

Daily Telegraph



Forever float that standard aloft! Where breathes the foe but falls before us...

OUR PLATFORM THE UNION—THE CONSTITUTION—AND THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAW.

HARRISBURG, PA. Tuesday Afternoon, January 14, 1862.

POLITICAL UNION.

We asserted a few days since, that, from the culmination of the rebellion at the south, the Republican organization had been unceasing in its efforts to conciliate the loyal men of the loyal states...

The political and personal friends of General Cameron receive the news of his retirement from the Cabinet with regret only equalled by the high esteem and consideration in which he is held throughout his native state of Pennsylvania.

The appointment of the Hon. Edwin M. Stanton as the successor of Gen. Cameron in the War Department, must be very popular, notwithstanding Mr. Stanton is so little known to the mass of the people.

LEGISLATIVE SHARP PRACTICE. We have frequently referred to the fact, that as politicians the Democracy were the most uncertain allies and dangerous friends the Republican party could possibly cultivate.

But these men are welcome to the opportunity of thus evincing their deep prejudices in favor of a corrupt old organization. When they return to their constituents they will be treated with the scorn and contempt which we have neither time or room to deal out to them in these columns.

UNANSWERABLE ARGUMENT. We print to-day the argument of the Hon. Ross Forward, before the committee in the contested election case of John Cessna against Geo. W. Householder.

In this connection we will only offer a word in reply to the silly charges which were made in this morning's Patriot and Union in reference to the printed report of Mr. Ross Forward's argument.

We report, therefore, that at this period in the history of the Republic, when great truths are stirring the people to greater efforts for the right and for liberty, it would be worse than suicidal to modify any just principles, merely to accommodate a few men who are anxious to maintain their consistency.

Mr. Householder's complaint then is not, that the law has been observed, but that it has been, which concedes all that you have any right to inquire concerning.

Mr. Householder's complaint then is not, that the law has been observed, but that it has been, which concedes all that you have any right to inquire concerning.

Mr. Householder's complaint then is not, that the law has been observed, but that it has been, which concedes all that you have any right to inquire concerning.

jeopard the present and the future peace of the Union. Maintain all in their strength and their purity, and, although we may be forced to struggle in deadly combat for a few years, the end will repay the sacrifice of life and treasure, with a free people secured in their freedom, and a nation forever blessed with peace and Union!

THE RESIGNATION OF GEN. CAMERON.

The telegraph confirms a rumor which was prevalent in this city last evening, to the effect that Hon. Simon Cameron had resigned his position as Secretary of War.

Before that resignation was accepted, President Lincoln pressed on the acceptance of Secretary Cameron, the post of Minister to Russia, made vacant by the resignation of Cassius M. Clay.

The political and personal friends of General Cameron receive the news of his retirement from the Cabinet with regret only equalled by the high esteem and consideration in which he is held throughout his native state of Pennsylvania.

The appointment of the Hon. Edwin M. Stanton as the successor of Gen. Cameron in the War Department, must be very popular, notwithstanding Mr. Stanton is so little known to the mass of the people.

LEGISLATIVE SHARP PRACTICE. We have frequently referred to the fact, that as politicians the Democracy were the most uncertain allies and dangerous friends the Republican party could possibly cultivate.

But these men are welcome to the opportunity of thus evincing their deep prejudices in favor of a corrupt old organization. When they return to their constituents they will be treated with the scorn and contempt which we have neither time or room to deal out to them in these columns.

UNANSWERABLE ARGUMENT. We print to-day the argument of the Hon. Ross Forward, before the committee in the contested election case of John Cessna against Geo. W. Householder.

In this connection we will only offer a word in reply to the silly charges which were made in this morning's Patriot and Union in reference to the printed report of Mr. Ross Forward's argument.

We report, therefore, that at this period in the history of the Republic, when great truths are stirring the people to greater efforts for the right and for liberty, it would be worse than suicidal to modify any just principles, merely to accommodate a few men who are anxious to maintain their consistency.

Mr. Householder's complaint then is not, that the law has been observed, but that it has been, which concedes all that you have any right to inquire concerning.

Mr. Householder's complaint then is not, that the law has been observed, but that it has been, which concedes all that you have any right to inquire concerning.

Mr. Householder's complaint then is not, that the law has been observed, but that it has been, which concedes all that you have any right to inquire concerning.

Contested Election Case.

Synopsis of the Argument Delivered by the Hon. Ross Forward.

The seat of Geo. W. Householder, member elect from the district of Somerset and Bedford, is contested by John Cessna, Esq., of Bedford county.

He bases his claim to the seat, upon the unconstitutionality of the apportionment bill of 1857, connecting these counties in the same legislative district.

The 4th section of the first article of the Constitution, on which is his main reliance, reads as follows: "Within three years after the first meeting of the General Assembly, and within every subsequent term of seven years, an enumeration of the taxable inhabitants shall be made in such manner as directed by law."

The number of Representatives shall, at the usual periods of making such enumeration, be fixed by the Legislature, and apportioned among the counties of Philadelphia and the several counties, according to the number of taxable inhabitants in each; and shall never be less than sixty nor more than one hundred.

Now, Mr. Cessna's claim to a seat for Bedford county cannot be sustained for two principal reasons:— 1st. Because the question of the constitutionality of the law has been decided by the only tribunal having any authority over the subject, and its decision, whether right or wrong, cannot be inquired into or reversed by the present Legislature, or any committee thereof.

In support of the first position we have only to examine the constitution, and observe to whom is entrusted the carrying out of its provisions, and on whom we are to depend for its preservation. The powers of the government are divided into legislative, executive and judicial. The members of the Legislature, sworn to support the constitution, there is confidence reposed in them that they will make no enactments contrary to its provisions.

Neither Bedford or Somerset had sufficient taxable, according to the ratio then established, to entitle them to a member. The ratio was 5976. Somerset had 5254 and Bedford 5197. And Mr. Cessna, in order to obviate the crushing force of this fact upon his claim, created from Bedford county, undertakes to create the latter clause of the 4th section as meaning "that when a new county has once obtained the number of taxable agreeable to the ratio then established, it is forever after entitled to a separate representation, no matter how far it may fall short of it at the times of subsequent enumerations and apportionments."

And any county not being an original county, and failing to have at any one of the several periods of enumeration and apportionment agreeable to the ratio which is then established is positively prohibited by the Constitution from having a separate representative. Admitting, Mr. Cessna, now then that Bedford county as she now is, and not as she was in 1790, is entitled to have at least one representative, although she had not an original county, and can make no such claims; and having fallen behind the ratio then, in 1857, established, is properly and of necessity connected with another county in representation.

But even if Somerset should have had the requisite number it was a matter entirely at the discretion of the Legislature, depending upon their judgment of the necessity or convenience of so doing, in districting the State. For the latter clause of the 4th section of the constitution is merely declaratory of a right which the new counties should not have, and not a positive enactment that they should have a separate representation, whenever they had the full ratio of taxable at the time of making the apportionment.

But even if Somerset should have had the requisite number it was a matter entirely at the discretion of the Legislature, depending upon their judgment of the necessity or convenience of so doing, in districting the State. For the latter clause of the 4th section of the constitution is merely declaratory of a right which the new counties should not have, and not a positive enactment that they should have a separate representation, whenever they had the full ratio of taxable at the time of making the apportionment.

But even if Somerset should have had the requisite number it was a matter entirely at the discretion of the Legislature, depending upon their judgment of the necessity or convenience of so doing, in districting the State. For the latter clause of the 4th section of the constitution is merely declaratory of a right which the new counties should not have, and not a positive enactment that they should have a separate representation, whenever they had the full ratio of taxable at the time of making the apportionment.

But even if Somerset should have had the requisite number it was a matter entirely at the discretion of the Legislature, depending upon their judgment of the necessity or convenience of so doing, in districting the State. For the latter clause of the 4th section of the constitution is merely declaratory of a right which the new counties should not have, and not a positive enactment that they should have a separate representation, whenever they had the full ratio of taxable at the time of making the apportionment.

But even if Somerset should have had the requisite number it was a matter entirely at the discretion of the Legislature, depending upon their judgment of the necessity or convenience of so doing, in districting the State. For the latter clause of the 4th section of the constitution is merely declaratory of a right which the new counties should not have, and not a positive enactment that they should have a separate representation, whenever they had the full ratio of taxable at the time of making the apportionment.

But even if Somerset should have had the requisite number it was a matter entirely at the discretion of the Legislature, depending upon their judgment of the necessity or convenience of so doing, in districting the State. For the latter clause of the 4th section of the constitution is merely declaratory of a right which the new counties should not have, and not a positive enactment that they should have a separate representation, whenever they had the full ratio of taxable at the time of making the apportionment.

take upon themselves the authority to alter the law so as to affect the membership of the present Legislature, and thereby take advantage of the people, giving them a representative they had no right of choosing. It would be such a disregard of the established usage and precedents, for the last seventy years, that it is hard to imagine how any man could conceive the idea of attempting it, and still harder to think it possible that he can convince any body of sane men of the propriety of so doing.

But let the first position be decided as it may, there can be no question as to the false construction, which is attempted to be made of the 3rd section of 1st article of the constitution. Mr. Cessna reads it as though it said, "each county shall have at least one representative," and there stopped. But the men who made that constitution had wisdom enough to know that in the progress of time, it would become necessary to make new counties, and they in anticipation of a difficulty which might be raised, proceed to say in the same sentence, "each county shall have at least one representative, but no county hereafter erected shall be entitled to a separate representation, until a sufficient number of taxable inhabitants shall be contained within it, to entitle them to one representative agreeable to the ratio which shall then be established."

Now in 1790 and for some years afterwards, every foot of land now in Somerset county was within the bounds of the counties of Bedford county. The people of that portion of Bedford county applied by petition to the Legislature in 1795 for a separate county organization, and they deemed it advisable to grant the privileges prayed for, on the 17th of April of that year erected the new county of Somerset. Then came up the question of representation, how was that to be arranged? Why just as the framers of the Constitution contemplated. They agreed to give them a separate county organization, but say in effect as to the matter of representation, you shall continue as heretofore connected, with the parent county, and within the limits of which you were at that time a Bedford county at the making of the constitution, and to which was assured a member, there shall be three members elected. Somerset, a part of Bedford county, and that part left, still known as Bedford, shall together elect three representatives. Such is the provision of the first enactment which gave a certain portion of Bedford county a new name and certain privileges, which did not at all interfere with the constitutional right of the people in that district, to be represented in the Legislature.

Now in 1790 and for some years afterwards, every foot of land now in Somerset county was within the bounds of the counties of Bedford county. The people of that portion of Bedford county applied by petition to the Legislature in 1795 for a separate county organization, and they deemed it advisable to grant the privileges prayed for, on the 17th of April of that year erected the new county of Somerset. Then came up the question of representation, how was that to be arranged? Why just as the framers of the Constitution contemplated. They agreed to give them a separate county organization, but say in effect as to the matter of representation, you shall continue as heretofore connected, with the parent county, and within the limits of which you were at that time a Bedford county at the making of the constitution, and to which was assured a member, there shall be three members elected. Somerset, a part of Bedford county, and that part left, still known as Bedford, shall together elect three representatives. Such is the provision of the first enactment which gave a certain portion of Bedford county a new name and certain privileges, which did not at all interfere with the constitutional right of the people in that district, to be represented in the Legislature.

Now in 1790 and for some years afterwards, every foot of land now in Somerset county was within the bounds of the counties of Bedford county. The people of that portion of Bedford county applied by petition to the Legislature in 1795 for a separate county organization, and they deemed it advisable to grant the privileges prayed for, on the 17th of April of that year erected the new county of Somerset. Then came up the question of representation, how was that to be arranged? Why just as the framers of the Constitution contemplated. They agreed to give them a separate county organization, but say in effect as to the matter of representation, you shall continue as heretofore connected, with the parent county, and within the limits of which you were at that time a Bedford county at the making of the constitution, and to which was assured a member, there shall be three members elected. Somerset, a part of Bedford county, and that part left, still known as Bedford, shall together elect three representatives. Such is the provision of the first enactment which gave a certain portion of Bedford county a new name and certain privileges, which did not at all interfere with the constitutional right of the people in that district, to be represented in the Legislature.

Now in 1790 and for some years afterwards, every foot of land now in Somerset county was within the bounds of the counties of Bedford county. The people of that portion of Bedford county applied by petition to the Legislature in 1795 for a separate county organization, and they deemed it advisable to grant the privileges prayed for, on the 17th of April of that year erected the new county of Somerset. Then came up the question of representation, how was that to be arranged? Why just as the framers of the Constitution contemplated. They agreed to give them a separate county organization, but say in effect as to the matter of representation, you shall continue as heretofore connected, with the parent county, and within the limits of which you were at that time a Bedford county at the making of the constitution, and to which was assured a member, there shall be three members elected. Somerset, a part of Bedford county, and that part left, still known as Bedford, shall together elect three representatives. Such is the provision of the first enactment which gave a certain portion of Bedford county a new name and certain privileges, which did not at all interfere with the constitutional right of the people in that district, to be represented in the Legislature.

Now in 1790 and for some years afterwards, every foot of land now in Somerset county was within the bounds of the counties of Bedford county. The people of that portion of Bedford county applied by petition to the Legislature in 1795 for a separate county organization, and they deemed it advisable to grant the privileges prayed for, on the 17th of April of that year erected the new county of Somerset. Then came up the question of representation, how was that to be arranged? Why just as the framers of the Constitution contemplated. They agreed to give them a separate county organization, but say in effect as to the matter of representation, you shall continue as heretofore connected, with the parent county, and within the limits of which you were at that time a Bedford county at the making of the constitution, and to which was assured a member, there shall be three members elected. Somerset, a part of Bedford county, and that part left, still known as Bedford, shall together elect three representatives. Such is the provision of the first enactment which gave a certain portion of Bedford county a new name and certain privileges, which did not at all interfere with the constitutional right of the people in that district, to be represented in the Legislature.

Now in 1790 and for some years afterwards, every foot of land now in Somerset county was within the bounds of the counties of Bedford county. The people of that portion of Bedford county applied by petition to the Legislature in 1795 for a separate county organization, and they deemed it advisable to grant the privileges prayed for, on the 17th of April of that year erected the new county of Somerset. Then came up the question of representation, how was that to be arranged? Why just as the framers of the Constitution contemplated. They agreed to give them a separate county organization, but say in effect as to the matter of representation, you shall continue as heretofore connected, with the parent county, and within the limits of which you were at that time a Bedford county at the making of the constitution, and to which was assured a member, there shall be three members elected. Somerset, a part of Bedford county, and that part left, still known as Bedford, shall together elect three representatives. Such is the provision of the first enactment which gave a certain portion of Bedford county a new name and certain privileges, which did not at all interfere with the constitutional right of the people in that district, to be represented in the Legislature.

Now in 1790 and for some years afterwards, every foot of land now in Somerset county was within the bounds of the counties of Bedford county. The people of that portion of Bedford county applied by petition to the Legislature in 1795 for a separate county organization, and they deemed it advisable to grant the privileges prayed for, on the 17th of April of that year erected the new county of Somerset. Then came up the question of representation, how was that to be arranged? Why just as the framers of the Constitution contemplated. They agreed to give them a separate county organization, but say in effect as to the matter of representation, you shall continue as heretofore connected, with the parent county, and within the limits of which you were at that time a Bedford county at the making of the constitution, and to which was assured a member, there shall be three members elected. Somerset, a part of Bedford county, and that part left, still known as Bedford, shall together elect three representatives. Such is the provision of the first enactment which gave a certain portion of Bedford county a new name and certain privileges, which did not at all interfere with the constitutional right of the people in that district, to be represented in the Legislature.

Now in 1790 and for some years afterwards, every foot of land now in Somerset county was within the bounds of the counties of Bedford county. The people of that portion of Bedford county applied by petition to the Legislature in 1795 for a separate county organization, and they deemed it advisable to grant the privileges prayed for, on the 17th of April of that year erected the new county of Somerset. Then came up the question of representation, how was that to be arranged? Why just as the framers of the Constitution contemplated. They agreed to give them a separate county organization, but say in effect as to the matter of representation, you shall continue as heretofore connected, with the parent county, and within the limits of which you were at that time a Bedford county at the making of the constitution, and to which was assured a member, there shall be three members elected. Somerset, a part of Bedford county, and that part left, still known as Bedford, shall together elect three representatives. Such is the provision of the first enactment which gave a certain portion of Bedford county a new name and certain privileges, which did not at all interfere with the constitutional right of the people in that district, to be represented in the Legislature.

Now in 1790 and for some years afterwards, every foot of land now in Somerset county was within the bounds of the counties of Bedford county. The people of that portion of Bedford county applied by petition to the Legislature in 1795 for a separate county organization, and they deemed it advisable to grant the privileges prayed for, on the 17th of April of that year erected the new county of Somerset. Then came up the question of representation, how was that to be arranged? Why just as the framers of the Constitution contemplated. They agreed to give them a separate county organization, but say in effect as to the matter of representation, you shall continue as heretofore connected, with the parent county, and within the limits of which you were at that time a Bedford county at the making of the constitution, and to which was assured a member, there shall be three members elected. Somerset, a part of Bedford county, and that part left, still known as Bedford, shall together elect three representatives. Such is the provision of the first enactment which gave a certain portion of Bedford county a new name and certain privileges, which did not at all interfere with the constitutional right of the people in that district, to be represented in the Legislature.

Now in 1790 and for some years afterwards, every foot of land now in Somerset county was within the bounds of the counties of Bedford county. The people of that portion of Bedford county applied by petition to the Legislature in 1795 for a separate county organization, and they deemed it advisable to grant the privileges prayed for, on the 17th of April of that year erected the new county of Somerset. Then came up the question of representation, how was that to be arranged? Why just as the framers of the Constitution contemplated. They agreed to give them a separate county organization, but say in effect as to the matter of representation, you shall continue as heretofore connected, with the parent county, and within the limits of which you were at that time a Bedford county at the making of the constitution, and to which was assured a member, there shall be three members elected. Somerset, a part of Bedford county, and that part left, still known as Bedford, shall together elect three representatives. Such is the provision of the first enactment which gave a certain portion of Bedford county a new name and certain privileges, which did not at all interfere with the constitutional right of the people in that district, to be represented in the Legislature.

Now in 1790 and for some years afterwards, every foot of land now in Somerset county was within the bounds of the counties of Bedford county. The people of that portion of Bedford county applied by petition to the Legislature in 1795 for a separate county organization, and they deemed it advisable to grant the privileges prayed for, on the 17th of April of that year erected the new county of Somerset. Then came up the question of representation, how was that to be arranged? Why just as the framers of the Constitution contemplated. They agreed to give them a separate county organization, but say in effect as to the matter of representation, you shall continue as heretofore connected, with the parent county, and within the limits of which you were at that time a Bedford county at the making of the constitution, and to which was assured a member, there shall be three members elected. Somerset, a part of Bedford county, and that part left, still known as Bedford, shall together elect three representatives. Such is the provision of the first enactment which gave a certain portion of Bedford county a new name and certain privileges, which did not at all interfere with the constitutional right of the people in that district, to be represented in the Legislature.

Now in 1790 and for some years afterwards, every foot of land now in Somerset county was within the bounds of the counties of Bedford county. The people of that portion of Bedford county applied by petition to the Legislature in 1795 for a separate county organization, and they deemed it advisable to grant the privileges prayed for, on the 17th of April of that year erected the new county of Somerset. Then came up the question of representation, how was that to be arranged? Why just as the framers of the Constitution contemplated. They agreed to give them a separate county organization, but say in effect as to the matter of representation, you shall continue as heretofore connected, with the parent county, and within the limits of which you were at that time a Bedford county at the making of the constitution, and to which was assured a member, there shall be three members elected. Somerset, a part of Bedford county, and that part left, still known as Bedford, shall together elect three representatives. Such is the provision of the first enactment which gave a certain portion of Bedford county a new name and certain privileges, which did not at all interfere with the constitutional right of the people in that district, to be represented in the Legislature.

Table with columns: Counties, Members, Taxables. Lists various counties and their respective member and taxable counts.

But the law being merely directory, it is a matter of favor or convenience resting upon the judgment of the legislature. And surely in the matter of doubtful interpretation of the constitution, that one, which has been unquestioned and sanctioned for three-quarters of a century by the legislature and the people, is not now to be overturned, when there are but two years left within which the question can be mooted.

Mr. Cessna claims to have obtained the opinion of many eminent lawyers and judges, all of whom support the position taken by him. Granting that he has such opinions, upon what are they based—on the statement of the case as he puts it, not on the facts as they really are, and of which they may have known nothing. He has no opinion whatever that touches the points, made in this argument, based upon the law and the facts. And I venture to assert that he never will obtain any. But as it is notorious that lawyers as well as judges will differ, he is careful not to inform us what eminent lawyers and judges, in the course of his applications for opinions, decided the case against him. It needs no one particularly versed in the law to form a correct judgment in this matter. And I venture to say that nine-tenths of the voters of the State will undertake to say that they can and do understand it. And if the outrage of throwing from his seat Mr. Householder, a member acknowledged to be duly elected by the voters of the district, formed by the only proper authority, is perpetrated, it will be met by such a howl of indignation, such universal derision and contempt, as should make its authors and perpetrators quail.

ROSS FORWARD, Counsel for Geo. W. Householder.

Pennsylvania Legislature. REPORTED EXPRESSLY FOR THE TELEGRAPH. TUESDAY, JAN. 14, 1862. SENATE.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock, a. m. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. R. Dewitt. PETITIONS.

Mr. REILLY presented a petition of two hundred and sixty-four citizens of West Pennsylvania, Schuylkill county, praying for the repeal of the act of February 17, 1859, relating to a stricter accountability of public officers, so far as the law relates to said township. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLYMER one from Samuel J. Walker, setting forth an affidavit showing that he has erroneously overpaid collateral inheritance tax on the estate of Joseph Sellers, deceased, and asking that the same be refunded. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLYMER read in place a bill, entitled "an act to refund to Samuel J. Walker certain monies erroneously paid by him as collateral inheritance tax on the estate of James Sellers, deceased. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary System.

Mr. BOUGHTER one to incorporate the Harrisburg Exchange and Mercantile Company. Referred to the Committee on Corporations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. The House was called to order at 11 o'clock, P. M. The SPEAKER announced the following Standing Committee for the session: Ways and Means—Messrs. Armstrong, Smith, (Chester,) Bigham, Abbott, Ross, (Luzerne,) Alexander, Pershing, Chatham, Craig, Windle, Ziegler, Gamble, Beaver, Brown, (Mercer,) and Hoffer.

Judiciary, (General)—Messrs. Scott, Williams, Smith, (Chester,) Shannon, Strang, Banks, Vincent, Brown, (Northumberland,) and Dennis. Judiciary, (Local)—Messrs. Bigham, Duffield, Pershing, Chatham, Ziegler, Cochran, Ryan, Greenbank and Bliss. Persons and Graduates—Messrs. Bliss, Graham, Grant, Ross, (Mifflin,) Bates, Pottsiger and Russell.

Estates and Bequests—Messrs. Strang, Kaine, Vincene, M'ulloch, Quigley, Blanchard and Beebe. Agriculture and Manufactures—Messrs. Gross, Caldwell, Windle, Thompson, Barron, Hutchman and Lehman. Education—Messrs. Elliott, Duffield, Bliss, Divins, Donley, (Greene,) Boileau, Early, M'Clellan, Twitchell, Householder, Fox, Kline, Rowland, Hopkins, (Philadelphia,) and Wimley.

Militia System—Messrs. Shannon, Hopkins, (Washington,) Smith, (Philadelphia,) Scott, Wimley, Crane and Myers. Railroads—Messrs. Hopkins, (Washington,) Alexander, Sellers, Moore, Dougherty, Myers, Tate, Craig, Barron, M'Makin, Freeland, Donnelly (Philadelphia) and Grant. City Passenger Railroads—Messrs. Willey, Happer, Divins, Graham, M'Coyle, Caldwell, Weidner, Ritter, Brown, (Mercer,) Thompson and Warner. Mines and Minerals—Messrs. Ryan, Bolieu, Householder, Wakefield, M'Mackin, Hess, Wolf, Hoover, DeLoe, Josephs, Donnelly, (Philadelphia,) Kline and Weidner. Printing—Messrs. Cowan, Neiman, Sellers, Tate and Henry. Public Buildings—Messrs. Duffield, Dougherty and Freeland.

PENNSYLVANIANS IN COL. LAMON'S BRIGADE. Mr. GROSS submitted the following: Whereas, Some six hundred men were illegally recruited in the county of Allegheny for the purpose of being attached to Col. Lamon's brigade in Virginia; and it having been ascertained that said men are in a destitute and suffering condition, the case of Weidner, Resolved, That the Governor of Pennsylvania be requested to furnish to this House, as soon as possible, all the facts connected with the case, and indicate at the same time in what manner relief can be afforded. The preamble and resolution was adopted.

REPEAL OF THE TONNAGE TAX BILL. Mr. HOPKINS, (Washington,) offered a resolution that the committee on the Judiciary System be instructed to bring in a bill for the repeal of an act of the last session of the Legislature entitled "An Act for the repeal of the Tonnage Duties;" agreed to.

Mr. HOPKINS, (Philadelphia,) offered a resolution that this House will proceed on Wednesday next at 12 o'clock, to the selection of a committee to investigate and try the contested election in the case of Richard Winder, now a sitting member of this Legislature. The resolution, after a protracted debate, was adopted, as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Banks, Barron, Boileau, Brown, (Northumberland,) Caldwell, Coffan, Craig, DeLoe, Divins, Donley, (Greene,) Donnelly, (Philadelphia,) Duffield, Early, Gaskill, Graham, Greenbank, Gross, Hess, Hoffer, Hoover, Hopkins, (Philadelphia,) Hopkins, (Washington,) Kaine, Kline, Labar, Lichtenwallner, M'ulloch, M'Mackin, M'Manus, Neiman, Pershing, Peters, Pottsiger, Quigley, Rex, Rhoads, Ross, (Mifflin,) Rowland, Ryan, Scott, Shannon, Tate, Thompson, Tutton, Wakefield, Weidner, Wimley, Wolf, Worley and Ziegler—50.

Mr. HOPKINS, (Philadelphia,) offered a resolution that this House will proceed on Wednesday next at 12 o'clock, to the selection of a committee to investigate and try the contested election in the case of Richard Winder, now a sitting member of this Legislature. The resolution, after a protracted debate, was adopted, as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Banks, Barron, Boileau, Brown, (Northumberland,) Caldwell, Coffan, Craig, DeLoe, Divins, Donley, (Greene,) Donnelly, (Philadelphia,) Duffield, Early, Gaskill, Graham, Greenbank, Gross, Hess, Hoffer, Hoover, Hopkins, (Philadelphia,) Hopkins, (Washington,) Kaine, Kline, Labar, Lichtenwallner, M'ulloch, M'Mackin, M'Manus, Neiman, Pershing, Peters, Pottsiger, Quigley, Rex, Rhoads, Ross, (Mifflin,) Rowland, Ryan, Scott, Shannon, Tate, Thompson, Tutton, Wakefield, Weidner, Wimley, Wolf, Worley and Ziegler—50.

Mr. HOPKINS, (Philadelphia,) offered a resolution that this House will proceed on Wednesday next at 12 o'clock, to the selection of a committee to investigate and try the contested election in the case of Richard Winder, now a sitting member of this Legislature. The resolution, after a protracted debate, was adopted, as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Banks, Barron, Boileau, Brown, (Northumberland,) Caldwell, Coffan, Craig, DeLoe, Divins, Donley, (Greene,) Donnelly, (Philadelphia,) Duffield, Early, Gaskill, Graham, Greenbank, Gross, Hess, Hoffer, Hoover, Hopkins, (Philadelphia,) Hopkins, (Washington,) Kaine, Kline, Labar, Lichtenwallner, M'ulloch, M'Mackin, M'Manus, Neiman, Pershing, Peters, Pottsiger, Quigley, Rex, Rhoads, Ross, (Mifflin,) Rowland, Ryan, Scott, Shannon, Tate, Thompson, Tutton, Wakefield, Weidner, Wimley, Wolf, Worley and Ziegler—50.

Mr. HOPKINS, (Philadelphia,) offered a resolution that this House will proceed on Wednesday next at 12 o'clock, to the selection of a committee to investigate and try the contested election in the case of Richard Winder, now a sitting member of this Legislature. The resolution, after a protracted debate, was adopted, as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Banks, Barron, Boileau, Brown, (Northumberland,) Caldwell, Coffan, Craig, DeLoe, Divins, Donley, (Greene,) Donnelly, (Philadelphia,) Duffield, Early, Gaskill, Graham, Greenbank, Gross, Hess, Hoffer, Hoover, Hopkins, (Philadelphia,) Hopkins, (Washington,) Kaine, Kline, Labar, Lichtenwallner, M'ulloch, M'Mackin, M'Manus, Neiman, Pershing, Peters, Pottsiger, Quigley, Rex, Rhoads, Ross, (Mifflin,) Rowland, Ryan, Scott, Shannon, Tate, Thompson, Tutton, Wakefield, Weidner, Wimley, Wolf, Worley and Ziegler—50.

Mr. HOPKINS, (Philadelphia,) offered a resolution that this House will proceed on Wednesday next at 12 o'clock, to the selection of a committee to investigate and try the contested election in the case of Richard Winder, now a sitting member of this Legislature. The resolution, after a protracted debate, was adopted, as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Banks, Barron, Boileau, Brown, (Northumberland,) Caldwell, Coffan, Craig, DeLoe, Divins, Donley, (Greene,) Donnelly, (Philadelphia,) Duffield, Early, Gaskill, Graham, Greenbank, Gross, Hess, Hoffer, Hoover, Hopkins, (Philadelphia,) Hopkins, (Washington,) Kaine, Kline, Labar, Lichtenwallner, M'ulloch, M'Mackin, M'Manus, Neiman, Pershing, Peters, Pottsiger, Quigley, Rex, Rhoads, Ross, (Mifflin,) Rowland, Ryan, Scott, Shannon, Tate, Thompson, Tutton, Wakefield, Weidner, Wimley, Wolf, Worley and Ziegler—50.

Mr. HOPKINS, (Philadelphia,) offered a resolution that this House will proceed on Wednesday next at 12 o'clock, to the selection of a committee to investigate and try the contested election in the case of Richard Winder, now a sitting member of this Legislature. The resolution, after a protracted debate, was adopted, as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Banks, Barron, Boileau, Brown, (Northumberland,) Caldwell, Coffan, Craig, DeLoe, Divins, Donley, (Greene,) Donnelly, (Philadelphia,) Duffield, Early, Gaskill, Graham, Greenbank, Gross, Hess, Hoffer, Hoover, Hopkins, (Philadelphia,) Hopkins, (Washington,) Kaine, Kline, Labar, Lichtenwallner, M'ulloch, M'Mackin, M'Manus, Neiman, Pershing, Peters, Pottsiger, Quigley, Rex, Rhoads, Ross, (Mifflin,) Rowland, Ryan, Scott, Shannon, Tate, Thompson, Tutton, Wakefield, Weidner, Wimley, Wolf, Worley and Ziegler—50.

Mr. HOPKINS, (Philadelphia,) offered a resolution that this House will proceed on Wednesday next at 12 o'clock, to the selection of a committee to investigate and try the contested election in the case of Richard Winder, now a sitting member of this Legislature. The resolution, after a protracted debate, was adopted, as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Banks, Barron, Boileau, Brown, (Northumberland,) Caldwell, Coffan, Craig, DeLoe, Divins, Donley, (Greene,) Donnelly, (Philadelphia,) Duffield, Early, Gaskill, Graham, Greenbank, Gross, Hess, Hoffer, Hoover, Hopkins, (Philadelphia,) Hopkins, (Washington,) Kaine, Kline, Labar, Lichtenwallner, M'ulloch, M'Mackin, M'Manus, Neiman, Pershing, Peters, Pottsiger, Quigley, Rex, Rhoads, Ross, (Mifflin,) Rowland, Ryan, Scott, Shannon, Tate, Thompson, Tutton, Wakefield, Weidner, Wimley, Wolf, Worley and Ziegler—50.

Mr. HOPKINS, (Philadelphia,) offered a resolution that this House will proceed on Wednesday next at 12 o'clock, to the selection of a committee to investigate and try the contested election in the case of Richard Winder, now a sitting member of this Legislature. The resolution, after a protracted debate, was adopted, as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Banks, Barron, Boileau, Brown, (Northumberland,) Caldwell, Coffan, Craig, DeLoe, Divins, Donley, (Greene,) Donnelly, (Philadelphia,) Duffield, Early, Gaskill, Graham, Greenbank, Gross, Hess, Hoffer, Hoover, Hopkins, (Philadelphia,) Hopkins, (Washington,) Kaine, Kline, Labar, Lichtenwallner, M'ulloch, M'Mackin, M'Manus, Neiman, Pershing, Peters, Pottsiger, Quigley, Rex, Rhoads, Ross, (Mifflin,) Rowland, Ryan, Scott, Shannon, Tate, Thompson, Tutton, Wakefield, Weidner, Wimley, Wolf, Worley and Ziegler—50.

Mr. HOPKINS, (Philadelphia,) offered a resolution that this House will proceed on Wednesday next at 12 o'clock, to the selection of a committee to investigate and try the contested election in the case of Richard Winder, now a sitting member of this Legislature. The resolution, after a protracted debate, was adopted, as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Banks, Barron, Boileau, Brown, (Northumberland,) Caldwell, Coffan, Craig, DeLoe, Divins, Donley, (Greene,) Donnelly, (Philadelphia,) Duffield, Early, Gaskill, Graham, Greenbank, Gross, Hess, Hoffer, Hoover, Hopkins, (Philadelphia,) Hopkins, (Washington,) Kaine, Kline, Labar, Lichtenwallner, M'ulloch, M'Mackin, M'Manus, Neiman, Pershing, Peters, Pottsiger, Quigley, Rex, Rhoads, Ross, (Mifflin,) Rowland, Ryan, Scott, Shannon, Tate, Thompson, Tutton, Wakefield, Weidner, Wimley, Wolf, Worley and Ziegler—50.

Mr. HOPKINS, (Philadelphia,) offered a resolution that this House will proceed on Wednesday next at 12 o'clock, to the selection of a committee to investigate and try the contested election in the case of Richard Winder, now a sitting member of this Legislature. The resolution, after a protracted debate, was adopted, as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Banks, Barron, Boileau, Brown, (Northumberland,) Caldwell, Coffan, Craig, DeLoe, Divins, Donley, (Greene,) Donnelly, (Philadelphia,) Duffield, Early, Gaskill, Graham, Greenbank, Gross, Hess, Hoffer, Hoover, Hopkins, (Philadelphia,) Hopkins, (Washington,) Kaine, Kline, Labar, Lichtenwallner, M'ulloch, M'M