CLEARFIELD REPUBLICAN.

GEO. B. GOODLANDER, Proprietor. PRINCIPLES; NOT MEN. TERMS—$2 per annum, in Advance.

VOL. 41--WHOLE NO. 2107. CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 1869. NEW SERIES--VOL. 9, NO. 32.

THE LEGISLATURE.

This body seems to be in great ibulation over a portion of its emloyees, *popularly* styled "pasters and olders," but *properly* loafers. The llowing debate, which took place in e House on the 17th of February, ves a partial view of how things are ne inside of the "ring." To fully mprehend the matter, it is necessary state that the Legislature of 1868 as so extravagant, and being alarm- at their loafers' bill when they me to settle, before adjourning sed an act prohibiting future bodies om employing more than thirty-four ficers. In the face of this act of sembly, the Radical caucus secretly reed to employ *twenty-seven* additi- nal—making *sixty-one* employees—d passed a joint resolution through e House to that effect; but when it ned up in the Senate for concurce it was defeated. Hence, all se members who failed to get their an" in before the *thirty four* seats re all taken, now have him on hand may be compelled to pay his ges out of their own pockets instead out of the State Treasury, as was ntemplated by the resolution in estion. We presume that if the use discharges these twenty-seven s at once, the Senate will be magnimous enough to pay them for the e they have been employed; but if former persist in their prodigal penditure of the public funds their stituents will thank the latter for ir economical course.

Mr. WILSON, (Rep.) Allegheny, call- up the general appropriation bill, yielded to

Mr. VANKIRK, (Rep.) Washington, o offered a resolution, which was ice read, as follows:

WHEREAS, The appointment of twenty-seven ks of this House, in addition to the number ed by the act of April 8th, 1868, was deemed essary at the commencement of the present sion, which necessity does not now continue to , for the reason that two election cases which e before this House, and seemed to require the pointment of additional officers, have been dis- d of; and

Whereas, The additional labor at the beginning the session in preparing and mailing depart- t reports, &c., has now, in a great measure, n performed; therefore,

Resolved, That the remainder of the twenty- ven additional officers, not already discharged the Chief Clerk, be now relieved and discharged, that their salary shall run from the time they all have been in their respective offices, which ay shall be a pro rata share of the salary of h officers for the session as fixed by the act of il 8, 1868.

Mr. DUNCAN, (Rep.) Venango. As number of the officers have already en discharged, I hope the House ll pass the resolution at once.

Mr. STRANG, (Rep.) Tioga. Mr. peaker, I think there will be one ing very apparent to every gentlean in the House, when he reflects a oment upon this resolution, and that however well intended it may be, cannot at all accomplish the object signed by it. If there is anything ll settled at all, it is that there is least a conflict of opinion between e two houses composing this Legis- ure, as to the kind of legislation cessary to insure the payment of ese men. I take it that we are all tisfied that before the disbursing ficers of the Commonwealth will ke upon themselves the responsi- ility of paying these men, they will quire authority either in the appro- iation bill or some other method, a w or joint resolution for that pur- se; and here is the difficulty. The ly effect of the passage of this reso- tion will be to discharge these men ithout any provision for their pay- ent.

Mr. WILSON. I will say to the gen- man that provision for their pay- ent is a matter which can easily be complished afterwards, if it is the nse of the House to discharge them. see no difficulty in that respect.

Mr. STRANG. It is a very easy mat- r to say that, but I beg leave to dif- r, *in toto*, from the opinion of the entleman from Allegheny, [Mr. Wil- on,] upon that question. If there is ny one thing certain, it is that these en are not to be paid until some law passed authorizing their payment. f we propose to discharge them now, t us treat them honorably and fairly. e have taken them into our employ y the almost unanimous vote of one olitical party. For one, I am not isposed to shirk the responsibility. am disposed to treat these men fairly d honorably. If we wish to dis- arge them, let us pass a joint reso- tion providing for their payment, d when they are put in a position o be paid, let them be discharged, if ch is the sense of this House. What ood can come from a resolution of e House alone, providing for their ayment? If that could have done y good, it would have been done ng ago.

Mr. M'GINNIS, (Dem.) Philadelphia. the Senate would not concur in the olution appointing these officers, I not see any good reason for our sing a joint resolution.

Mr. STRANG. Simply because, not y a portion of this House, but a ge portion of the Senate, as I under- nd, take the position, in which posi- n they are sustained by the dis- rging officers of the Commonwealth, t the payment of these men requires her a law or a joint resolution. ow, I am saying nothing upon the rits of this resolution, one way or other, but simply that the resolu- n cannot accomplish the purpose ired.

Mr. M'GINNIS. I offer the following endment: To strike out the word mainder," and insert, "as many reof as the Speaker and Clerk can spense with."

Mr. WILSON. The original resolu- n calling for the additional number officers to the number of twenty- ven, provides that when, in the gment of the Chief Clerk, any offi- s are not needed, he shall discharge em. It seems to me that ought to fy the question.

Mr. M'GINNIS withdrew his amend- nt.

Mr. DAVIS, (Rep.) Phila. It is very dent to me that we have got into difficulty here, and the best thing can do this morning is to try to get t of it. Now, the House has appoint- a number of additional officers, and the gentleman from Tioga, [Mr. rang.] I never shirk any responsi- ity. I was in favor of their appoint- nt, but after the action of the Sen- refusing to sanction the action of Senate, refusing to sanction the on of the House amending the bill st year, I believe it is very doubtful whether those men will be paid. Certainly the House should pass some such resolution as that offered by the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. Vankirk.] These men should be paid, at least for the time they have been here. Now, my judgment is that if we let this matter run on to the end of the session, those men will remain here, doing the work assigned to them, and in the spring leave without pay; or at least there is danger of that. If this resolution is made a joint resolution, I do not think the Senate would refuse to concur; though they have positively refused to pay them for the entire session. I would be in favor of standing by what the House has done, if I believe we could do so with justice to the men brought here from their homes. I do not believe that the House has too many officers. If we have, it is a question for us, and the responsibility lies with the members and their constituents; but it is entirely wrong for us to keep these men here with the risk of letting them go after the adjournment without pay for their services. This resolution should be made a joint resolution. At the time the resolution of the gentleman from Tioga [Mr. Strang] was passed, I believed, after mature consideration and careful examination of it and the law upon the subject, that these men could not be paid, unless the Senate concurred in and the Governor signed the bill providing for the payment. The disbursing officers of this Commonwealth have decided in the same way. I was entitled to hand in the name of one man, whom I wished to appoint from my district. He was a poor man, and I preferred that he should board at home with his family to boarding here without receiving pay in the spring; and I never gave in his name. I will stand by the caucus of the party, and I will stand by the House. I will go as far as any; but we must pay these men or dismiss them. The resolution is eminently proper; it should be passed this morning, if passed at all. I move to amend by making it a joint resolution, so that it may receive the concurrence of the Senate, and these men be paid for the time they have been here. I do not think the resolution as it stands will do any good.

Mr. NICHOLSON, (Rep.) Beaver. Mr. Speaker, I think things are getting a little mixed up. Let us try to unravel this busines. When the resolution providing for additional officers was passed, I, contrary to my own judgment, acquiesced. It was said that we needed more officers, and I believe we did need some. They were appointed with the distinct understanding—I wish to call the attention of the ex-Speaker (Mr. Davis, Phila.) to this—that they took the risk of receiving no pay at all. I think you, Mr. Speaker, and two or three others of us, at least, know that it requires both branches of the Legislature to pass an act of Assembly, and I think there is another power somewhere about the hill that has something to do with it. Now let us not mix up the matter. The contract with these men was that they were to be dismissed when the Clerk thought their services were not necessary. Now, this resolution is only a reminder or instruction to the Clerk. Most assuredly we can instruct the Clerk.

Mr. DAVIS. (Philadelphia.) I wish to make it a joint resolution to provide for the payment of these men.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I will come to that if the gentleman will wait. Let us pass this resolution which is in accordance with the contract and the expectation of these men; and then let us pass a joint resolution to pay them on its own merits. Let us end this matter. The difficulty will be much greater if we continue these men to the end of the session; for in that case I am satisfied the Senate will never agree to pay them. Whether right or not, the Senate has taken its position, and it requires a great deal of nerve, even on the part of a wise man, to say "I was wrong." There are a few who can do it—you and I, and a few others can say so; but everybody will not. The Senate has said over and over again, and I think I have heard some whisperings from that other quarter to which I alluded, that this should not be done. Now, is it wise on the part of the friends of these twenty-seven officers to insist on their staying here five, six or eight weeks more, and increase the chance of no pay? Let us pass this resolution, and then pass a joint resolution providing for their payment, and fight it out on that line until the end of the session.

Mr. ROBERTS, (Dem.) Philadelphia. I think that the Senate having refused to concur in the resolution first introduced by the gentleman from Tioga, [Mr. Strang,] will not stultify themselves by adopting this resolution if it should be made a joint resolution. At the time the first resolution was before the House several gentlemen on this side of the chamber—myself among the number—made the point that it was contrary to law. The gentleman from the Tenth district of Philadelphia [Mr. Davis] being then in the chair, overruled the point. He said that the House could choose its own officers under the Constitution. The Senate thought differently, and I think gentlemen on both sides of this chamber now think that decision was wrong. If not, where is the necessity of this resolution? The point then made was that it required a joint resolution to change the act of 1868. The disbursing officers of the Commonwealth have sustained the position then taken, and it is not probable that the Senate, holding the same view, will adopt this if made a joint resolution. I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Beaver [Mr. Nicholson] is a very wise one indeed. We might as well begin to correct our evil doings and discharge all these men at once; then we can try the Senate with a joint resolution to pay them. The Senate certainly cannot, in consistency with their past action, adopt this—having flatly said to the House, "You had no power to pass that resolution." I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. Davis] will not prevail.

Mr. M'CULLOUGH, (Dem.) Clearfield. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be just, as well as generous. Shortly after the appointment of these twenty-seven officers I took occasion for several days to visit the departments in which their labor was being performed. I had heard a great deal said, and though I had taken no part in the matter whatever, I constituted myself a committee of one to look after the work of these men and those who had been previously appointed. The Senate refused to concur in the resolution of the House—that body, so dignified—probably not dignified, but so refined—for I hold that we are entitled to assume that we have some dignity, and should have something to say in this matter as well as the other branch. Now, granted for the sake of argument, that they did not concur, and do not intend to concur in a resolution paying these men, I believe as was held by the Speaker *pro tem.* the other day, that this House has authority under the Constitution to appoint its own officers, and by implication its employees. Now, this House is certainly as dignified a body as the other branch of the Legislature, although it may not be as refined. The House appointed certain employees and officers, to the number of twenty-seven, and those having authority to discharge them, have seen proper, in their wisdom, to discharge a certain number who did their work well; and now let me say that after having examined the departments, I found a large majority of those men laboring diligently, late and early, in the performance of their duties. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I have found as many as five of those employed by the House at work for the Senate, who refuse to pay the pittance allowed by act of Assembly to these poor men who came here believing that they would be paid for their labors. I presume, Mr. Speaker, I shall be censured for what I am saying, but I stand here to do equity and justice between men. I shall not stultify myself, if I do belong to the minority side of the House. I intend, while I am here, to stand up for the right, God being my helper! If this House has the authority to appoint and select its officers and employees, and if those who have charge of the several departments see proper to indicate that a certain number of men are absolutely necessary to transact the business of the House, then, I say, we do right to vindicate this House. A majority of this House has decided to employ additional officers; these men have been selected and have come here in good faith, believing that they would be paid, and have been performing their labor as it should be performed. I, for one, having voted against the appointment of the twenty-seven, say that these men who have been employed and have faithfully performed the labor as they have been commanded, should be paid; and I shall stand here from this time until next March a year before I will turn these poor men away without the pittance they are justly entitled to. I care not whether I am censured by this side of the House or the other side.

Mr. WEBB, (Rep.) Bradford. I would like to enquire if the gentleman has a "man" here among the twenty-seven?

Mr. M'CULLOUGH. I have. I was told that I might select a "man," and I did so, and he is here performing his labor from morning until night. I shall not deny anything that is the fact. I would have said just what I have said if I had not a man here. If his pay is refused I can pay him myself.

Mr WEBB. Another question. Who told you you could have a "man?"

Mr. M'CULLOUGH. Well, sir, the persons having authority to do so.

Mr. HERR. The question of the gentleman from Bradford [Mr. Webb] can be answered. The gentleman from Clearfield was informed by the Republican party that he could have a "man" here.

Mr. WEBB. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, who spoke for the Republican party? I did not know the party had given such authority.

Mr. HERR. By authority of the party, without respect to individuals.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Without regard to race or color. [Laughter.]

Mr. M'CULLOUGH. With regard to race, I have nothing to say; with regard to color, I shall not say anything.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of disposing of this matter as the dignity of this body requires. I am in favor of passing a joint resolution, because that is the only way by which these men can be paid, if they are paid at all. I am in favor of this joint resolution to bring the matter before the House in its proper shape, that it may go to the co-ordinate branch of the Legislature in the only shape in which we are authorized to present it. If these men are to be paid, let us know it; if not to be paid, let us know it. Let those who brought the men here know it; because I suppose they have been brought here on account of their merits, or because they were the favorites of those who brought them. Let us proceed in the only way in which we are authorized by the laws of this Commonwealth; let us have a joint resolution bringing the matter squarely before this body, and go into the co-ordinant branch in a shape which will require their attention. And if the Executive of the Commonwealth sees proper to turn away, without their pay, the poor men who have come here and done the labor, the co-ordinate branch agreeing with this, then I say let him do so. I am willing to pay the expenses of the gentleman whom I brought here, although he is a Republican. Let us get at this in the right way. If the gentleman who introduced the resolution (in good faith, I have no doubt,) will amend it so as to make it a joint resolution, I will agree with him. Let us, Mr Speaker, ascertain how many of these twenty-seven men have entered upon the duties assigned them, and how many have been discharged by those having authority to do so, and knowing the number requisite to carry on the business of the House. Let us ascertain the facts. I say we have not twenty-seven additional officers here; I assert that we have not seventeen additional; I do not know how many have been discharged, but I know that as many as five on the several days when I have examined the departments, were employed in doing the work of the Senate; so that when that body says to this branch of the Legislature, "We will not agree to anything of the kind," it comes with a very bad grace. As I said before we professed to have and exercise as much dignity, if not refinement, as the co-ordinate branch. I propose that we go at this matter "right end foremost"—to commence at the commencement, and go through with it as men. Any question asked me as to my having a "man" here has nothing to do with the case at all. I acknowledge that I named, as I supposed, and as I *know*, an honest, upright man, who has always voted the Republican ticket. If that be a sin, why, here you have it. I did not feel at liberty to bring in a Democrat. My district has never had an employee in the House of Representatives since the formation of this Commonwealth; therefore, I chose one, and he is here, performing his duty from morning until night.

Now, let us get at this as we should. Let us have a joint resolution. Let us get at it in a way in which we can know what we are doing—whether the co-ordinate branch of the Legislature will allow these men now employed their pay, and whether the Executive of the Commonwealth, or whether both the co-ordinate branch and the Executive will turn out of employment, without a cent, these poor men, who have been laboring here to maintain their families. If so, I want to send my man home—to give him money to pay his expenses home. If he tells me that he cannot get along with his poor family, I expect to give him a hundred or two dollars, because I brought him here.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I propose now to make in three minutes my last "paster and folder" speech. I was in hopes I had made it some time ago. I take, it sir, that I occupy a position in reference to this question, which gives me as good a right to make a speech as any gentleman of the House. I apprehend I have been about as much talked about in this connection—about as well abused by the high-toned press of this Commonwealth—as any other gentleman on this floor. During the four years I have had the honor of a seat here, I believe I have not spent four minutes in talking about myself; and I do not intend to spend very much time in talking about myself now.

Now, sir, as to the proposition before us. We find ourselves in just this fix. The Legislature of last winter, which, as has been said over and over again upon this floor, found it necessary to employ for their convenience over one hundred officers during the entire session, became so economical just at the close of the session—so willing, as the comic writer said about the draft, "to sacrifice all his wife's blood relations"—as to say that all future legislatures should be confined to thirty-four employees, although over one hundred men were necessary for their convenience. But no man among all the reformers who were active in the passage of that resolution found that they had too many men then; but just at the close of the session they found themselves able to say that we and all legislatures who should come after them, should find thirty-four men sufficient, and they passed a law binding us to that number. The Senate, and I give them credit for it, (I am not saying a word against the Senate in relation to that question)—the Senate, composed of thirty-three members, were smart enough to manipulate that bill during its passage, so as to provide themselves with twenty-four officers. All right, all right; but as I am credibly informed, some of the loudest-mouthed among the reformers—some of those who were building themselves the most lofty reputation as economists—the fiercest watch-dogs of the treasury of this Commonwealth—and doing their barking and biting in that Senate——

Mr. BROWN, (Dem.) Clarion. I would ask the gentleman if these men are not members of the same political party he is?

Mr. STRANG. I should not wonder if they were. I should not wonder if the party to which the gentleman from Clarion happens to belong, should ever get in the ascendancy, either here or there, from the avidity which he manifests upon this question, he will be apt to get his full share.

Well, sir, we got together, at the beginning of this session, and looked this thing over, and I undertake to say that every honest man of both political parties came to the conclusion that thirty-four men were too few for this House to get along with properly, comfortably and easily in the transaction of business. Why not sir? If twenty-four men are not too many for the Senate, which is composed of thirty-three members, are not thirty-four men to few for this House? Granting, sir, and I am willing to stand before the people of this Commonwealth, as I said in the few remarks I made the other day on the question, granting that perhaps sixty-one men may be half a dozen too many. I do not stand here denying it. I never did and never intend to deny that sixty-one men may be half a dozen more than are absolutely necessary for the rigidly economical transaction of the business of this House, upon the same principle which a manufacturing company or any private corporation do their business. When you get together sixty-one men in a body organized like this, you have no resort but to distribute your patronage or to throw yourselves into the tender mercies of the contractors who swarm about this capital, proposing to do the labor of this House by contract! From all contracts, Mr. Speaker, "good Lord deliver me." I do not care how honest the contractors are, or may be, or how conscientious; let them once fasten their fangs upon a contract in connection with the business of this Capitol, and we know where it leads to. Talk about economizing by making contracts for the pasting and folding of this House! Why, every man who ever visited this Capitol, let alone such as have been members here, knows that it is the sheerest nonsense in the world. The contract for the printing of this House is for sixty per centum less than any living man can afford to do it. We know that the contractors always manage, by some hook or crook, to make money. I would rather trust the finances of this House in the hands of the unsophisticated pasters and folders, than in the hands of a sharp set of contractors; I do not care whether they come from Lancaster or anywhere else.

Now, sir, I have said all I have to say on the merits of this question. We find ourselves in this fix. The Senate has twenty-four men to thirty-three, while we have thirty-four to one hundred. The gentleman from Beaver tells us they will not ratify our action. Now what is the next thing?—why, for my part, I am ready to stand by my man here now; but I do not believe we ought to be quite as sharp with these men as the gentleman from Beaver indicates. I believe these men came here with the understanding that they were to get their pay some way or other; no man of these twenty-seven came with the clear, definite understanding that he was to run the risk of getting his pay. I think we all assured them, upon our honor as men, that we thought there would be no trouble about their pay. I have no doubt about that. I am willing to compromise upon this basis. If it is the sense of the House to discharge these men by a join resolution to-day, to-morrow or next week, let us pass a joint resolution to that effect, and say, if you please, that the necessity for this appointment has ceased to exist, and pay them *pro rata* for the time they have been here and send them home. I am willing to discharge every officer of the House if the gentlemen think the economizing spirit of their constituents requires it. But let us by a joint resolution say to the Senate, "if you are willing to discharge these men in case they are paid *pro rata*, pass the bill to discharge them at once." And if they will not, with the gentleman from Clearfield, [Mr. McCullough] I will stay here until next year, but that the appropriation shall be passed providing for the pay of these men. I would never go back—never, sir, while I had the spirit of a man, or the first characteristic of manhood. I will never go back upon our implied contract, and discharge these men, until some provision by law has been made for their payment up to this time.

Mr. MILLER, (Rep.) Allegheny. Mr. Speaker, so far as this side of the House is concerned, perhaps I stand in rather a peculiar position in regard to this question. When the resolution was offered to increase the number of men, I not only voted in favor of the increase, but I advocated the increase of that number, deeming it necessary for properly conducting the business of this House, that these additional men should be appointed. I voted in favor of the resolution. In consequence of that, I have incurred the censure to some extent of the members of the political party to which I have the honor to belong; but what I did was done conscientiously. I believed then that it was necessary, and when the resolution was offered with the provision that where the Speaker or the Chief Clerk deemed it necessary to retain those additional men, they should be retained; but as soon as that was passed, they might be discharged, or such number should be discharged as they should deem necessary to discharge, I voted for it. I did it, believing that it was necessary for properly carrying on the business of this branch of the Legislature. And, sir, when I believe a thing is necessary, I vote in favor of it, no matter whether my political party sees proper to censure me for it or not. I stand here upon this floor as one of the representatives of my county, as a free man. I act as a free man, and when I believe a thing is right, no matter whether it emanates from the Republican side or the Democratic

"I consider Hoofland's German Bitters invaluable medicine in case of Indigestion or Dyspepsia. I can certify this from experience.

"Yours, with respect, JAMES THOMPSON,"

From Rev. Joseph D. Kennard, D. D., Pastor of the Tenth Baptist Church, Philadelphia.

Dr. JACKSON—Dear Sir: I have been frequently requested to connect my name with recommendations of different kinds of medicines, regarding the great majority as properly appropriate spheres, I have declined; but with a clear proof in several instances, and particularly in my own family of the usefulness of Dr. Hoofland's German Bitters, I depart for once from my usual course, to express my full conviction that for general debility of the system, and especially for Liver Complaint, it is a safe and valuable preparation. In some cases it may fail, but usually, I think it will be very beneficial to those who suffer in the above cases. Yours, very respectfully,

J. D. KENNARD.

tertained by different men, whether it is a very high honor to be a member of this body or not. But upon that matter, I have nothing to say.

Sir, I have no man here, although I advocated the resolution offered by the gentleman from Tioga [Mr. Strang] I have no man in the pasting and folding room; hence I act independently. It was not because I have a man here that I advocated that resolution, or that I expected to have a man here. I acted honestly and conscientiously in regard to that matter. During last winter, when the act was passed, limiting to a certain number the officers of this House, I thought then that it was gotten up for buncombe on the part of the opposition side of the House, and some of them have been honest enough to admit since that it was a great mistake. But it was gotten up for buncombe, and they have had to recede from that view of the case, which they took to their homes, and ask for an additional number of men.

Now, because this resolution emanated from the Republican side of the House, is it any reason why any Democrat, after that resolution has been passed—after these men have been employed—is it any reason that any Democrat on this side of the House should refuse to vote for a joint resolution providing for the payment of these men, simply because they choose to make a political question? No sir. Let them make it a political question if they choose; let them censure me, as they have censured me already for voting for it. But, sir, their censures pass by me like "the idle wind," for which I care not. I believe I have a duty to perform, and in the conscientious performance of that duty I stand here to-day; and I will perform it, no matter who find fault—whether they be Democrats or Republicans. I will perform that duty fearlessly and regardless of any individual.

Now, sir, I stand here an independent man in this matter. I have no instructions from my constituency, and if they had attempted to instruct me upon matters of legislation, I would have said to them, "No; I will stay at home before I will be instructed." I came here to perform my duties as a member of this Legislature according to the best of my ability and understanding, and I will perform those duties fearlessly and regardless of what may be said to the contrary, either on one side of the House or the other. I hope therefore, that this resolution will be amended and made a joint resolution.

Mr. PLAYFORD. I feel reluctant to occupy a moment of the time of this House in the discussion of this resolution. I know that the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. Wilson] is anxious to call up the appropriation bill, and I do not desire to delay it a moment. I promise that I will not consume over three minutes of our valuable time.

All through this session we have heard a great deal about the fairness and unfairness of the apportionment of these employees, and from the beginning we have had the discussions connected with the passage of the act of 1868, and the small number of officers provided by that act to discharge the business of this House. The House resolution providing for twenty-seven additional officers followed, in the passage of which there was shown some disrespect to the Senate. I am not here as the apologist of that body or its defender; but I say the proper way in relation to that matter would have been to introduce a joint resolution increasing the number of officers of this House, and after its passage here, to have sent it over to the Senate, when the action of that body could have been taken upon it.

Mr. WILSON. If my memory serves me right, that is just the course it is now proposed to take.

Mr. PLAYFORD. In case the Senate refused to concur, then it would have been proper to have cut these men adrift, and dispensed with all these extra officers.

Mr. STRANG. Does the gentleman think thirty-four officers enough for the transaction of the business of the House?

Mr. PLAYFORD. I do not know the amount of business to be transacted; but there was no necessity for going on and employing these men, and then compelling them to run this risk of receiving their pay.

Mr STRANG. Does the gentleman know that in 1868, when the Democrats were in a majority, that the number of officers in this House was one hundred and three?

Mr. PLAYFORD. I know this, that the expenses of the House were much less under Democratic rule, than they have been since.

As to this matter, I think no risk should have been run. There is no implied contract on the part of the Senate to vote for the payment of these men. There is nothing binding upon my morals, or upon my conscience, to vote one single dollar as compensation to these men. Let them who brought them here pay them off, if it comes to that.

I am in favor of this resolution, but I think the Senate will stultify itself if it agrees to pay one dollar towards compensating these men, in the capacity of employees.

Mr. WILSON. I am exceedingly anxious to bring the consideration of this resolution to a close; and I hope it will be made a joint matter. I never had any doubt, sir, of the right of this House to employ these additional officers, under the Constitution, and for making that assertion, I have received, perhaps, more abuse, excepting the gentleman from Tioga [Mr. Strang] than any other gentleman in the House.

Mr. DAVIS, (Philadelphia.) I insist that the gentleman includes the member from the Tenth district of Philadelphia [Mr. Davis.] [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON. I have received particular notice, and especially in one paper, published I believe in Cambria county, my attention was called to that notice through, I suppose, the editor of the paper, who took particular pains to send me a copy—otherwise I would never have known of the existence of the sheet. I suppose he presumed I would give him five dollars to tell the truth, but I did not do any such a thing. In that paper I was most grossly abused, and in other journals I have been most unjustly censured on account of this matter.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I hope that this amendment will not pass. I leave this suggestion to the good sense of the House. Let us pass this resolution dismissing these men, and then let some gentleman get up a joint resolution to pay them. Let me assure you that this joint resolution, with the amendment offered, will just complicate the question, and that it will not be passed in the other body. I have been assured within five minutes, in the Senate, that if you pass this resolution dismissing these men, and also providing for their payment, it will not pass there.

Mr. DAVIS, (Phila). To obviate that difficulty, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. STRANG. I renew it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I believe I have the floor, and want to finish what I have to say. I will not speak more than an hour. Now, in the face of known facts, stubbornly recorded, and proclaimed by the Senate, will you ride heedlessly along, and pass the resolution? Can you have the assurance to do it?

Mr. STRANG. I am not ready to yield to the Senate quite yet.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Upon that particular remark I desire to say a word. Some time ago the gentleman notified this House on a particular occasion that he would do no more "dirty work this session," and the editor of the Pittsburg *Gazette* has so stated, that the gentleman from Tioga [Mr. STRANG], would do no more such work, and he quoted the language used, too. Now, I submit to the gentleman from Tioga that I wish he would not make that expression any more.

Mr. STRANG. I think the gentleman from Beaver [Mr. NICHOLSON] has no reason to complain. I am certain he has none.

Mr. CORNMAN, (Dem.) Cumberland. If the resolution offered a few days ago by the gentleman on the other side had been adopted, I think there is no doubt but that the matter would have been settled ere this. A proposition had been made to set apart a day for the discussion of that bill. I have no desire to discuss the merits or demerits of this bill; but this much I will say here, and now—and that is that a man who voted for the appointment of the twenty-seven additional officers would stultify himself if he failed to vote to pay them for services rendered. I voted against these twenty-seven additional officers because I thought their services were not necessary, and I think so now.

Mr. STRANG. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, I would ask him if he also is aware that in 1863, the Democratic party had one hundred and three officers in this House?

Mr. CORNMAN. I do not know about that. But there is one thing I do know; and I refer the gentleman from Tioga [Mr. STRANG] back to the year 1847, and from that year to the present time, and he will find that when the Democratic party ruled in this House the expenses were at least twenty-five per centum less than they are to-day. I defy him, after a careful examination of the records from that time until now, to show a different result; and if he can, I ask him to do so. The result of such a financial research could soon be reported, and placed before us for investigation.

Sir, I was not in favor of that resolution, as I said. It has been stated by gentlemen upon this side that they expected to be censured and are censured by gentlemen representing this portion of the House. I do not know as they are censured. I hold that every man upon this floor has the right to do just as he thinks—to do what he thinks is right, notwithstanding the vote of this House. I propose to do what is right, whether I am in the minority or not. I voted against the additional twenty-seven, and I will vote against this resolution; but I feel sir, that every one of those twenty-seven who have faithfully performed the duties devolving upon them (and I know one of those twenty-seven who has performed his duties faithfully), should now receive the support of those who favored their appointment. I believe they should now be discharged, and that every man who faithfully filled his position should be paid.

Mr. WEBB. It strikes me that the debate on this resolution has taken a very wide range, although very much has been said in relation to the merits and demerits of the case.

Now, I would like to know if any of these twenty seven persons have been placed in the employ of this House by proper authority? If I recollect rightly, the gentleman from Tioga [Mr. STRANG] offered the resolution, which was passed, authorizing the Speaker and Clerk of this House to appoint twenty seven persons for certain purposes, if in their judgment such appointments were necessary. Now I make the inquiry, how many of these persons have been appointed by this House? I am informed that none have been, and too, from a source that is entitled to credit. I again ask if any person provided for in the gentleman's resolution has been put to work by or under that resolution? If so, then it seems to me that the talk about equity payment here does not amount to much.

It seems to me that if the resolution now before the House is to be passed at all, it should be passed for relieving those persons, and then let their friends take care of them in the appropriation bill, as was suggested by the gentleman from Beaver [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, I desire to inquire of the Speaker in relation to this question. If the joint resolution, as read here and amended, passes this house, will these additional officers be dismissed, regardless of the action of the Senate—or, supposing the Senate will not pass this joint resolution? I want an answer to this question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know that they will by the joint resolution.

Mr. WEBB. In relation to these twenty-seven persons—

The SPEAKER. I am not aware that all these men are necessary.

Mr. WEBB. Now, I would like to inquire of the Chair whether it is expected that these twenty seven persons will be paid, if this resolution is not passed. Is it not the intention to put the matter of their pay into the appropriation bill, and stand by it; and also to insist upon its passage through the Senate, and have his Excellency the Governor approve it, whether he is so inclined or not? Now, let us pass this resolution.

Mr. STRANG. Does the gentleman desire an answer to his question?

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. STRANG. The idea is this: We are willing to make this compromise with the Senate. We will discharge these men now, and pay them a *pro rata* amount of their allowance. We desire to pass this resolution now, and see what their answer is. A fair and square way, it seems to me, to meet the Senate is for us to discharge these men and pay them for the time they have been here.

Mr. WEBB. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the easiest and best way to reach this question, would be to pass a resolution discharging them forthwith, and then to put the matter of their pay into the appropriation bill, or amend this joint resolution providing for their pay, and send it to the Senate. In case this resolution is passed in that way, if the Senate "goes back" upon it, we can then put it in the appropriation bill, and compel the Senate to accept it or lose the whole bill. It is a peculiar question, looking at it in any way you may. *These men are not necessary*, and they should be discharged and paid a *pro rata* allowance, as provided in this bill.

Something has been said here, about gentlemen on the other side of the House, having men employed here upon the floor. The gentleman from Dauphin [Mr. Herr] says that it was done upon the authority of the Republican party, that some men upon the other side of the House are to have positions. Now, I would like to know how that authority was delegated or by whom it was made. It has been stated by the gentleman from Tioga [Mr. Strang] and by other gentlemen on the floor of this House, that each member was to have a man. Now, sir, if that be true, each Republican member should have had the right to name a man. There are Republicans upon this floor whose men are not here. The gentlemen from Lancaster, four in number, have only two men. The gentleman from Bedford [Mr. Longenecker,] sir, I am informed, has no man; and the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. Davis] has no one.

Mr. STRANG. I rise to a point of order. It is not proper to state the business of this House—those persons who have men here, and those who have not.

The SPEAKER decided the point of order well taken.

Mr. WEBB. Then it is probably in order for me to state that I have no man here, and I suppose it is also in order to say that the sixty members of the Republican caucus have no right to name a man for any other Republican member.

Mr. JONES. The point is well taken. [Laughter.]

Mr. VANKIRK. There seems to be some doubt as to the discharge of these men at this time on account of this having been amended so as to be a joint resolution. My object and purpose was to effect the discharge of the men not needed, at once, and to dispense with all further trouble about the matter. I therefore offer the following amendment to the amendment:

"And that the Chief Clerk be directed to discharge immediately the twenty-seven additional officers authorized by a resolution of this House."

Mr. STRANG. That is offered as an amendment to the joint resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the bill?

The joint resolution was then agreed to.

The title was read and agreed to as follows: "A joint resolution dispensing with the services of the persons appointed under a resolution of the House of Representatives, and providing for their payment for the time they were in service."

The bill was then read the third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Senate for concurrence.

Mr. Cushing's Treaty.

The treaty made by General Cushing with the Government of Columbia concedes to the United States the exclusive right to construct an interoceanic canal across the Isthmus of Darien at any point which may be selected by the United States. The Columbian Government cedes six miles of the land on each side of the canal—one half for its own benefit, and the other for that of the party undertaking the construction of the work. The Columbian Government is to receive ten per cent. of the net income for the first ten years, and after the canal is paid for twenty five per cent. of the net profits. The treaty is to be ratified by the United States within ten months, the surveys to be made within two years after the ratification, the canal begun within five years and finished within fifteen years after the ratification, otherwise the charter falls. The charter runs for one hundred years.

The canal is to be under the control of the United States, and Congress can fix the rate of tolls. The navigation is to be open to all nations in time of peace, but closed to belligerents who may seek to avail themselves of its advantages. It is estimated that the canal will cost $100,000,000. A company was not long ago organized in New York under a charter of that State, with Peter Cooper as President. It is said on distinguished authority that this company have the capital and are ready to commence the work. Congress, however, is at liberty to give the preference to this or any other private company; or the United States can itself undertake the construction of the canal. The treaty was sent to the Senate on Monday.—*Harrisburg Patriot.*

SURRATT TO WRITE A BOOK.—The Washington correspondant of the Boston *Herald* says: "John H. Surratt is now in South America, but will return here in a month. I learn from one of his friends that he has prepared a full and explicit statement of the conspiracy which resulted in the death of President Lincoln. In this he denies all knowledge of the assassination plot, but confesses freely that Booth and himself and others were in a plot to abduct Mr. Lincoln. He declares that assassination was never spoken of to him, and was not agreed on by Booth and Payne until the night it took place. He further insists on the entire innocence of his mother, maintains that every effort was made to keep the abduction plot, and says she was simply the victim of unfortunate circumstances and the machinations of the witness Weichman, whose evidence, it will be remembered, caused Mrs. Surratt's conviction. Surratt proposes to tell the good, bad indifferent, and make oath to it. He feels, it is said, that it will be so impartial and straightforward that it will be believed.

A revivalist encountered a large sized African, and asked him: "My good man, have you found the Lord?" To which Sambo replied in a surprised manner: "Golly, massa, am de Lord lost?"

If you are truly benevolent and charitable, perhaps you will, when you see a neighbor in distress, ask some other neighbor to help him.