted a Secretary of War from the general power of the President to make removals from office. It is only necessary then that I should refer to the power of the Executive under the laws of the United States to remove from office the Secretary of War.

The resolution denies that under these laws this power has any existence. In other words, it affirms that no such authority is recognized or given by the statutes of the country. What then are the laws of the United States which deny the President the power to remove that officer? I know but two laws which bear upon this question. The first in order of time is the Act of August 7th, 1789, creating the Department of War, which, after providing for a Secretary as the principal officer, proceeds as follows:

SECTION 2. That there shall be in the said Department an inferior officer, to be appointed by the said principal officer, to be employed therein as he shall deem proper, and to be called chief clerk in the Department of War, and who, whenever the said principal officer shall be removed from office by the President of the United States, or in any other case of vacancy, shall, during such vacancy, have the charge and custody of all records, books and papers pertaining to the said Department.

It is clear that this act, passed by a Congress, many of whose members participated in the formation of the Constitution, so far from denying the power of the President to remove the Secretary of War, recognizes it as existing in the Executive alone, without the concurrence of the Senate, or of any other department of the Government. Furthermore, this act does not purport to confer the power by legislative authority, nor in fact was there any other existing legislation through which it was bestowed upon the Executive. The recognition of the power by this act is therefore complete, as a recognition under the Constitution itself, for there was no other source or authority from which it could be derived.

The other act, which refers to this question, is that regulating the tenure of certain civil offices, passed by Congress on the second day of March, 1867. The first section of that act is in the following words:

That every person holding any civil office to which he has been appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and any person who shall hereafter be appointed to any such office and shall become duly qualified to act therein, is and shall be entitled to hold office until a successor shall have been in like manner appointed and duly qualified, except as herein otherwise provided: provided that the Secretary of State, of the Treasury, of War, of the Navy, of the Interior, the Postmaster General, and the Attorney General, shall hold their offices respectively for and during the term of the President by whom they may have been appointed, and for one month thereafter, subject to removal by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The fourth section of the same act restricts the test of office to the limit prescribed by the law creating them. That part of the first section which precedes the proviso, declares that every person holding a civil office, to which he has been or may be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall hold such office until a successor shall have been in like manner appointed. It purports to take from the Executive, during the fixed time established for the tenure of office, the independent power of removal, and to require for such removal the concurrent action of the President and the Senate. The proviso that follows proceeds to fix the term of office of the general heads of departments, whose term never had been defined before, by prescribing that they shall hold their office respectively for, and during the term of the President by whom they may have been appointed, and for one month thereafter, subject to removal by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Thus, as to these enumerated officers, the proviso takes from the President the power of removal, except with the advice and consent of the Senate. By its terms, however, before he can be deprived of the power to displace them, it must appear that he himself has appointed them. It is only in that case they have any tenure of office, or any independent right to hold during the term of the President and one month after the occasion of his death, resignation, or removal by the President, beyond one month after the succession of his successor.

In the case of Mr. Stanton, the only appointment under which he held the office of Secretary of War was that conferred upon him by my immediate predecessor, with the advice and consent of the Senate. He has never held from me any appointment as the head of the War Department. Whatever right he had to hold the office was derived from that original appointment and my own sufferance. The law was not intended to protect such an incumbent of the War Department, by taking from the President the power to remove him. This, in my judgment, is perfectly clear, and the law itself admits of no other construction. We find in all that portion of the first section which precedes the proviso, that as to civil officers generally the President is deprived of the power of removal, and it is plain that if there had been no proviso that power would just as clearly have been taken from him so far as it applies to the seven heads of departments. But for reasons, which were no doubt satisfactory to Congress, these principal officers were specially provided for, and as to them the express and only requirements that the President who has appointed them shall act without the advice and consent of the Senate, removes them from office. The consequence is that as to my Cabinet embracing the officers designated in the last section of the act, taken from me the power, without the concurrence of the Senate, to remove any one of them I have appointed, but it does not protect each of them as I did not appoint, nor give to them any tenure of office beyond my pleasure. An examination of this act, then, shows that while in one part of the section provision is made for officers generally, in another clause there is a class of officers designated by their official titles, who are exempted from the general terms of the law, and in reference to whom a clear distinction is made as to the general power of removal limited in the first clause of the section. This distinction is that as to such of those enumerated offices as hold office under the appointment of the President, the power of removal can only be exercised by him with the consent of the Senate, while as to those who have not been appointed by him there is no like denial of his power to displace them. It would be a violation of the plain meaning of this enactment to place Mr. Stanton upon this footing, as these heads of departments have been appointed by myself. As to him this law gives him no tenure of office. The members of my Cabinet, who have been appointed by me are by this act entitled to hold for one month after the term of my office shall cease. But Mr. Stanton could not, against the wishes of my successor, hold a moment thereafter. If he were permitted by that successor to hold for the first two weeks, would that successor have no power to remove him? But the power of my successor over him would be no greater than my own. If my successor would have the power to remove Mr. Stanton after permitting him to remain a term of two weeks, because he was appointed by his predecessor, I who have tolerated Mr. Stanton no more than two years, certainly have the same right to remove him, and upon the same ground, namely, that he was not appointed by me but by my predecessor. Under this construction of the Tenure of Office act, I have never doubted my power to remove him. Whether the act was constitutional or not, it was always my opinion that it did not secure him from removal. I was aware that there were doubts as to the construction of the law and from the first deemed it desirable that at the earliest possible moment these doubts should be settled, and the true construction of the act fixed by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. My order of suspension in August last was intended to place the case in such a position as would make a resort to a judicial decision both necessary and proper. My understanding and wishes, however, under that order of suspension, were frustrated, and the late order for Mr. Stanton's removal was a further step towards the accomplishment of that purpose.

I repeat that my own conviction as to the true construction of the law, and as to the constitutionality, were well settled and were sustained by every member of my Cabinet, including Mr. Stanton himself. Upon the question of constitutionality each one in turn deliberately advised me that the tenure of office act was unconstitutional. Upon the question whether as to these members who were appointed by my predecessor, that act took from me the power to remove them, those members unanimously, in presence of the others sitting in the Cabinet, said that they did not come within the provisions of the act, and that it was no protection to them. No one dissented from this construction, and I understood them all to acquiesce in its correctness. In a matter of such consequence I was not disposed to rest my own opinions, though fortified by my Constitutional advisers. I have therefore sought to bring the question at as early a day as possible before the Supreme Court of the United States for final and authoritive decision.

In respect to so much of the resolution as relates to the designation of an officer to act as Secretary of War *ad interim*, I have only to say I have exercised this power under the provisions of the first section of the Act of February 13th, 1795, which, so far as they are applicable to vacancy caused by removals, I understand them to be still in force. The legislation upon the subject of *ad interim* appointments in the Executive Department stands as to the War office as follows. The section of the act of the 7th of August, 1789, made no provision for a vacancy in the very case of a removal of the head of the War Department, and upon such a vacancy, the charge and custody of the records, books and papers to the Chief Clerk. Next by the act of the 8th day of May, 1792, section eight it is provided that in case of vacancy by death, absence from the seat of Government, of sickness of the head of the War Department, the President may authorize a person to perform the duties of the office until a successor is appointed, or the disability removed. Then, it will be observed, does not provide for the case of a vacancy caused by removal. It was in the first section of the act of February 13th, 1795, it is provided that in case of any vacancy the President may appoint a person to perform the duties while the vacancy exists. These are followed by that of the 20th of February, 1863, by the first section of which provision is again made for a vacancy caused by death, resignation, absence from the seat of government, or sickness of the head of an executive department, and upon the occurrence of such a vacancy power is given to the President to authorize the head of any other executive department, or other officers in either of said departments, whose appointment is vested in the President, at his discretion to perform the duties of said respective offices until a successor be appointed, or such absence or disability by sickness shall cease; provided, that no one vacancy shall be supplied in the manner aforesaid for a longer period than six months. This law, with some modifications, re-enacts the act of 1792, and provides, as did that act, for the sort of vacancies to be filled, but, like the act of 1792, it makes no provision for a vacancy occasioned by removal. It has reference altogether to vacancies arising from other causes. According to my construction of the act of 1863, while it implicitly repeals the part of the act of 1795, regulating the vacancies therein described, it has no bearing whatever on so much of the act of 1795 as applies to a vacancy caused by removal. The act of 1795 therefore furnishes the rule for a vacancy occasioned by removal, one of the vacancies expressly referred to in the act of 7th of August, 1789, creating the Department of War. Certainly there is no express repeal by the act of 1863 of the act of 1795. The repeal, if there is any, is by implication, and can only be admitted so far as there is a clear inconsistency between the two acts. The act of 1795 is in no inconsistent with that of 1863, as to a vacancy occasioned by death, resignation, absence or sickness, but not at all inconsistent as to a vacancy caused by removal. It is scarcely proper that the President should have the same power to fill temporarily a vacancy occasioned by removal, as he has to supply a place made vacant by death or expiration of a term. If, for instance, the incumbent of an office should be found wholly unfit to execute the functions, and the public service should require the immediate exclusion of such, probably should exist and be at once applied, and time be allowed the President to select and appoint a successor, as is permitted in case of a vacancy caused by death or the termination of an official term. The necessity therefore for an *ad interim* appointment is just as great, and indeed may be greater, in cases of removal than in others. Before it be held, therefore, that the power given by the act of 1795, in cases of removal, is abrogated by succeeding legislation, an express repeal ought to appear. So wholesome a power should certainly not be taken away by loose implications. It may be, however, that in this, as in other cases of implied repeal, doubts may arise. It is confessedly one of the most debatable questions which arise in the construction of statutes upon such a question, if I have fallen into an erroneous construction, I submit whether it should be characterized as a violation of official duty and of law.

I have deemed it proper, in vindication of the course which I have considered in public moneys and financial agent of the United States.

NEW ORLEANS.

Order of Gen. Hancock Regarding Judge Abolitionist.

(By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.)

NEW ORLEANS, Feb. 23.—Gen. Hancock yesterday issued an important order regarding the Judiciary. The order states that the Auditor and Treasurer having represented officially the indebtedness of the State to be such that under the present revenue laws the debt cannot be paid, and the Governor has sent an official communication to the Commanding General having declared the State Treasury totally bankrupt, so that Judges and all other State officers cannot be paid, and that unless some remedy be applied the machinery of the State must stop, the collection of arrears and taxes for four years being suspended by the Legislature until the 1870, and the appropriation act having expired Dec. 31, 1867, and the emergency being such that prompt action is indispensable to prevent an archy confusion and loss of all semblance of civil authority, the Commanding General considers it his duty to declare that the Auditor and Treasurer are authorized to perform the duties of their offices, and to pay the salaries of the Judiciary and State officers, as far as the collections of taxes will permit, and that the Governor and Legislature shall meet to-morrow at their rooms, with closed doors, to settle the details which are to govern the regular meeting of the Legislature. The members present at the informal meeting were: A. Belmont, New York; S. H. Lyman, Maine; R. B. Smith, Vermont; Wm. Converse, Connecticut; W. A. Galbraith, Pennsylvania; A. Yocum, Delaware; L. S. Trimble, Ky.; R. P. Ranney, Ohio; W. E. Niblack, Ind.; W. F. Story, L. V. Boyer, Mich.; J. H. McKinney, Minn.; Geo. W. Flint, Wis.; Charles Mason, proxy of D. O. Finch, Iowa; Perry Fulton, Missouri; S. C. Pomeroy, Kansas; John Patrick, Nebraska; Geo. S. Moore, Ala.; Thos. Sweeny, W. Va.; Judge Marvin, Florida; J. T. Lewis, Virginia; J. M. Stevens, proxy of A. H. Green, Ark; and J. A. Fischer, of Louisiana.

Governor Wells and other gentlemen present, but not members of the Convention, were: Ex-Governors Morrill, of Augusta, Me.; Green, Fitch, Taylor, Winslow and Rice, of Cleveland, Ohio; Lawrence and Hamilton, of Indianapolis; Rich, of Leavenworth, and Miller, of Connecticut; Bruce, of Montana; Wendell, of Michigan; Senator Fenton, Ridson, Marion Morale, of the *World*; Humphrey, Prince, Cornell and Cuyler, of New York; and Senator Clagette, Davis and Buckner, of Missouri.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 22, 1868.

THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE

The National Democratic Committee adjourned *sine die* after naming New York city as the place and July fourth as the day for the meeting of the National Democratic Convention. No distinction whatever was made between members from loyal and rebel States, and representatives in the National Convention are to consist of twice the number of Congressmen to which each State is entitled by the last apportionment, the entire Southern representation is made to the excluded States. Eight States were not represented in the Committee, viz: Georgia, Florida, Texas, Louisiana, North Carolina, Virginia, Rhode Island and New Jersey.

The rule for voting adopted by the Committee was one declaring the call for a National Convention shall embrace all those who are willing to support the Union and opposed to radicalism.

Just previous to adjournment General Emory and some other members of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Union were admitted and formally announced that the President they would call their convention to meet in New York at the same time. The latter role in place was adopted ten for New York, eleven for St. Louis, August Belmont, P. O. Prince, H. Paul and Lewis J. Bogy were appointed to draw up an address when they meet on Monday.

A special to the N. Y. *Herald* says the Committee as a body is opposed to Chief Justice Chase for President. Seymour is talked of by many Representatives of Eastern States, but his claim assumed no definite shape. Hendricks, of Indiana, will be pressed by his State. All propositions in favor of General Hancock were met with the reply: "We don't want a soldier. We want a civilian." But Vice President Wright, of Penn, marked unanimity was manifested for John Quincy Adams.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

By Mr. ERRETT, of Allegheny: Authorizing the removal of the ruins of dams and locks of the Youghiogheny Slack Water Company.

Authorizing the appointment of two magistrates in boroughs South of the Monongahela and Ohio rivers, in Allegheny county, to hear and determine cases of drunkenness and disorderly conduct, and to regulate compensation therefor.

Also, providing that the payments by Insurance companies under the act of April 2nd, 1856, may be made in lawful money of the United States.

Mr. SEARIGHT, of Fayette, a bill incorporating the Union Lumber and Boom Company of Fayette.

BILLS PASSED FINALLY.

A supplement to the act relating to the revenue of the Commonwealth by the taxation of the shares of stock of National Banks, and prohibiting the appraisement of such stock at higher than the market value.

Act incorporating the Consolidation Bank of Pittsburgh.

HOUSE.

BILLS PASSED FINALLY.

Enabling the School Board of Fifth ward, Allegheny city, to borrow money.

Prohibiting the sale of Intoxicating Drinks in Industry township, Beaver county.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. WILSON, of Allegheny, a supplement to Election Laws, being a registry law for Pennsylvania agreed upon by the Republican caucus of both Houses.

Mr. WILSON, of Allegheny county, establishing a ferry over the Allegheny river, between Lower Oakland and the city of Allegheny.

Supplement for Kittanning Manufacturing Company, legalizing the Bounty Bonds issued in Rural township, Armstrong county.

Mr. MILLAR, of Allegheny, authorizing opening of air courses and water drains for coal mines, under act of April 16th, 1838, relative to underground private roads.

Mr. WILSON, of Allegheny, authorizing the School Directors of Patton Township to pay surplus bounty fund for school purposes.

Mr. RUDDLE, of Allegheny, authorizing the making of new indexes to deed books of Recorder's office of Allegheny county, and regulating the manner of keeping same.

Supplement to an act passed May 1st, 1851, relative to applications for admission to almshouses.

Supplement to an act annexing Manchester borough to Allegheny.

Mr. FORD, of Allegheny: Incorporating the Pennsylvania Mining and Transportation Company.

Mr. BECKERT, of Allegheny: Supplement relative to weights and measures.

Mr. HICKMAN, of Chester, a joint resolution naming Mr. Anthony Wayne and Robert Fulton, as Pennsylvanians, for statues to be placed in the Old Capitol at Washington, and authorizing the Governor to employ native artists for furnishing the statues.

Mr. GALLAGHER, of Westmoreland, authorizing the School Directors of Bollivar Borough, of Westmoreland, to borrow money.

Mr. PIKE, defining and regulating the liabilities of Railroad Companies.

Pending discussion of last bill adjourned.

—At Pithole, Monday morning, a fire broke out, consuming thirty buildings, and causing a loss estimated at $125,000. The losers are: Arnold Brox, clothing store, $5,000; A. J. Christy, drug store, $6,000; Lewis, Terrapin Lunch, $1,000; Deutchen, tailor, $1,000; P. Marr, grocery, $10,000; M'Afee, shoemaker, $1,000; Jackson, news depot, $1,500; Kander, clothing store, $5,000; Excelsior Bakery, $700; C. Prescott, liquor store, $10,000; Ellison, (Canandaigua Saloon,) $2,500; Mrs. Deyo, (Metropolitan Saloon,) $2,500; J. C. Merlin, shoe store, $1,000; Dr. Waring, $1,000; Confer House, $1,000; Barnes, $400; Niagara House, Michigan provision store, St. Nicholas Hotel, store formerly occupied by Col. Alfred, and several barns and outbuildings on Brown street, all of which were entirely consumed. The fire originated by the explosion of a kerosene lamp.

Pennsylvania Legislature.

(Special Dispatch to Pittsburgh Gazette.)

HARRISBURG, February 21, 1868.

SENATE.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

By Mr. ERRETT: Protecting sidewalks upon public roads and in unincorporated towns, inflicting penalty for riding or driving thereon.

Enabling vendors of sewing machines to sell throughout the State by paying ordinary license fees.

Authorizing the Pittsburgh, Ft. Wayne and Chicago Railway Company to extend their road from terminus and build branches from any point in Allegheny city to connect with any other roads, and for this purpose shall have all the privileges of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, but no right to occupy streets or alleys in Pittsburgh or Allegheny without the consent of Councils.

Changing the organization and management of the Allegheny County Prison.

BILLS PASSED FINALLY.

Establishing an additional State Insane Asylum for the Northern District—entire cost not to exceed two hundred thousand dollars, one-fourth to be drawn this year.

Providing for the deficit in the soldiers' orphans' department.

Enabling purchasers of corporate rights by sheriff's sale to reorganize with all privileges.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THE WORD "WHITE."

Nearly the whole time was occupied in a spirited discussion arising out of an amendment offered by Mr. JONES, (Dem.,) of Berks, to a local bill defining the qualifications of voters for School Directors in Lancaster county. His amendment was to insert the word "white."

Mr. HICKMAN, (Republican,) of Chester, spoke till the hour of adjournment, charging that the Republican majority of the House had held a caucus, in which they refused "to face the music" on his recently proposed Constitutional amendment and to smother them. He was not afraid of that caucus; it should not hind him. He had never gone into it. He would never sell his principles to any caucus. He charged Mr. Mann, (Republican) of Potter, with gross inconsistency, with dodging the question, with glaring injustice. He knew that the Republican majority would murder his amendments, because they were cowards. He gave Democrats full permission to pitch into them. He was called to order frequently by the Speaker and others, but proceeded with his speech amid great excitement. The previous question was moved, but not sustained, five or six Republicans voting "nay" with the Democrats. He appealed to that God who ordered things, that slavery should not be in the exercise of civil government. He would yet live to see these recreant Republicans suffer for their inconsistency and their cowardice. The people would retake them on one side or the other. They never said that the negro was entitled by the laws of God and nature to the elective franchise, but refused to vote for his amendments because they, miserable dodgers, tricksters and trimmers, were afraid of losing the next election.

FROM EUROPE.

(By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.)

GREAT BRITAIN.

LONDON, February 21.—George Francis Train delivered his first lecture in Dublin last evening. It was very thinly attended. There was no rioting, though measures had been taken by the authorities for the preservation of the peace. A correspondent of one of the morning journals, in alluding to the lecture, says: "As a speculation it was an entire failure."

John Curtin, an inn keeper, and David Murphy, a waiter, were arrested at Cork, yesterday, on the general charge of complicity in Fenian movements. Murphy recently arrived from the United States.

LONDON, February 21.—The Coroner's jury have concluded the protracted investigation of the explosion at the Clerkenwell House of Detention, and to-day rendered a verdict that they bring a charge of murder against the prisoners Barrett, English, O'Keefe, Mullooey, the two Diamonds, the woman Ann Justice, and others whose names are not yet made known. Doubt is expressed as to the complicity of Allen, who was recently discharged but has been re-arrested. The verdict concluded by severely censuring the police in the Clerkenwell District for lack of activity and vigilance.

The indications are that Beresford Hope will carry the election for member of Parliament from the University of Cambridge. The seat was rendered vacant by the appointment of Mr. Selwyn to the Bench.

Mr. Hunt, under Secretary of the Treasury, has informed the House of Commons that the operation of the new postal treaty between Great Britain and the United States has been temporarily suspended, but only to enable both governments to revise certain points which were mutually overlooked and necessary to be set right.

DUBLIN, Feb. 21.—The audience at Train's lecture last night was very boisterous. Signs were present who hissed the speaker were roughly used. A strong force of police was on hand and prevented any serious personal violence or disloyal demonstrations.

The jury were unable to agree on a verdict in the case of Jno. Martin and others, the parties on trial or participating in the Fenian funeral procession have been discharged.

LONDON, Feb. 21.—The *Globe* has a report that alarming revolts are broken out among the prisoners in India.

LONDON, February 21—*Evening.*—In the House of Commons this evening Mr. D'Israeli gave an explicit denial to the report that the expenditures already incurred for the Abyssinian expedition exceed the estimates laid before the House at its last session by the Government.

Lord Stanley made an explanation in regard to Mexico. He said diplomatic relations with that country had been suspended for the reason that last September the Mexican Government dismissed all ministers who had spoken of which recognized the late empire.

Sir Stafford Northcote, Secretary of State for India, read extracts from letters received from General Napier gave no hope of war in Abyssinia "would be until this season.

Tuesday, February 25th, has been assigned as the day for the Irish Church debate in the House of Commons.

LONDON, February 22.—Mr. Sullivan, of the Dublin *Nation*, recently convicted of publishing seditious libels, was sentenced to six months imprisonment. Each State was entitled by the last apportionment to the number of Congressmen to which it is made to the excluded States. Eight States were not represented in the Committee, viz: Georgia, Florida, Texas, Louisiana, North Carolina, Virginia, Rhode Island and New Jersey.

The rule for voting adopted by the Committee was one declaring the call for a National Convention shall embrace all who are willing to support the Union and opposed to radicalism.

Just previous to adjournment General Emory and some other members of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Union were admitted and formally announced that the President they would call their convention to meet in New York at the same time. The latter role in place was adopted ten for New York, eleven for St. Louis. August Belmont, P. O. Prince, H. Paul and Lewis J. Bogy were appointed to draw up an address when they meet on Monday.

A special to the N. Y. *Herald* says the Committee as a body is opposed to Chief Justice Chase for President. Seymour is talked of by many Representatives of Eastern States, but his claim assumed no definite shape. Hendricks, of Indiana, will be pressed by his State. All propositions in favor of General Hancock were met with the reply: "We don't want a soldier. We want a civilian." But Vice President Wright, of Penn, marked unanimity was manifested for John Quincy Adams.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Counterfeit 7-20s.—Treasury notes, of the denomination of one thousand dollars, dated June 15th, 1865, differing materially in the more of the bonds from which those originally presented were included, are being forwarded to the Treasury Department, as soon as opportunity. The public are, therefore, notified that all notes of the date of June 15th, 1865, should be immediately forwarded to the Department for conversion.

FINANCIAL.

Fractional Currency printed during the week, $344,462; shipped, 450,272. National Bank Notes issued, $121,850; amount in circulation, 294,178,506; currency redeemed and destroyed, $203,400.

The Second National Bank of Dayton, Ohio, has notified the Comptroller of its dissolution.

MILITARY.

Gen. Thomas' instructions to Gen. Sheridan, Military Commander of Louisiana, are to the effect that the civil authorities are to be left undisturbed in the exercise of their functions, except in cases of necessity, and that the military will be used only in aid of the civil authorities when requested by them.

Gen. Sherman has left for Louisiana.

Gen. Thomas has ordered the Fifteenth Regiment to Louisiana.

Gen. Meade has ordered the Fourteenth Regiment to Georgia.

Gen. Hancock has ordered the Fifteenth Regiment to Louisiana.

Gen. Pope has ordered the Fourteenth Regiment to Alabama.

Gen. Ord has ordered the Fifteenth Regiment to Mobile.

Gen. Thomas has ordered the Four