EDITED BY THOMAS RITCHIE.

THOMAS RITCHIE & JOHN P. HEISS,
PROPRIETORS AND PUBLISHERS.

TERMS.

DAILY,	per year,	$10 00
SEMI-WEEKLY,	(published tri-weekly during the session of Congress)	5 00
WEEKLY,		2 00

Clubs will be furnished at follows:

Five copies of the DAILY, for	40 00
Five copies of the SEMI-WEEKLY,	20 00
Ten copies of the " "	35 00
Five copies of the WEEKLY,	8 00
Ten copies of the "	15 00

The Daily Union.

VOLUME IV. "LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION." NUMBER 28.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, FRIDAY MORNING, JUNE 2, 1848.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

The name of no person will be entered upon our books unless the payment of the subscription be made in advance.

Distant subscribers may forward the money by letter, the postage on which will be paid by us, and all sich incloses by ourselves in the safe transmission.

The COUNTRY PAPER is published tri-weekly during the sessions of Congress, and semi-weekly during the recess.

Subscriptions for a period less than a year will be received at terms proportioned to the above annual rates.

A postmaster's certificate of remittance in payment for subscriptions or advertisements will be a sufficient receipt therefor. The notes of any specie-paying bank will be received.

☞ POSTMASTERS are authorized to act as our agents; and, by sending us TWO DAILY subscribers, with $20 enclosed, or five SEMI-WEEKLY subscribers, with $25 enclosed, or five WEEKLY subscribers, with $10 enclosed, will be entitled to one copy of the same edition as they furnish us subscribers for, gratis.

☞ THE CONGRESSIONAL REGISTER will be furnished them on the same terms.

IN CONGRESS OF THE U. STATES.

Thirtieth Congress—First Session.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1848.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The journal having been read—

Mr. CUMMINS, pursuant to notice, introduced an act declaratory of the rights of naturalized citizens of the United States, and to protect them in the peaceful exercise and enjoyment of their rights and privileges against the acts and influence of foreign governments and their diplomatic agents: read twice, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ST. JOHN, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, reported back, without amendment, the Senate bill for the relief of John Lorimer Graham, late postmaster in the city of New York: read and committed.

Mr. CRANSTON presented resolutions of the legislature of the State of Rhode Island, in relation to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and the removal of the seat of government within the limits of one of the free States: laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee for the District of Columbia, asked that said committee be discharged from the further consideration of the petition of Charles Fletcher, and that it be laid upon the table: agreed to.

THE FINANCES.

Mr. STROHM, from the Committee on Public Expenditures, submitted a report in relation to the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury upon the condition of the finances; which he asked to have laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BEDINGER said this report came from a committee which had heretofore, in relation to the business of the House, been considered almost as a nullity. During the last Congress he believed that the Committee on Public Expenditures hardly held a single session; but now suddenly, as it would seem, it had assumed a grade of the highest importance amongst the committees, and thrust itself into the way of reviewing the acts and making charges against the Secretary of the Treasury. With reference to the report now offered, he said it was prepared and adopted in the committee while the Secretary had not the slightest knowledge of what was going on. He asked now the indulgence of a delay in the order to print, till an opportunity may be given to the minority of this committee to make a counter-report. So far as he was concerned, though he had knowledge of his appointment on the sub-committee, and some notice of its meeting; yet, for most of the time, he did not know where the committee was tomeet; and at other times, when he would meet with them, there would be no quorum. He had not the least idea that such a lengthy and elaborate report was preparing, till it was suddenly sprung upon the committee. He asked, therefore, the indulgence that the report be recommitted.

Mr. COBB of Georgia suggested that the motion should be so shaped as to make the order to print both reports together.

Mr. BEDINGER assented.

Mr. STROHM deemed it due to the committee to state, that the minority has had ample time to make their own report already. The gentleman from Virginia would not deny that the minority has had the report for two full weeks in their possession. The report was a fair and candid exposition of what a majority of the Committee on Public Expenditures honestly believed to be errors committed on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury. With respect to the assertion that the committee did not sit during the whole of last session—

Mr. BEDINGER said he had heard that such was the fact.

Mr. STROHM. It was a mistake. The committee had their sessions, although there was but little matter referred to them, and, of course, no large amount of business done.

Mr. COBB of Georgia desired to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STROHM] whether he had any objections to offer against the printing of the minority report of the committee, and sending it forth along with his own report? He would state that the printing would not probably be delayed a single hour by waiting some eight or ten days for the minority to prepare their report. There were orders for printing, which would completely occupy the printers for that length of time at least. From this consideration, he appealed to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the House, to allow both the reports to go before the country at the same time.

Mr. STROHM still considered that the minority had had already sufficient time to prepare their report.

Mr. HUDSON thought the motion very singular, to order the printing of a document not now in existence. It was very extraordinary and objectionable, because the reading of the document was the only test of the necessity or propriety of printing. If the document were prepared, he would certainly vote to print, unless it contained something very objectionable. If such a motion should come from this side of the House, he ventured nothing in asserting that the gentleman from Georgia would be the first man to rise up against it. The report had been now two weeks in the hands of the minority.

Mr. BEDINGER interposed to say, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STROHM] did give the report now made into his hand about two weeks ago. But he thought it unequal to require of the minority, in this brief period, to go over the same investigations, for which the majority had taken nearly all the winter.

Mr. ROCKWELL would ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BEDINGER] whether the report had not been in his hand, and in the hand of the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. HALL,] for more than two weeks?

Mr. BEDINGER. No, sir.

Mr. HUDSON resumed, and still insisted that there had been ample time for the minority to report. The gentleman from Virginia, being a member of the committee, must have had the same subject before his mind, also, all the winter—certainly as long as the majority of the committee have been considering it; and now, to ask for ten days more, was a very unreasonable request. He saw no necessity of prolonging the discussion; and he would, therefore, move the previous question. But——

Mr. HOUSTON, of Alabama, and Mr. HALL, of Missouri, desiring still further to explain, the motion was withdrawn.

Mr. HOUSTON, of Alabama, said: He was not aware of the existence of the report now under consideration, until this debate called his attention to it. Not being a member of the Committee on Public Expenditures, he, of course, could not know anything of its intentions.

Upon looking at the report, however, very hastily, he found it to be one of the most extraordinary papers ever presented to this House. He would ask to read its commencement.

"The Committee on Public Expenditures, having had under consideration the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, communicating his annual report on the state of the finances to Congress, with a view to ascertain whether the statements contained in that report are correct, and whether said statements could not be made in a form less difficult and more easily to be comprehended, report," &c.

That committee had taken jurisdiction and charge of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury; they had assumed the duties of the Committee of Ways and Means. And why or how had they done so? Who had authorized them to take charge of that subject? Certainly not the rules of this House; nor had it been referred to that committee by resolution or order of this body. If such resolution exists, let it be produced. He presumed none such could be found. He would read the rule of the House prescribing the duties and marking the proper jurisdiction of that committee:

"It shall be the duty of the Committee on Public Expenditures to examine into the state of the several public departments, and particularly into laws making appropriations of money, and to report whether the moneys have been disbursed conformably with such laws; and also to report, from time to time, such provisions and arrangements as may be necessary to add to the economy of the departments, and the accountability of their officers."

Now, was there any branch of this report which came within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Expenditures as marked out by this rule? He did not complain, nor did any member on his side of the House, or of the minority of the committee, complain that the committee had thought proper to investigate the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury. He was willing and desirous to have that investigation take place. All he wanted was, that justice and fairness should be observed. Had that course been pursued? He would like to know of some member of the committee whether the Secretary had been heard.

Mr. HALL, of Missouri, (in his seat.) No; no notice was given.

Mr. HOUSTON, (continuing.) He would like some gentleman of the majority of the committee to state whether the Secretary of the Treasury had been notified by any member of the committee that such an examination was going on? He did not deny the right of any committee of this body to examine and pass upon whatever the House committed to its charge; he did not intend to say that such committee had to give an officer notice in advance of their investigation. No such thing. But if, in the course of such examination, the committee should find, or think it had found, an error, an inconsistency, or a falsehood, it should communicate the fact to the officer whose conduct was being passed upon, and give him an opportunity to explain it. After the explanation, it should decide and report to the House accordingly.

Mr. STEWART, of Pennsylvania, inquired whether, if this report were printed, it would not give every gentleman an opportunity to examine it, and answer it, if they saw fit to attempt it? Whether the printing of the report would not be better for the other side of the House?

Mr. HALL replied he thought it would not be better for his side of the House or the country that this report should be first printed, and an *ex parte* statement be spread before the country. That was not the way to do justice.

Mr. HOUSTON of Alabama resumed the floor. He had been referring to the extent of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Expenditures, not for the purpose of conveying the impression that he or any other member on his side of the House desired the suppression of that report, but for the purpose of showing that it was a piece of the party machinery of the other side of the house, and not intended to elucidate and bring forth the facts of the case as they existed. The rule which he had read, defined the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Expenditures, and they saw that, according to their own statement, the majority had transcended their jurisdiction. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury had not been referred to them; but they, so eager to create party capital, had gone beyond the extent of their powers, and grasped after the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, and drawn it within the vortex of their investigation. Let them go further and see how this had been done. One would imagine that the object of the report was to bring forth facts connected with the report of the Secretary of the Treasury; but, instead of that, the fact was admitted that the Secretary had not been advised of the investigation at all. If gentlemen desired to know the truth, and publish to the world whether the Secretary of the Treasury had been correct in his statements, why had they not given him the opportunity of being heard when they held their sessions? Why hold their sessions in secret, not only so far as the Secretary of the Treasury—whose statements and allegations were under examination by them—was concerned, but why hold them in secret as far as their colleagues on the committee were concerned? It had been stated in this debate, that in preparing this *ex parte* statement, which they had endeavored to force upon the country, involving interests of such magnitude, they had not advised a part of the committee as well as the Secretary of their proceedings.

Mr. STROHM (the floor being yielded) said he was chairman of the sub-committee, and had taken particular pains to inform the gentleman from Virginia of its meetings, and that he had promised to attend, but had taken no notice of it, and never did attend, and neither was he present when the whole committee were called together.

Mr. BEDINGER could not suffer this statement without notice to go forth to the world, and the impression to be made that he, as one of that sub-committee, had had full notice of what was intended, and had refused to attend its meetings. He said he knew nothing of the sort. The gentleman from Pennsylvania had notified him once or twice that the committee (he did not say the sub-committee) would meet. He had never dreamed of this committee appointing a sub-committee to consider and spring on the House such a report as that; and from such a committee as that to which he was compelled to say he had been degraded from the Committee on Military Affairs. He had had no idea of it; and the gentleman knew very well that half of the time they had not known in what room they were to meet; they had not met at first, because they could not find a room; then, because they could not get a quorum; and, finally, when he had despaired of meeting the sub-committee, the whole committee were astonished by having this bundle of errors and false statements hurled upon them. And when they asked ten days to set the matter before the country correctly, they were told that they had had time to prepare; that he [Mr. BEDINGER] was one of the sub-committee appointed to work such wonders. He had his doubts whether any member of that committee had prepared the report. He thought he saw upon it blundering marks which he could find elsewhere. Certainly he could not be charged with delinquency, with neglect of his duty in such a case as this, when he had gone for days, and not been able to find either the sub-committee or the committee.

Mr. HOUSTON, of Alabama, said that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STROHM] had confessed, in the face of the House and of the country, that he had given the Secretary of the Treasury no opportunity to explain what the majority thought to be discrepancies or errors. Then it must have been his intention to obtain what he might call facts in his own way, and through his own medium. No one would deny but that statements, and especially those which naturally and necessarily pertain to a report from a Secretary of the Treasury, are difficult of a proper understanding, and particularly by those unacquainted with such calculations and reports. Different men put different constructions upon the same sentence, understanding it to mean different things. He had no doubt such was true in regard to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury; yet, upon those very points of doubt and misunderstanding, on the part of the committee, they have refused an explanation from the author of the report; a man whose political reputation, if not his private character, was involved. He could see neither fairness, justice, nor propriety in this; nor would any fair thinking man, free from party bias, approve the course of the committee.

He asked gentlemen if they were willing to publish that which would injuriously affect the character of an officer or a citizen, without knowing whether it is true—without giving the individual, thus to be injured, an opportunity to explain?

If gentlemen desired nothing but fairness, why did they desire to send forth an *ex parte* statement? Why not agree to let the minority report be printed, and form a part of the same document with the majority report? If they believed in their own report, they would not fear it—they would prefer that the views of the minority should go with theirs, side by side, giving to the country a fair opportunity to examine and determine upon their respective merits or demerits. Such were his notions of justice and liberality.

It was not his purpose to defend the present head of the Treasury Department because a democratic administration was in power. No such thing. He would defend upon the same grounds and under like circumstances any public functionary or any administration. If truth be the object, let us have it; and to obtain it, let us adopt those means best calculated to bring it forth. He appealed to gentlemen's sense of propriety and right. He appealed to their love of justice and truth, and asked whether the course pursued by the committee was open, frank, or manly. If the report was a development of facts, and an exposure of error, why not let the minority send their views with it? He wanted this report published, and would regret its suppression. The minority desire it made public; they believe it abounds with mistakes and errors. All they ask is an opportunity to exhibit those errors.

Mr. STEWART asked whether it would be entirely proper to go to the Secretary with a request for him to attend upon the investigation of a committee?

Mr. BURT could not think the House would print a document purporting to expose errors in the estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury, while it was alleged that a just and fair examination of the books would sustain the department. The claim of the minority of the committee was a matter of sheer justice; and it was, moreover, a courtesy which was always accorded to minorities. Mr. B. stated his recollection that in 1844 there were five reports made from one committee upon the same question, and they were all printed by order of the House. He said the present report was too elaborate for an investigation of a few days. A fortnight was wholly insufficient to go through with it thoroughly.

The morning hour having expired—

Mr. McKAY here called for the consideration of the special order, but withdrew the call.

Mr. OUTLAW, from the select committee to whom was referred the subject, reported a bill making provision for the families of such commissioned officers, non-commissioned officers, musicians, and privates, whether belonging to the regular or volunteer corps, who have been killed in battle, or died from wounds received, or diseases contracted in the service during the present war: read twice, and referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINTON asked that the Committee of Ways and Means be discharged from the further consideration of the petition of the American Statistical Association in relation to the mode of taking the next census, and that it be laid upon the table: agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF CLERKS.

The question being then put upon Mr. McKAY's motion, that the House proceed to the consideration of the order of the day, it was decided in the affirmative.

So the House proceeded to the consideration of the "bill to regulate the employment of clerks in the executive departments, and for other purposes."

Mr. ANDREW JOHNSON moved to amend the bill by inserting two new sections, to come in after section 1, providing for the apportionment of the offices according to representation, and the arrangement of the officers in four classes, one class to be discharged every two years. He was glad to see such a bill brought forward by so distinguished and influential a member as the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. McKAY.] One principle of the bill was to provide for the examination of clerks by a board of competent persons; and another was to promote those who faithfully discharged their duties. One other principle he wished to see engrafted on the bill—the selection and appointment of the clerks from the several States, in proportion to their population. There was no propriety in confining the appointment to particular localities. Some States had been pensioned on the government. Virginia and Maryland had furnished nearly all the clerks, while Ohio and other great States were debarred from any share in these offices. Every congressional district could furnish an adequate number of competent persons to fill these positions. It would be very proper to allow to citizens of the States remote from this city, an opportunity to send their sons here, for the acquisition of useful information while discharging their civil duties. It might be objected, that we could not trammel the President in the selection of these clerks; but, if we could require a regard to locality from the President in relation to military officers, we could also do it in relation to the civil service. He (Mr. J.) would also wish that, in these appointments, an eye should be had to the farmers and mechanics of the country. Though these classes were the most important to the welfare of the community, they enjoyed very little share in public affairs. In our representative bodies, the lawyers were found in great numbers, to the exclusion of laboring men. Mr. J. was very glad to learn that Pennsylvania was an exception; that in the legislature of that State, a majority of the members were farmers. In this body, in the last Congress, there were only twenty laboring men out of two hundred and thirty-eight members.

Mr. HUNT. What does the gentleman mean by a laboring man?

Mr. JOHNSON said that he meant that portion of our people who perform the farming and mechanical operations of the country—the men who earn their bread by the sweat of their face, and not by their wits. The lawyers and other professional men were justly called the aristocracy of this land. They gave a tone to our legislation. Our young men, who were put to the study of law at an early age, become better acquainted with English constitutions than with our own, and have no proper sympathy with the body of the people.

Mr. EVANS made a point of order. The gentleman from Tennessee was not speaking to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON did not know, he said, much about special pleading, and he did not know but, by some technicality, he could be ruled out of order. He was making an argument entirely relative to the question. It was in order to show that, in the selection of clerks and other officers of the government, it was proper to regard the farmers and mechanics of the country—the substratum of society. He proposed to have a letter read on this subject from a farmer of the old Bay State. The letter was very flattering to him, on account of his efforts in behalf of the farming and laboring interests; but he could, without indelicacy, give it publicity.

A VOICE. Did a lawyer write it?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; but it is a well-written letter.

The letter was read; and

Mr. JOHNSON, resuming, said that was one of the many letters he had received on the subject of the resolution which he had offered at this and the late session; and encouragement from such disinterested quarters would induce him to persist in his course.

There was another principle which ought to be incorporated in the bill—a principle that was applied to the Senate—the renovation of the body, by bringing in new men every two years. This amendment proposed to divide the country into four districts, and let one-fourth go out every year, providing that, after eight years, a clerk shall be ineligible. This would do a vast deal of good. It would create a more independent spirit in the officer. It would render him economical in his habits. He would adopt a frugal style of living—saving enough to buy a little farm—without going, every four years, with their families, and imploring, with tears, continuance in office, because they had saved nothing and wanted bread. This principle would serve another purpose: it would prevent the continuance in office of imbecile and decrepid men, merely from motives of charity. Another principle he would propose to engraft on the bill was, to reduce salaries of a thousand dollars and over, one-fifth. After all our professions of economy and retrenchment, we have done little towards putting them in practice. Now was the time, while the treasury was burdened with the expense of a foreign war, to practise economy, and adopt measures for retrenchment. Some might say that he was hard pressed for capital, in taking up this subject; but it was not so. He had entire confidence in the strength and ultimate success of the principle he had advanced.

Mr. HAMMONS replied, stating that, however it might be elsewhere, as far as the legislature of the State of Maine was concerned, they were not there under the domination of lawyers.

Mr. JOHNSON had said he had assumed that the proportion of representation amongst lawyers and farmers, as distinct classes, was about one hundred to one.

Mr. HAMMONS understood the position perfectly. The gentleman says he assumes—and it was all assumption, and nothing else. This sort of attack upon lawyers was understood well in Maine; and so sensible was the gentleman himself that his position was not a good one, that he felt himself called upon to defend his remarks from the imputation of demagoguism. If those belonging to the legal profession were to be denominated as the aristocracy, Mr. H. was proud of belonging to such an aristocracy. It was the aristocracy of Jefferson and Madison. He believed, also, that every President of the United States had some time in his life been a lawyer—unless, perhaps, Gen. Harrison was an exception.

Mr. JOHNSON said he spoke not of the character of lawyers. He merely remarked that lawyers were accustomed to wield the greatest amount of political influence. Speaking of the character of that profession, he had said he only regretted that he was not himself a good lawyer. He designed to cast not the slightest imputation against the gentleman from Maine, [Mr. HAMMONS,] or his profession; though he rather thought now, that, like himself, upon a thorough examination, that gentleman would be found not to be lawyer enough to hurt him. [A laugh.]

Mr. HAMMONS judged the gentleman from Tennessee to be ill qualified to decide whether a man was a good lawyer or a good tailor. [A laugh—the point insinuated being that Mr. JOHNSON was once by his trade a tailor.] But if the gentleman would not take Mr. H. to be a good lawyer, he was free to acknowledge that. He considered the speech of the gentleman from Tennessee as a sort of lecture to the people, telling them whom they should choose to be their representatives; and it was because he presumed the people themselves were as good judges of that business as the gentleman from Tennessee, that he had taken this notice of his attack upon the profession. As an illustration of the gentleman's democracy in the matter of reducing the salaries of clerks one-fifth, he referred to the salary and mileage which the gentleman from Tennessee was himself now quietly receiving as a member of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON. I proposed no such thing. I expressly included officers of government and members of Congress.

Mr. HAMMONS admitted, then, that he had not understood the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HOLMES, of South Carolina, hoped there would be no case of personal altercation between these gentlemen; since, if they were not both good lawyers, still, in their respective civil employments, they have both engaged themselves in the business of *making suits*. [Laughter.] They were brethren at all events, and should not fall out.

Mr. HAMMONS replied to the pleasantry of the gentleman from South Carolina, and continued. He reminded the gentleman from Tennessee, that democracy begins at home, and desired to suggest to him the propriety of his looking to a certain class of his people nearer home, while he was endeavoring to show up the inequality of political rights on the part of the farmers of the north.

Mr. CUMMINS was in favor of incorporating the first amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the bill, should it pass. The States near the seaboard now obtained nearly all the situations under the government here. A person in a remote State had no opportunity to obtain a place here, for the offices were always filled, and those who had the filling of them would not make removals. This principle had been adopted in regard to the Military Academy and the midshipmen's appointments in the navy, and ought to be adopted also in regard to the civil officers. He was also in favor of regulating the salaries according to the importance of the duties discharged.

Mr. EVANS of Maryland offered an amendment, providing that the members of Congress make the nominations from their respective districts, at the time when the vacancies occur.

Mr. STANTON said there seemed to him to be little occasion for the passage of much of this bill. The public service did not suffer for the want of this bill. It had been represented that the body of the clerks were neglectful of their duty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Tennessee explained that he had spoken of some instances of remissness of duty; but to allege that, as a body, they were negligent and idle, was what he had not done.

Mr. STANTON was glad to hear this explanation from his colleague. He (Mr. S.) was very sure that every clerk who might be incompetent and idle would be dismissed by the President, as soon as the fact came to his knowledge. It would be an interference with the constitutional duties of the President to restrict his selection of officers to any locality.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Tennessee. Do I understand my colleague as being opposed to giving to his district a fair proportion of these offices?

Mr. STANTON would, he said, do what he could for his constituents, consistently with the provisions of the constitution and a regard to the public service. The President was invested by the constitution with the duty of appointing officers. He was not restricted in his selection to localities. He might appoint them all, if he chose, from one district. The following was the provision of the constitution:

"He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law."

Mr. A. JOHNSON would ask his colleague if he considered the similar provision in the ten regiment bill as correct?

Mr. STANTON said that provision he had regarded as unconstitutional. The President could disregard it, if he chose. These offices were created not for the benefit of the individual incumbents, but for the discharge of the public business. He apprehended that if clerks were to be appointed upon examination, the head of the department would thus be exonerated from a proper responsibility for the appointments. He could not see the propriety either of discharging an experienced and faithful clerk, to introduce a person entirely inexperienced.

Mr. NICOLL argued, briefly, that the bill was constitutional and expedient. There were from five to eight hundred clerks employed here—some three hundred in the Treasury Department alone; and it was impossible that the head of the office should have means to know the qualifications of all the clerks. They were appointed generally in relation to political services. A board of examiners, if properly constituted, could report correctly upon the qualifications of a clerk, and thereby the services of competent persons could be secured.

Mr. POLLOCK said, that out of the eight hundred clerks employed here, a third or more were incompetent. This bill embraced some provisions that would be beneficial to the government and to the individual clerks. A man permanently established here as a clerk, he considered as buried alive. After living in this atmosphere for a long time, a man became incompetent for any valuable service. He was opposed to the restriction of appointments to any localities. He wanted honest and capable men, from whatever part of the country they might come. This bill, if it passed, would serve also to check the system of appointments on party grounds.

Mr. HOUSTON, of Delaware, did not (he said) think that there was any foundation for the constitutional objection urged by the gentleman from Tennessee. If appointments were to be made on the principle that the spoils belong to the victors, then there should be an equal division of the spoils. But he held to the doctrine that the only inquiry should be, in an appointment to office, is he honest, capable, and faithful to the constitution?

Mr. JOHNSON, of Tennessee, explained that his amendment did not savor of the principle of spoils. There was nothing in it inconsistent with the Jeffersonian doctrine.

Mr. HOUSTON said, if the provisions of the bill were to prevail, he apprehended that the same principle of political favor would be applied. Some standard, some test should be established as to qualifications. He would vote for the original bill, and against the amendment.

The previous question was ordered, and the amendment offered by Mr. EVANS, of Maryland, was rejected.

The question recurring upon Mr. JOHNSON's amendment, a division of the question was called for, and the vote being taken by yeas and nays—first upon a portion of the amendment providing for an apportionment of the offices according to representation of the various States—was decided in the negative by yeas 64, nays 90.

The question recurring upon the second portion of the amendment, providing for the arrangement of the clerks in four classes, one class to be discharged every two years—

Mr. JOHNSON withdrew the same.

After sundry verbal amendments, the bill was then ordered to be engrossed, was read a third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider the same was laid upon the table.

Mr. HARALSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill to provide for the suppression of Indian hostilities in the Territory of Oregon, and for other purposes: read twice, and referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

FOREIGN MAIL SERVICE.

The House, at the suggestion of Mr. CHARLES BROWN, proceeded to the consideration of the House bill to amend an act to provide for the transportation of the mail between the United States and foreign countries; which had been returned from the Senate, with amendments.

Mr. ROOT, of Ohio, said that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads were in favor of agreeing to all the Senate amendments, except the third; and, as it was important that the bill should be passed at once, he expressed the hope that the House would take the vote now, and he therefore moved the previous question; which was ordered, and the question was stated upon agreeing to all the amendments, except the third.

Mr. T. B. KING, who desired an opportunity to examine the amendments, moved that the House adjourn; which motion prevailed, and

The House then adjourned.

MARSHAL'S SALE.

IN virtue of a writ of *fieri facias* issued from the clerk's office of the circuit court of the District of Columbia, for the county of Washington, and to me directed, I shall expose at public sale, for cash, on Thursday, the 18th day of May next, at 10 o'clock, a. m., before the court-house door of said county, the following property, viz: All that part of the lot of ground number 20, in square number 251 of the city of Washington, with a two-story brick house and other improvements thereon, now in the occupancy of Wm. Dowling; the said part of lot fronting on the south side of F street, north, nineteen feet and eleven and a half inches, extending from the northwest corner of the lot eastwardly, and running back of the same width as the front, and binding on the west line of the lot at a 30 feet wide alley; being the same property conveyed by a deed from Sarah Howe and E. P. Pearson, executors of Robert F. Howe, to Wm. Dowling, dated the 18th of July, 1835. Seized and levied upon as the property of William Dowling, and sold to satisfy judicials No. 192 to March term, 1835, in favor of William Lee, use of Robert G. Bickley.

ALEXANDER HUNTER,
April 19—dts Marshal of the District of Columbia.

☞ The above sale is postponed till Thursday next, 25th inst., same hour and place.

May 19 A. HUNTER, Marshal.

☞ The above sale is further postponed till June 8th next, same hour and place.

May 26 A. HUNTER, Marshal.

JESSE E. DOW,
Notary Public and General Agent,
Office, No. 3, Union Buildings, directly under the Union Office, Washington, D. C.,

ATTENDS to the prosecution of claims before Congress and the various departments of the government. Pensions and bounty-land warrants particularly attended to. Bounty-land warrants purchased and sold. The heirs and legal representatives of the officers and crew of John Paul Jones's squadron in 1779, will find it to be to their interest to apply to Mr. D., he having the rolls of the Bon Homme Richard and Alliance, and can tell at a glance *who are* and *who are not* entitled to a share in the Denmark prizes. Persons abroad, who desire business to be attended to by Mr. D., will be required in all cases to pay postage and enclose a retaining fee of $5.

Refer to the members of the 28th and 30th Congresses generally.

Mar 23—1y [Intel.]

PATENT OFFICE, May 2, 1848.

ON the petition of Sprague Barber, of New York, praying for the extension of a patent granted to said Sprague Barker for an improvement in the steam engine, for seven years from the expiration of said patent, which takes place on the 14th day of June, 1848—

It is ordered that the said petition be heard at the Patent Office, on the 24 Monday of June, at 12 o'clock, m.; and all persons are notified to appear and show cause, if any they have, why said petition ought not to be granted.

Ordered, also, that this notice be published in the Union and National Democrat, Washington; Pennsylvanian, Philadelphia; Post, Pittsburg; True Sun and Sun, New York; Post, Boston; Gazette and Republican, Portsmouth; once a week for three successive weeks previous to the 2d Monday in June next.

EDMUND BURKE,
Commissioner of Patents.

P. S. Editors of the above papers will please copy, and send their bills to the Patent Office, with a paper containing this notice.

TREASURER'S STATEMENT,

Showing the amount at his credit in the Treasury, with assistant treasurers and depositaries, for public deposites, and the Mint, by returns received to Monday, 29th May, 1848; the amount for which drafts have been issued, and were then unpaid, and the amount then remaining subject to his draft. Showing, also, the amount of future transfers to and from depositaries, as ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury.

In what place.	Amount on deposite.	Drafts heretofore drawn, but not yet paid, though payable.	Amount subject to draft.
Assistant Treasurer, Boston, Massachusetts	$236,615 37	$160,127 35	$76,488 02
Assistant Treasurer, New York, New York	319,840 79	214,241 31	105,599 48
Assistant Treasurer, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	63,452 94	9,136 50	54,316 44
Treasury of the United States, Washington, D. C.	98,411 50	36,497 78	61,913 72
Assistant Treasurer, Charleston, South Carolina	49,212 98	15,895 58	33,324 40
Assistant Treasurer, New Orleans, La.	749,184 73	670,059 61	79,125 12
Assistant Treasurer, St. Louis, Mo.	752,775 56	362,453 46	390,322 10
Depositary at Buffalo, New York	930 18	82 90	847 28
Depositary at Baltimore, Md.	14,472 48	2,105 67	12,366 81
Depositary at Richmond, Va.	349 69	333 23	16 46
Depositary at Wilmington, North Carolina	2,353 84	-	2,353 84
Depositary at Savannah, Georgia	157 87	153 46	4 41
Depositary at Mobile, Alabama	12,221 91	4,651 97	7,569 94
Depositary at Nashville, Tennessee	15,742 95	1,110 45	14,632 50
Depositary at Cincinnati, Ohio	20,762 91	1,981 42	18,781 49
Depositary at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania	847 07	819 00	28 07
Depositary at Norfolk, Virginia	3,118 45	1,924 70	1,193 75
Depositary at Little Rock, Arkansas	21,517 18	7,251 87	14,265 31
Depositary at Jeffersonville, Indiana	127,818 11	4,143 11	123,675 00
Depositary at Chicago, Illinois	62,679 51	5,840 65	56,838 86
Depositary at Detroit, Michigan	69,689 75	24,013 53	45,676 22
Suspense account — $2,097 42	-	2,097 42	
Mint of the United States, Philadelphia, Penn.	444,988 05	-	444,988 05
Branch mint of the United States, Charlotte, N. C.,	32,000 00	-	32,000 00
Branch mint of the United States, Dahlonega, Ga.,	26,850 00	-	26,850 00
Branch mint of the United States, N. O., Louisiana,	79,421 95	-	79,421 95
	$3,205,385 77	$1,524,913 97	$1,682,569 22
Add outstanding transfer drafts	-	-	100,000 00
			$1,782,569 22
Deduct suspense account	-	-	2,097 42
Nett amount subject to draft	-	-	$1,780,471 80

TRANSFER ORDERED.

To Assistant Treasurer, New Orleans - - - - - - - - - $100,000 00

June 2—It [Intel. & German Gaz.]

THE pain of decayed teeth from cold or toothache, arising from exposure or tenderness of the nerve, is always cured in one minute by WHEELER'S TEABERRY TOOTHWASH, and will all decay of this and all the other teeth, if any there be decayed, is entirely arrested, and they remain protected by this tooth wash in perfect health. It also keeps pure, strengthens, and solidifies the gums, and preserves the purity of the mouth and breath. It effectually cures soreness of the gums, where it may have existed; entirely cures softness of the gums, and stops all bleeding of the gums at once. It corrects all the complaints of the teeth, gums, and mouth, and keeps the teeth, gums, and mouth so corrected—always pleasant, and in a perfect state of the best health.

The following copyright will show the time of the origin of *Wheeler's Teaberry Tooth-Wash* to be over five years since, while imitative articles are of recent origin:

Eastern District of Pennsylvania, to wit:

Be it remembered, that on the second day of [SEAL.] February, anno Domini one thousand eight hundred and forty-two, W. Wheeler, of the said district, hath deposited in this office the title of a book, which is in the words to wit:

TEABERRY TOOTH-WASH,

the right whereof he claims as proprietor, in conformity with an act of Congress, entitled An act to amend the several acts respecting copy-rights.

FRA'S HOPKINSON,
Clerk of the U. S. District Court.

1842, Feb. 2d, copy deposited—CHAS. F. HEAZLETT.
Re-entered in 1847, by W. W. HUBBELL, Inventor.

Testimonials in its favor.

I have seen *Wheeler's Teaberry Tooth-Wash* used in very many cases of diseased teeth, with the best results.
J. L. ROSE, M. D.

I have occasionally used *Wheeler's Teaberry Tooth Wash*, and experienced beneficial results. I consider it a useful preparation, and unite with others in recommending it as a purifier of the teeth and gums. JAMES PAGE.

Have the goodness to send me by the bearer one large bottle of your Tooth Wash. I have used it for the last two years, and find it the best article of the kind I have ever met with; in fact, it is the only wash, the use of which hardens my gums and preserves them from bleeding.
With respect, yours,
GEO. F. SITES, Cor. Front & Race sts.

On Saturday last, while suffering with an extremely painful toothache, I called in at No. 71 Chesnut street, to obtain a bottle of *Wheeler's Teaberry Tooth Wash*, applied a little of it to the tooth, and *instantly* it caused *all* toothache to *cease*, and I have not had any pain since; which I publicly state for the relief of those who suffer with toothache. A. W. STRUTHERS.

Having used *Wheeler's Teaberry Tooth Wash* and Powder, I have found them to possess cleansing and purifying properties, and while they whiten and beautify the teeth, they have a beneficial effect upon the gums, by imparting to them free and healthy action.
F. A. RAYBOLD.

I have used *Wheeler's Teaberry Tooth Wash*, and its effects upon my teeth and gums have given me a high opinion of its merits. I cheerfully recommend it to the general use
H. R. KNEASS.

Having been requested by two dentists, I have for a long time used *Wheeler's Teaberry Tooth Wash*; and deem it well worthy of patronage by the public generally for curing toothache, allaying irritation of the gums, and preserving the teeth and gums. E. B. SCHNABEL.

This is to certify, That I have used *Wheeler's Teaberry Tooth Wash*; and can assure the public that it is really a meritorious article, and has proved beneficial to my teeth and gums on every application. JACOB LEIDY.

Having used *Wheeler's Teaberry Tooth Wash* for diseased teeth and gums, and found that although before its use my gums were so much out of order that the lower teeth could be laid back—a few applications of this tooth wash effectually cured all disease. I recommend it to the public in general, as a very efficacious and the best article I have ever used. BENJ. G. MITCHELL.

So very great has been the benefit derived from *Wheeler's Teaberry Tooth Wash* by my family, and every person to whom we have recommended its use, also by the workmen employed by me, by its immediately and effectually curing all toothache and preserving the teeth and gums from disease, that I, with this certificate, earnestly recommend its use to persons generally, as a certain remedy and pleasant article. F. S. JOHNSON.

It gives me great pleasure to say, for the alleviation of the usual pain and difficulty of teething, that, in the case of my child, although other preparations, sometimes considered useful, were without much benefit used, that *Wheeler's Teaberry Toothwash* afterwards, for the first time, was used to remedy soreness and fever in the gums of my child while teething; and it did alleviate all pain and fever, is very beneficial, and manifestly is an excellent article to wash the gums of children while teething.
N. S. LAWRENCE, Minor st., Phila.

Having used *Wheeler's