

FIRST EDITION.

TWELVE O'CLOCK, P. M.

THE CAPITAL.

(By Telegram to the Pittsburgh Gazette.)

WASHINGTON, December 4.

CONGRESS ASSEMBLING.

About twenty Senators and thirty members of the House have arrived, and the number is increased by every arrival.

THE MESSAGE.

The President has written about two-thirds of his message. Some of the reports of the heads of departments are also unfinished.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS.

Some of the heads of Departments and chiefs of Bureaus have received printed copies of their reports. In all cases they will endeavor to prevent the publication in advance of their presentation to Congress.

Members of the press receiving them in advance will be required to give assurance that they will observe this rule. Among the reports already printed are those of the Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Comptroller of Currency, Treasurer and Register of the Treasury. The report of the Secretary of War was printed in the office connected with the Department, the report of the Secretary of the Treasury at the Treasury office and the remainder at the Government Printing Office.

Those immediately interested, after the close of the investigation, are satisfied that no portions of the President's message and the report of the Secretary of the Treasury have been surreptitiously obtained from the Treasury printing office.

CONGRESS VOLUNTARILY.

The outstanding circulation of legal tender notes is nearly \$550,000,000, and of fractional currency, thirty-two millions. Total three hundred and eighty-eight millions. The total amount in use as a circulating medium is nearly two hundred and twenty-six millions. Total amount of all kinds outstanding, five hundred and sixty-five millions.

ARMY PAYMENTS.

The actual payments for the army, less repayments, in each year for eight years, from 1891 to 1898, both inclusive, were \$3,241,000,000. In 1899, they were \$3,241,000,000. In 1900 they were \$3,241,000,000.

BONDS TO UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD.

It is stated, on what is considered reliable authority, that the President has ordered bonds to the amount of \$1,250,000 to be delivered to the Union Pacific Railroad.

PATENT EXTENDED.

The patent office today extended for seven years the patent of Cyrus Wheeler, Jr., for grain and grass harvesters.

PUBLIC STATEMENT.

The public debt statement will not be ready for publication until some time next week.

CUSTOMS.

The receipts for the week ending November 30th, were \$2,766,714.

A SNOW STORM.

Commenced today about eleven and still continues.

NATIONAL BOARD OF TRADE.

Convention at Cincinnati—Third Day's Proceedings.

(By Telegram to the Pittsburgh Gazette.)

CINCINNATI, December 4.—The President called the Convention to order at ten o'clock this morning.

On motion of the Committee on Admission, the Mobile Chamber of Commerce was admitted, and its delegates, Messrs. Stewart, Smith and Walker, were admitted to full membership.

The President then addressed the meeting. He said a good deal of the most important business yet remained to be considered, and trusted no member would talk of dispersion so long as there were any matters which remained undecided, and that those who felt compelled to leave should make every effort to stay, showing no haste to evade their responsibilities, whereby their deliberations would have their due weight with the people and with Congress. He then renewed his former suggestions as to the form of proceeding, that every gentleman, when arising, instead of saying "I have a motion," should announce his own name and place distinctly. Also, as to the vast importance of the motion brought up yesterday from the Board of Trade of Norfolk, Virginia, he asked the concurrence of the Board in his former suggestion. This was, that each member of the Board should have priority of speech in the discussion of the motion, and that the delegates be admitted to the privilege of speaking, but not voting.

Mr. Brandt complained of Mr. Nazro's extreme technicality.

The motion was put, and the vote cast ere thirty-five yeas and twenty-nayes.

The Chairman of the Committee on Admissions again presented the claims for admission of the delegates from Springfield, Mo. The delegates were admitted to the board and permitted to speak, but not to vote. The delegate from Council Bluffs, Ia., was also admitted under the same exception.

The Cairo Board of Trade was admitted, though no delegates have presented themselves.

The application of the Mobile Board of Trade was also presented, a communication being received by telegram.

Mr. Hincken, of New York, objected, "we were drifting into an unconstitutional course; we have no evidence whether this privilege was granted by a constitutional authority. We had nothing to do with any individual interests, but with general commerce; we have organized for exclusively commercial purposes. Not admitted."

Mr. Dalton, of Milwaukee, was excused on attendance.

Mr. Friley, President of the National American Shipping—This matter came up yesterday. It arose from a recom-

mendation proceeding from the New York Produce Exchange, to the effect that American shipping can be restored to its position of the supremacy of the ocean, from which it was driven by the rebellion, and from the want of proper legislation.

Mr. Hincken, of New York, wanted to be put to rest, and every one in the United States, to know that American ships no longer convey the vast produce of our soil.

The decline of our tonnage has been about one and a half millions of tons. The proposition is that we be allowed to buy vessels wherever they can be obtained at the cheapest rates, and sell them under the American flag.

We could buy any article anywhere, and import it by paying a duty, but not a ship nor a steamer will come here claiming free trade. We could be allowed to do what England and France has done, but we are willing to pay and to be printed and made a special order for to-morrow.

The Committee on Telegraph reported the following:

Resolved, That the National Board of Trade recommend the adoption by the general government of measures to cheapen and extend telegraphic communication between different parts of the country, by making it part of the postal system.

The resolution was postponed, to come up after the shipping question.

Mr. Myers, of St. Louis, thought it desirable that Congress should, by legal enactment, restore the currency of the nation to a specie basis, and reduce the unpaired and depreciated promises of the Government by resuming specie payment as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

Mr. Loney, of Baltimore, offered a resolution recommending Congress to pass a law forbidding the sale of gold in the United States Treasury for legal tender notes or other currency, and requiring the Secretary to dispose of the gold in the market as early as practicable.

Mr. Myers made some remarks on the advantages that would result from such a course.

Chair stated that the best way to hear from all on the subject was to have delegates speak in alphabetical order of their several States.

A delegate from Albany stated that his delegation was in favor of specie payment.

cordial—may her prosperity in the future be equal to her prosperity in the past." John Keck, President of the Council, gave the Old Timer State.

J. B. Brown, of Portland, Me., returned the thanks of Portland to Cincinnati and other cities for the aid they had sent Portland after her serious loss by fire.

"South Carolina—the home of a Marion and a Rutledge."

Resolved by Mr. Cabell, of Charleston, who concluded with a sentiment.

"Agriculture, Commerce and the Mechanic Arts—they add wealth and prosperity to any people."

Mr. Charles F. Eroughton, of Richmond, Va., replied in an eloquent speech, hoping, however, that the war was ended, the two sections of the country would live in harmony and unity.

At the conclusion the band struck up first "The Bonnie Blue Flag," followed by "Yankee Doodle," amid great applause, and finished with the "Star Spangled Banner." The whole audience rose to their feet and expressed the most unbounded enthusiasm.

RICHMOND, VA.

Argument in Motion to Quash the Indictment Against Jefferson Davis—The Chief Justice Favoring the Motion to Quash.

(By Telegram to the Pittsburgh Gazette.)

RICHMOND, December 4.

In the United States Circuit Court today, Chief Justice Chase presiding, on the motion to quash the proceedings against Jeff. Davis, R. H. Dana, for the Government, proceeded to show the Fourteenth Amendment, pleaded in bar of punishment by the defendant, was not a penal statute, but merely a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths.

Mr. Dana, of New York, argued that the defendant's counsel was wrong in his contention that the amendment was not a penal statute. He argued that the amendment was a declaration of the political system, secure trustworthiness in office and preserve purity in the administration of the Government. It was a measure of precaution to secure the country against filling offices with persons who once filled them and broke their oaths. If it had been intended to inflict punishment, it would have been the utmost folly of legislation, seeing that while it would, if viewed as the defendant's counsel viewed it, lighten the punishment of leaders who had held office and broken their oaths. It would leave people who never held office the highest bidder, and would, in effect, as provided in the Constitution before the adoption of the amendment. It was an expression only of public will as to the fitness of a man to hold office in a rebellion, after breaking their oath, to hold office again. It was not intended to punish, but to restore to office those who had broken their oaths. It was not intended to punish