Evening Telegraph.

BY GEORGE BERGNER | HARRISBURG, PA., MONDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 22, 1864. | PRICE TWO CENTS.

By Telegraph.

IMPORTANT FROM WEST VIRGINIA.

The Rebel Ferguson and His Command Captured.

Reported Re-capture of 1600 Union Prisoners.

CINCINNATI, Feb. 20.

A special dispatch to the *Commercial*, from Louisa, Ky., says that on the 14th inst. Col. Gallup surprised Col. Ferguson's command, in Wayne county, Va., capturing sixty prisoners, including Ferguson, his surgeon and two lieutenants.

Eighty stands of arms, a large number of stolen horses and all the rebel supplies of forage, ammunition and subsistence were taken. It was Colonel Ferguson's command that captured Gen. Scammon a short time since.

The despatch adds that 1,600 Union prisoners were released.

AN AFFECTING INCIDENT OF THE WAR.—In September, 1863, the steamer R. Campbell, on its way down the Mississippi, when opposite Milliken's Bend, Louisiana, was found to be on fire. It was at once headed toward the eastern bank of the river. But the flames spread so rapidly that before it reached the shore, all on board were obliged to spring into the stream. About thirty of them perished. On board was a lady whose husband, as she stated, had been killed in the army. She had with her a flaxen-headed daughter, probably four years old. She may have had other children. She was sick and unable to leave her bed; the child, amid the confusion, got upon the deck, and, seeing others jump into the water, asked a soldier if she must do so too. The soldier lost sight of her, but when he reached the shore found her lying apparently dead upon the beach. He took her to a fire near by, and warmed and chafed her until she came to.

After a while a boat coming up the river landed and took the survivors across to the camp of the Second Mississippi regiment, stationed at Milliken's Bend. Major John F. Robinson, of that regiment, saw the soldier leading the child, dripping wet, and invited him into his tent, gave him his breakfast and received the child from him. The child thus providentially cast upon his care, the Major, though a young man, resolved to adopt it if its relatives could not be found, and rear it as his own. Being unable to keep it properly in camp, he sent it to his parents in Ashland, Ohio. The child's name, as she gives it, is Mary Jane Hanson, or Hhmpsted.

Some time after the burning of the boat, a gentleman, searching for the body of a brother lost at the same time, found that of a woman which he supposed to be the body of this child's mother. He had it buried, and took a specimen of the dress and cloak and a purse with a copper advertisement of a business firm in New Castle, Indiana. The child is well and with the parents of Major Robinson.

Should this meet the eye of any one connected with the family thus cut off, they can obtain information of the child by addressing either Major J. F. Robinson, 3d Mississippi regiment, A. G., Milliken's Bend, Louisiana, or Rev. John Robinson, Ashland, Ohio. If any person who may see this can give any information in regard to the family of this child it will be thankfully received by either of the above parties.

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

Notice to Re-Enlisted Soldiers.

LOCAL Bounties collected for soldiers who have credited themselves to any part of the State of Pennsylvania or elsewhere, at *professional rates*. Soldiers can, in many instances, save half and even more of the local bounty to which they may be entitled, by having themselves credited to the locality they may prefer, and applying for the collection of the bounty, at the reliable claim agency of EUGENE SNYDER, Attorney-at-law, Third street, Harrisburg, Pa. feb12-d2w.

GUM PECTORALS are useful to soothe a cough, allay Tickling in the Throat, to relieve Hoarseness, Catarrh, Sore Throat, &c. They contain Coltsfoot, Horehound, Ipecacuanha, Senega and Squill, (the most reliable expectorants known,) are the chief active constituents, so blended with Gum Arabic and Sugar, that each lozenge contains a mild and very pleasant dose. Manufactured solely by S. A. KUNKEL & BRO., Apothecaries, 118 Market street, Harrisburg. jan2.

1,000 LBS. CODFISH, of the celebrated St. George brand, just received and for sale by [feb1] WM. DOCK, JR., & CO.

CROSSE & BLACKWELL'S ENGLISH PICKLES, a rare article for table use, just received and for sale by [feb1] WM. DOCK, JR., & CO.

THE CELEBRATED VIRGINIA OIL OF AIX, and Day & Martin's London Blacking, just received and for sale by [feb1] WM. DOCK, JR., & CO

APPLES! APPLES!!—150 barrels of York State Apples of every variety. Also, York State Butter, for sale at jan29 BOYER & KOERPER.

ALL persons having Grape Vines of choice varieties, which they wish to have pruned, can have it done in the best manner and free of charge, by addressing a note through the Post Office to JACOB MISH.
N. B.—The present season and weather are most favorable for the purpose. feb16

LEA & PERRINE'S WORCESTER SAUCE! the most popular and the purest ever offered to the public, just received and for sale by feb1 WM. DOCK, JR., & CO.

FRENCH BEANS—A rare article, just received at [feb3] W. DOCK, JR., & CO.

ORANGES! ORANGES!!—20 boxes in prime order. Just received wholesale and retail. feb2 WM. DOCK, JR., & CO

BUTTER! BUTTER!—1,000 pounds New York State Butter just received, and for sale by the Firkin or Pound, at the new grocery of dec4 BOYER & KOERPER.

A PATRIOTIC GIFT BOOK.
OUR CONSTITUTION, GOVERNMENT AND UNION. "Our Government," an exposition of the Constitution, &c., for popular use. By M. M'KINNEY. Price $1. For sale at d414 BERGNER'S BOOKSTORE.

BUCKWHEAT! BUCKWHEAT!—A small lot but superior quality of Buckwheat, direct from Towanda, Pa., for sale by the sack or quart, at jan29 BOYER & KOERPER.

20 BOXES ORANGES, selected from late importations, and the most superior ever brought to this market at this season, just received and for sale by [feb1] WM. DOCK, JR., & CO.

40 BOXES ORANGES, in good order; also, 100 Barrels of CHOICE APPLES for sale at feb5 JOHN WISE Fruit Store.

FINE ROMANO SHERRY, imported in 1848. Warranted the Finest Sherry Wine in this country. For sale at WM. DOCK, JR., & CO. feb2

Daily Telegraph

DEBATE

ON THE

Resolutions offered by Mr. Kelley, Preventing Payment of Damages to Disloyal Citizens.

Mr. KELLEY. I desire to state, sir, on my own account, why I urged the bringing up of this resolution a second time before the House; and I regret exceedingly that I feel very unable this evening to enter upon a lengthy discussion of the subject, and go over the whole ground. When I offered this resolution I had not the slightest, the remotest, anticipation of the extraordinary course which has been pursued in regard to it by gentlemen upon the other side of the House, nor of the extraordinary discussion to which it has given rise. I made no manner of preparation to support it upon this floor by a speech, for I regarded the justice of such a provision in the law for the adjudication and settlement of these claims to be so self-evident as to require no support from me nor from any one else. The simple question with which we have to deal is, shall the loyal people of Pennsylvania be taxed to pay the claims for damages of those who, by their encouragement and invitation to the rebels to invade our State, have brought those losses upon us; shall the people who have contributed so freely of their blood and treasure to carry on the war for the Union against treason and rebellion be now compelled to make good the losses of traitors and rebels occasioned by their aiders and abettors?

In offering this resolution, sir, I had not the slightest intention of charging the Democratic party as a mass with disloyalty. There is no such charge contained in the resolution either expressed or implied; and why is it, sir, I ask, that gentlemen upon the other side put such a construction upon it; why is it that they make such an application of language which had no reference to them? I can only account for it one way, and that is that they have not acted their parts as loyal citizens and true patriots in this war for the preservation of the Government. The man who has a conscience void of guilt winces not when guilt is spoken of in his presence; but, on the other hand, it is a true saying that a guilty conscience is its own accuser. If the gentlemen upon the other side and the party which they represent feel in their hearts that they are loyal and true to their Government and its history, if they feel and know that they have honestly and faithfully stood by the Government in this great struggle against treason, why should they deprecate investigation; why should they fear to have their conduct and actions reviewed, why should they wince when the word "disloyalty" is uttered in this hall? I have made no charges against the Democratic party, in this House, but, they have made charges against themselves by their application of the language of this resolution. It has been so, sir, since the commencement of the session. Whenever a remark has been dropped upon this side of the floor in condemnation of rebels and rebel sympathizers, the gentlemen upon the other side have always sprung up and protested against such attacks upon the *Democratic* party. Mr. Speaker, I should be sorry indeed to believe that the masses of the Democratic party of the present day are disloyal at heart. I have never made such a charge either upon the hustings or upon the floor of this House, notwithstanding the insinuation of the gentleman from Northumberland that I owe my success in the election last fall to my denunciations of the Democratic party. But I will tell the gentleman from Northumberland to what, in a great measure, I owed that success. It was to the fact that nearly every Democratic meeting, so called, held in that county was a disgraceful scene of drunkenness and rowdyism, of men waving their hats and cheering for Vallandigham. It was, sir, because Democratic orators traversed that county from centre to circumference, spouting such cold words of treason that the better portion of their party left them and voted the Union ticket. I do not alone mean the lower order of Democratic stump orators. I may refer to a particular example. A distinguished leader of the Democratic party, a would-be candidate for Governor of this Commonwealth, came into that county in the course of the campaign, and in one of his speeches to the Democracy there said that Vallandigham was to be elected in Ohio and Woodward in Pennsylvania; that they would act in conjunction with Parker, of New Jersey, and Seymour, of New York, and that this miserable abolition administration would be compelled to make peace.

I say this, sir, I have made no sweeping allegations of disloyalty against the Democratic party; but I do say, and I say it boldly and fearlessly, that the now recognised leaders of that party are disloyal men. I do say that the honest yeomanry of the Democratic party have been led into opposition to the Government and tacit encouragement of the rebellion through the efforts of these designing demagogues, who have constituted themselves the leaders of that party, and who care for nothing under heaven but the advancement of their own interests. I have as much love now for pure Democracy, the democracy of Jefferson, Madison and Jackson, as I ever had, and from my boyhood was educated in that faith; and that democracy taught me that devotion to the country was a duty paramount to every other consideration; that when that government was threatened with destruction by traitors, I should not stop to consider whether or not, as a Democrat, I could consistently support a Republican President in his efforts to subdue the rebellion and preserve the Nation; but that my duty as a loyal citizen and as a true Democrat was to render all the aid I could to the suppression of the rebellion. And I say, sir, that man who withholds his assistance from his government when it is engaged in a death struggle with armed treason from paltry party considerations, is neither a true Democrat nor a loyal man. I dropped my party prejudices when I shouldered my musket and went out into the service of my country; and while armed rebellion stands ready to destroy the government, I shall recognize no party affinity and stand shoulder to shoulder with no man who is not unconditionally for the Union and for carrying on the war until this rebellion is crushed never to rise again.

The gentleman from Philadelphia asks me if I am for the Union as it was. I want to know what the gentleman means by "the Union as it was." Does he mean that we shall allow the rebels to come back without stipulation or requirement? Does he mean that we shall go back now, after all that has taken place, and reassume the relationships which we occupied before the outbreak of this war? Does he mean that Davis, Toombs and Breckinridge, all those arch traitors who plotted this hellish rebellion, shall again resume their seats in the halls of Congress? Does he mean that every slave which this war has set free, and who has helped us to fight our battles, shall be returned to his rebel master? Does he mean that we shall crush down the great grief welling up in our hearts for our desolate hearthstones and deserted homesteads? Does he mean that we shall smooth our brows and humble ourselves as of old before the arrogant aristocracy of the South, and submit to be ridden over in the future as we have been in the past? If that is meant by "the Union as it was," then I tell the gentleman from Philadelphia and his coadjutors on the other side of the House, I am not for the Union as it was. I am for crushing the rebellion, and with it that which gave it birth, so that until the end of time there never can again occur in this land a war of slavery and slave power against the Government.

In the progress of this discussion we are again met by the old cry of the unconstitutionality of the acts of this administration. That same cry from the same source has been dinned in our ears since the commencement of the rebellion. It has been made the screen behind which Northern treason has continually veiled itself. At the outset, when an army of traitors, ready drilled and equipped, precipitated themselves upon us, when their guns were trained upon the very capitol of the nation, the call of the President for seventy-five thousand volunteers was met by this cry of unconstitutionality. Every effort which the National Government has put forth since that time has been greeted in like manner. I look in vain, Mr. Speaker, in that Constitution for any rights guaranteed to rebels. The people of the South wilfully and deliberately renounced their allegiance to this Government, made war upon this very Constitution and fired upon the very flag of the nation. What rights have they then under this Constitution? Why, the right which in all time, in all countries and under all governments, has been granted to traitors—the right to hang between heaven and earth. [Applause.]

But, sir, the gentleman from Northumberland tells us that freedom of speech and of the press is denied, that we are living under a despotism because treasonable newspapers have been suppressed, and such traitors as Vallandigham and Mahoney and so on, arrested and banished, or sent to a military prison; because men here in the North are not allowed to denounce their Government and uphold the rebellion, to convey information and encouragement to rebels, to discourage enlistments, and throw every obstacle in the way of carrying on the war. Sir, the great difficulty all along has been that too few arrests have been made. If more of these same traitors had been caught and hung, the war would have been over long since.

Freedom of speech denied! Why, sir, the very fact that men are allowed to stand up on this floor and denounce the Government, is proof positive that there is too much free speech. The very fact that papers over the country are permitted from week to week to pour out their vituperation and slander against the constituted authorities and Government of the United States, to assert that the war is unholy, unjust, is sufficient evidence that there is too much freedom of the press.

And while I am referring to the gentleman from Northumberland, let me notice another particular. He says my remarks the other day in reference to the mobbing of his press were more in commendation than in condemnation of the act. He goes on to say that the Democratic party have always been opposed to mob law, thereby insinuating that the opposite party have been encouraging it. Mr. Speaker, I have never, nor do I now, attempt to justify mob law; and I must say his insinuation is ill-timed in view of the riots which took place in the city of New York last summer; and when he says that mob law has been suppressed under Democratic administrations, I point the gentleman to the history of the South for years and years before the outbreak of this rebellion, when a Northern man holding extreme views in regard to slavery, dare not put his foot upon Southern soil for fear of being robbed and murdered.

But, sir, to come back to the point upon which I was speaking; and I shall be very brief, for I am not able to speak long upon this question. I ask, sir, if any loyal man feels his liberty to be any the less on account of these arbitrary arrests. Have any of us suffered by it? Do we not walk as safely through the day and rest as securely in the night as we ever did? If then, sir, the rights of loyal men are not affected by this exercise of military power, I care not how many traitors are affected by it. I want to see their power shortened at every turn. The man who in a crisis like the present, when the Government is struggling for its very existence, can turn against it and give his sympathy and encouragement to such a wicked rebellion, is a monster not fit to breathe the free air of heaven. That there are such men among us cannot be denied. To them, in a great measure, we owe the protraction of this war; to them particularly we owe the invasions of our State and the blood shed on the immortal hills of Gettysburg; to them we owe the vacant seats in our family circles and the agony of bereavement still fresh in many a heart. The whole State of Pennsylvania, and not Pennsylvania alone, but the whole land is in mourning through their instrumentality. Can we, I ask, sit here in our places and solemnly legislate to tax the people of our State, who have given not only the treasure of their lands but the treasure of their hearts to the Union cause, to make restitution to these traitors for what the people lost by their treason? Can we do it? I appeal to you, gentlemen on the other side of the House. There are some of you who have suffered by this war; there are some of you whose hearts are still bleeding from the wounds received through the loss of loved ones who fell at Gettysburg. I ask you in view of these facts, which are patent to us all, in view of the recent developments which have been made of disloyal organizations existing in several of the counties of this State, can you vote to pay these claims as indiscriminately presented? Can you refuse to require a test of loyalty? Can you agree to place the Union citizens and the traitor upon a common level? For my own part, I cannot do it; and so help me God I never will.

Mr. SMITH (Philadelphia) Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the gentleman from Washington is designed to prevent disloyal men from receiving pay for losses and damages by the common enemy. Exception is taken to this resolution by the gentlemen on the other side of the House; and one gentleman asks, what is to be the standard of loyalty. I answer that gentleman in the language of one who might be considered of his own party—Governor Bramlette, of Kentucky: "I may differ in opinion as to some of the measures of the Administration; but that difference has not degenerated into hostility to the Government. Agreeing in the object to be promoted, I differ as to the means. The object which we hold in common, the preservation of the Union and the perpetuation of our nationality, being immeasurably higher than any means which can or may be employed for its accomplishment, secures our patriotism from being swayed or jostled from its centre by any subordinate consideration."

When our friends on the other side of the House promulgate the sentiments of that kind we may take their assurances of loyalty as worth something. That the Democratic party should be thin-skinned, when any question touching loyalty is mentioned, is to be expected; for their leaders have, since the rebellion began, been the allies of Jefferson Davis and the right wing of Lee's army. Look to my own district, and you find the Reeds, the Biddles and the Ingersolls in sympathy with the rebels. Jeff. Davis can look with pride upon these champions and a host of lesser lights—men whose every act has been in sympathy with the rebellion since its commencement. In my district these men are the leaders of the Democratic party. Look again to other sections of the State, and what has been the evidence in regard to rebel sympathizing secret societies? Where have they been formed? In Republican districts? No, but in such Democratic counties as Berks, Schuylkill and Carbon.—What has been developed? Why, sir, it has been clearly shown that these men are banded together to prevent the draft, if possible, and that if drafted, their object is to desert to the rebels upon the first opportunity. Who are these men thus associated together for this unlawful purpose? Are they Republicans, or are they the followers of Wm. B. Reed and Frank Hughes, whose voices have been re-echoed from the hustings of those counties, where they have declared that "this is an unjust war—a war created by the Abolitionists and negro-worshippers of the North;" and have announced that it is no offence to deride the Government, that it is an inherent right guaranteed by the Constitution. Acting under the suggestions of such leaders, those associations have gone on until they have culminated in the death of our citizens. These modern leaders of the Democratic party are to day put forward as the patron saints; while such life-long Democrats as Daniel S. Dickinson and John A. Dix, of New York, Judge Holt, of Kentucky, Benjamin F. Butler, of Massachusetts, Edwin M. Stanton, Judge Knox and Judge Champneys, of Pennsylvania, Wright of Indiana, Brough and Tod, of Ohio, Andy Johnson, of Tennessee, and a host of others, are excommunicated from the Democratic party, because they stand on the side of their country; and Wm. B. Reed, Geo. M. Wharton, Geo. W. Biddle and other Whig fossils are set up in their places.

Whilst hundreds and thousands of Democrats of 1860 have come to the support of the Government, there are those who have assumed to be its supporters for the purpose of getting into honorable positions—men who were supposed to be honest in their professions of loyalty and support of the Government, but who have turned traitors. We have, Mr. Speaker, just such a case in my own ward. In 1862, one Frederick C. Brightly, professing to be a war Democrat, was nominated and elected, by the Republicans, by over six hundred majority, to a seat in the select council. I have no doubt that this individual, in connection with other semi-Union Democrats in the ward, deceived the people of my district, thus demonstrating the fact that the rebel sympathizers, like their principal, Jeff Davis, will resort to the grossest deception to carry out their diabolical designs. Yet this man Brightly, the better to cover his duplicity, issued a circular in which he administered the following truth to his Democratic friends, to whose bosom he has since returned:

"I cannot shut my eyes to the glaring fact, plain as the noon day sun, that the so-called leaders of the Democratic party (in this city) are disloyal in their sentiments, false to their country and their Government, and ready to aid the Southern traitors in breaking up a Union under which we have all prospered."

His case is on a par with that of some of the Southern deserters, who seek our lines, take the oath of allegiance the better to deceive our people, and after getting all the information that will be of service to the enemy, again desert. So did he.

Mr. Speaker, "the Constitution as it is," is the "harp of a thousand strings" which the leaders of the Democratic party have played upon; and the "peace Democracy," led by Fernando Wood, are continually prating about the accomplishment of peace—a peace that will dismember this glorious Union, augmenting the already large liabilities of our Government, tax our people for the indebtedness of the rebels, (for it is proposed to assume the confederate debt,) and perpetuate slavery upon our continent. Such is the peace that his leadership would bring. Do you desire indubitable proof that the Democratic leaders are giving aid and comfort to the rebels? Look to England, where Maury, the rebel agent, in London, made a formal statement to this effect in a letter last September to the London *Times*. His claim was that the peace party were growing so strong that they were certain to elect Vallandigham in Ohio and to carry New York and Pennsylvania—all of which would weaken the cause of our Government, and give strength to the cause of the rebels. The same arguments were held out to the Southern people to quiet their clamors about high prices and starvation and general distrust brought on through this accursed rebellion. Maury urged his friends to have patience a little longer, stating that the fall elections in the Northern States would overthrow the National Government. Do you tell me that men would make and publish these statements, if there was not an understanding between the rebels and their Northern allies, the leaders of the Democratic party? For you must recollect that Vallandigham was in Canada, when he could communicate without restraint to his friend Maury the true sentiments of his party.

Talk about peace! Go back to the time in May, 1861, when at Chicago, Illinois, Stephen A. Douglas, too ill to write himself, wrote through his amanuensis to Virgil Hickok, chairman of the Democratic State Committee, the following language:

"It seems that some of my friends are unable to comprehend the difference between arguments used in favor of equitable compromise with the hope of averting the horrors of war, and those urged in the support of the Government and the flag of our country, when war is being waged against the United States, with the avowed purpose of producing the permanent disruption of the Union and the total destruction of the Government. All hopes of compromise with the cotton States were abandoned when they assumed the position that the separation of the Union was complete and final, and that they never would consent to a reconstruction in any contingency—not even if we would furnish them with a blank sheet of paper and permit them to inscribe their own terms."

With these declarations before the world, what have the leaders of the Democratic party done? Have they come up to the full measure of supporting the General Government in putting down this rebellion? I answer, no. And so the freemen of Pennsylvania spoke on the second Tuesday of October last, and had William B. Reed been the candidate of the Democratic party of Pennsylvania, as Vallandigham was the true exponent of Jefferson Davis and his hordes in Ohio, he would have been as badly beaten as was Vallandigham. Next November, the people in their majesty will again speak; and at that time it will be in tones of thunder, declaring that this rebellion shall be put down (if that has not already been done,) and that Abraham Lincoln, the patriot of 1864, shall have the plaudits of his fellow-countrymen.

Mr. Speaker, as I have referred to the late Stephen A. Douglas, let me add what he said in reference to the duty of patriotic citizens:

"In view of this state of facts, there was but one path of duty left to patriotic men. It was not a party question involving partisan policy. It was a question of government on no government, country or no country; and hence it became the imperative duty of every Union man and every friend of constitutional liberty to rally to the support of our common country, its government and its flag, as the only means of checking the progress of the revolution and preserving the Union of the States. I know of no mode by which a loyal citizen may so well demonstrate his loyalty to his country as by sustaining the flag, the Constitution and the Union under all circumstances and under every Administration, (regardless of party politics,) against all assaults at home and abroad."

Mr. Speaker, the course of Clay and Webster during the administration of General Jackson, in the days of nullification, presents a noble and a worthy example to all true patriots; and in our own day, Daniel S. Dickinson and a host of other patriots have, in the day of our nation's trial, given their support to the Government, although they took no part in the election of those who now administer it. What a contrast with such men as Fernando Wood, Vallandigham, Reed and other followers, whose every act has had for its object to embarrass the Government!

My colleague (Mr. BARGER) has spoken of this resolution as extraordinary in its requirement that persons applying for indemnity shall prove their loyalty. Sir, if I understand anything about the general laws governing such cases, it is the law of every land and country that a subject claiming compensation for damages done by the common enemy must prove his loyalty and faithfulness to his country or crown.

The same gentleman has also referred in glowing terms to the opponent of my colleague (Mr. WATSON.) I would say that he was not the only one who had worn the uniform of the Government, whose loyalty was questioned. Some who had attained even a higher position have been served in the same way; and if that candidate was not elected, it was because he was repudiated by the loyalty of a Democratic district.

Mr. Speaker, the leaders of the Democratic party in our city have, on all occasions, misrepresented our party and attempted to secure votes by working on the prejudices of the foreign voters. I call to the mind of my colleague on the other side of the House one fact. A newspaper publisher in Philadelphia, managed by a Democrat who would have liked to represent the Sixteenth Congressional district of our State, (in which, however, there were too many loyal voters to allow him to do it,) stated a vile slander against me, and attempted to use it to defeat me in my district. It will be remembered that at a previous session, I read in place a bill, entitled An act to incorporate an Emigration Society, which empowered the stockholders, in case of the absconding of a party before he had paid all the advances made by the company, to bring him back, or if the absconding party gave security he must be released. This was placarded abroad as an application of the fugitive slave law to white men. They further said that we desired "epaulettes for negroes, and handcuffs for Irish and Dutch." Why, Mr. Speaker, there was not a section in the bill that would compare in stringency with the powers of masters under our apprentice system, to bring back their absconding apprentices. And again, every man named in the bill as a corporator, with two exceptions, was an Irishman and a Democrat. And yet these leaders of the Democratic party, by such vile slanders, would attempt to serve their rebel brethren by defeating loyal men.

Mr. Speaker, what the patriot desires in this struggle is, not that a party may win, but that the country may be saved; and, if our Democratic leaders would follow the teachings of Clay and Webster, whom they at this time, profess to revere so much, we might trust their loyalty. But we have too many proofs of the opposite kind. Who does not remember that last session, when Andrew Johnson, a loyal Democrat of Tennessee, asked for the use of this Hall, that he might address his fellow-citizens, that privilege was refused by the votes of Democrats—thank God, not by all; and when some one, I know not who, placarded the names of those who thus refused the Hall, some of those members gloried in it, justifying the act, and claiming that, if just such placards as those were posted in their districts, they would be at no expense for electioneering purposes. Is there not reason why the gentlemen on the other side are so sensitive upon the question of loyalty, when we have indubitable proof that their leaders are in sympathy with the rebels?

My colleague (Mr. BARGER) has spoken disparagingly of the condition of our commerce and our manufacturing and mechanical operations during this war. Does not the gentleman know that at no time in our country's history have we been so prosperous as now—that at no time have our mechanics and artisans been better remunerated than now? From every workshop and mill we hear the busy hum of the spindle. The sound of the hammer and the anvil is heard everywhere through the country. And at no time have workmen in all branches been better paid. Look at our own city of Philadelphia. Heretofore every winter, soup societies and charitable associations have been taxed to their utmost capacity to provide for the necessities of the indigent. Such is not the case now. There is not nearly the amount of destitution that existed in former years.

The gentleman has also spoken of the horrors of war. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that our people have no taste for war. They delight in the pursuits of peace, and deeply pity the deluded people of the South. They feel the heavy burdens of taxation. Yet they say, "prosecute this war till the last armed rebel expires."

Sir, I have only to say that I can see no objection which any loyal man could have to coming forward and presenting his claim under this resolution; and he who cannot prove himself to be a loyal man should not receive from this Commonwealth one iota for any damages done during the raids by the rebels, or by our own troops. I trust that when the vote shall be taken, there will be a large majority on this floor in favor of the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. ORWIG. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose, on this occasion, to occupy the time of the House in any lengthy discussion upon this question. The resolution simply proposes to apply the test of loyalty to a certain class of claimants against the Government. Gentlemen on the other side of the House evidently do not want that test applied, and, as a consequence, they propose to pay out millions of public money without discrimination, as well to disloyal as to loyal claimants. This, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of serious importance to the people of this Commonwealth. In consequence of the several invasions of our State by the rebel armies, the people of the border counties lost much valuable property, while, at the same time, the people of the middle and northern counties lost much valuable time, expended large sums of money and suffered many hardships, privations and toils to drive these invaders from our borders.

Now, sir, the gentleman from Franklin, by the bill which he has presented, proposed to pay the citizens of the border counties for the losses which they sustained. When the bill itself comes to be considered in this House, I shall endeavor to state my objections to it. At this time we have under consideration only the resolution instructing the committee that has this bill in charge to add to that bill a section requiring a proof of the loyalty of the claimants. Now sir, it is an unaccountable thing to me, and it has been a matter of surprise to this side of the House generally, that our friends on the other side of the Hall exhibit so much sensitiveness, and fly into such a terrible passion at the bare proposition that disloyal men should not be paid out of the treasury of the Commonwealth for losses which they sustained in consequence of their own acts. I cannot think, sir, that the gentlemen fairly and truly represent the great body of the Democratic party of Pennsylvania. I believe, sir, that this occasion has been seized upon for the purpose of building up or upholding a tottering and crumbling organization. I do not think, sir, that the constituents of these gentlemen who here declare, or openly boast that they would be excepted from the benefits of this appropriation by the application of this rule, fairly represent the great Democratic party of Pennsylvania.

Why, sir, I had the satisfaction myself of hearing, full two years or more ago, the speech, or at least part of the speech which was delivered in this House a few days ago by the gentleman from Northumberland (Mr. PURDY.) And I regret exceedingly that that gentleman is not in his seat to-night; I hope he will have an opportunity, before this debate closes, to reply to anything I may say concerning himself or his constituency.

The gentleman from Northumberland has charged the Republican party with being the disloyal party—the cause of this unholy and unrighteous war, and the cause of all the bloodshed and suffering and sorrow that have resulted from it. He boasted that he, and those who act with him politically, represent the only true and loyal party in this Commonwealth. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has further informed us that he is the editor of a Democratic paper in the district which he represents. I desire, sir, to refer to his issue of April 19th, 1861—about the period of the commencement of this war. In that paper he refers approvingly to the resolutions of what he styles "a great and enthusiastic Democratic meeting," at which they

"*Resolved*, That the rapid developments of the last five months have rendered the existence of the Southern Confederacy a fixed fact, and that we are opposed to every form of coercion, under whatever pretext, of enforcing law, collecting revenue or re-taking property which may lead to a conflict with the seceded States."

This, sir, is a resolution adopted at "a great and enthusiastic Democratic meeting." This, sir, was the position, at that time, of the Democratic party, which now prides itself as being, as it claims always to have been, the great champion of the Constitution of the union of these States. There, sir, by "a great and enthusiastic meeting," they declared the establishment of the Southern Confederacy a fixed fact and deprecated all efforts on the part of the National Government to suppress it.

Now, sir, this same paper—issued on the 19th of April, 1861—the first issue, I believe, after the proclamation of President Lincoln calling for seventy five thousand men to suppress the rebellion—does not contain one letter or one syllable of that proclamation, while at the same time you will find, in almost every column of that paper, displayed in glowing capitals, the name of President Davis and the whole of his proclamations—every word, every syllable, every letter.

Now, sir, I would ask the gentleman from Northumberland, where did he give the influence of his publication? Where did he give the aid and encouragement and assistance that he, as a private individual and as the publisher of a newspaper, was pleased to render upon that trying and important occasion in the history of our country? Why, sir, is not the fact staring us all in the face that he gave his assistance and influence, whatever these may have been, to the side of the Southern Confederacy? Did he not recognize that arch-rebel and traitor, Jefferson Davis, as the lawful President of an established government?

It would perhaps be tedious, and would occupy the time of this House at too great length to follow up the record that this gentleman has made for himself during these troublesome years which have followed the date of his newspaper to which I have referred. Suffice it to say, that, if you will examine the columns of that paper, and compare the record that this gentleman has made for himself, and the record that the Democratic party in that part of the State have formed for themselves, you will find that they have adhered to those ideas and pursued that course of conduct from that day to this. While the loyal hearts of this country were throbbing with anxiety and looking forward to the speedy return of some of the Southern States to the old Government, and while the effort was progressing rapidly and encouragingly in the city of New Orleans, this same editor published the following, in his issue of the twelfth day of this month:

"Nobody now appears at the so called Union meetings in New Orleans, except the Northern disunion abolitionists, who have been exported to that State by Mr. Lincoln. These wretches (that is, the Union men of New Orleans) assemble to the number of a few hundred, and call themselves the State of Louisiana, elect

CONTINUED ON FOURTH PAGE.