trict unless the salary should be increased. The present judge had been induced to accept the judgeship, because he was assured by the judge who preceded him—Judge Pennybacker, who left the district to take a seat in the United States Senate—that he would introduce a bill to increase the salary; and if it were not done, Judge Brockenbrough must resign his office from sheer necessity, and no man who was fit to discharge the duties would accept the salary. He hoped the House would allow this bill to pass.

Mr. VINTON begged permission to make a slight correction of the remarks he made a few minutes ago in relation to the remuneration of the judges of Ohio and of the western States. They received but $1,500, and not $1,600, and for performing the duties of an entire State; whereas, in Virginia, there were two district judges, each receiving a large salary. He knew that in Virginia the expenses of the judges were not extravagant. The people in the western district were a simple people; their modes of living were not expensive. The gentleman from Virginia said the judges travelled round their districts, but that, he supposed, was a matter for their own convenience. The judge of Ohio held his court at but one place, and the people engaged in litigation in the courts of the United States were required to go to the seat of government of that State. It might be a matter of convenience to the people of Virginia that the judge should travel round, but it was no reason why this Government should pay more to a judge in western Virginia than to the one who held his court at Columbus, Ohio.

Mr. MEADE inquired how many days that judge sat?

Mr. VINTON said he could not tell, but he saw from the roll of the Supreme Court of the United States, that there was three times as much business there from the State of Ohio in the last few years, as from all the State of Virginia. He had no objection to the judge of the western district of Virginia receiving $2,500 a year, but he was for even-handed justice, and he should ask that the salary of the judge of Ohio should be increased also.

Mr. GOGGIN thought that what the gentleman from Ohio had said was conclusive evidence that the judge of Ohio got more than he was entitled to, but it was not evidence that the judges of Virginia got enough.

Mr. VINTON said, the judge of Ohio was formerly a member of this House; and he had seen gentlemen from Virginia here who were not more intelligent than he is.

Mr. GOGGIN had no doubt there were gentlemen here from Ohio, near the line of the State of Virginia, who were, perhaps, not as intelligent as that judge. He had no intention to reflect on the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. VINTON.] He had only risen to say, that this Government should give salaries commensurate with the duties and the position of its officers. If not, they would drive men of talent to the State courts, and they would not be able to get a man of even moderate abilities to preside in the Federal courts. He bestowed a flattering eulogy on Judge Brockenbrough, and called upon the House to reject the motion to strike out.

Mr. DICKEY moved the previous question, and there was a second.

The motion to strike out the third section was agreed to, by yeas and nays; the vote being—yeas 117, nays 40.

The bill was then ordered to be engrossed for a third reading.

Mr. MEADE moved to reconsider the vote ordering the engrossment of the bill, with a view to move its recommitment to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions so to amend the bill as to fix the salary of the judge at two thousand dollars.

Mr. MEADE again stated the large amount of labor to be performed by the judge, the extent of country over which he had to travel, the number to of the population, the number of courts he had hold, and the very great amount of travel he had to perform on horseback, &c.; and expressed an earnest hope that the motion to reconsider would prevail.

Mr. LINCOLN said, he felt unwilling to be either unjust or ungenerous, and he wanted to understand the real case of this judicial officer. The gentleman from Virginia had stated that he had to hold eleven courts. Now, everybody knew that it was not the habit of the district judges of the United States in other States to hold anything like that number of courts; and he therefore took it for granted that this must happen under a peculiar law, which required that large number of courts to be holden every year; and these laws, he further supposed, were passed at the request of the people of that judicial district. It came, then, to this: that the people in the western district of Virginia had got eleven courts to be held among them in one year, for their own accommodation; and being thus better accommodated than their neighbors elsewhere, they wanted their judge to be a little better paid. In Illinois, there had been, until the present season, but one district court held in the year. There were now to be two. Could it be that the western district of Virginia furnished more business for a judge than the whole State of Illinois?

Mr. J. R. INGERSOLL advocated the motion to reconsider at some length and with much earnestness. He referred to the law of Virginia, which imposed an immense amount of business on the judge of the western district of Virginia. Mr. I. had travelled through a number of the States the last season; but in his whole journey he encountered no such roads as those over which this unfortunate gentleman was destined to travel 280 miles every year. He held eleven courts, and received but $1,600, a sum greatly reduced, too, by his travelling expenses, for he was allowed no mileage. It was said that this was attributed to the law. If the law was wrong, correct it; but as long as the law remained which exacted this enormous amount of service, let the compensation be in some fair proportion to the labor rendered. It was said that in all Illinois there had been but one district court held in a year. If a similar rule should be enforced in Western Virginia, it would amount to a delay, and almost to a denial, of justice. The people might break their necks in trying to get to the court, and after all fail. Our only sovereign, under the people, was the law: and the ministers of the law were justly entitled to an adequate compensation in proportion to the services discharged. In England, not only did judges receive a liberal allowance while they continued in office, but when, owing to length of service and the infirmities of age, they were obliged to retire, the law provided for them an ample honorary pension during the residue of their days. The duties of this bench were sufficient to break down a constitution of iron. As an instance of this, he referred to the case of Judge Kennedy, of Pennsylvania, who, when he entered on judicial duty, was, as he said, "able to handle any man in Pennsylvania;" but the course of his duties on the bench ultimately prostrated his large and powerful frame, and brought him to a premature grave. He referred to the salaries allowed in his own State and some others, and warmly pressed an increase of the allowance for the bench of Western Virginia.

A statement was now sent to the clerk's table to be read, exhibiting the comparative amount of travel, courts held, and distance travelled by all the district judges of the United States.

Mr. VINTON did not know how correct that table might be as to the amount of travel; but he knew, that so far as Ohio was concerned, it was incorrect. A judge residing in Steubenville, and required to hold his court in Columbus, was set down as having no travel to perform. How he got from the one city to the other without travelling, Mr. V. did not pretend to understand. He was satisfied there were many of our judges who did not receive as much as in justice they ought to have; but Mr. V. was in favor of a general revision and due apportionment of salary, according to the service respectively rendered.

He moved that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table. The motion prevailed; and the bill was then read a third time and passed.

CIVIL AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATIONS.

The House then, on motion of Mr. VINTON, resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. ROOT, of Ohio, in the chair,) and proceeded to consider the bill making appropriations for the civil and diplomatic expenses of Government for the year ending June 30, 1849.

Mr. HOLMES, of South Carolina, addressed the committee during his hour, basing his remarks upon the memorial of the citizens of Charleston for an appropriation of $100,000 for the purchase of a site and the erection of a custom-house in that city, and (notwithstanding the favorable report of the engineer in charge) the hostility of the President thereto, which he ascribed to the general hostility of the Executive to the State of South Carolina on account of Mr. Calhoun's thwarting his efforts on the Oregon question, and saving us from a war with England. He related some interesting facts connected with Mr. Calhoun's course in opposition to 54° 40', and ascribed to him the credit of having turned back the current of public opinion, lashed into fury by the President's extreme claim to that territory, and having preserved peace. He touched incidentally upon the Mexican war, and expressed the opinion that it was got into and precipitated by the rashness of the President. While we were in the war, he had never disputed about its propriety, necessity, and expediency, but had reserved this expression of his opinion until we were out of it. In closing, he paid an eloquent tribute to General Taylor, in his military, civil, and social character, and proclaimed his intention to support him for the Presidency.

Mr. SIMS replied with much warmth, and vindicated the Secretary of the Treasury against the charges made in relation to a custom-house at Charleston, and the Executive against an imputation of partiality to one State above another.

[These speeches will appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. WOODWARD said, he did not rise for the purpose of entering into this debate, but to make some explanation personal to himself. Having voted with his colleague [Mr. SIMS] on the proposition to increase the appropriation for the repair of Fort Moultrie, he could not avoid taking to himself the censure pronounced by his colleague [Mr. HOLMES] against his colleague [Mr. SIMS.]

Mr. W. said the department had indicated the sum necessary for the work, and the proper committee had, upon consideration, recommended that sum as sufficient. He thought proper to be governed by the recommendation of those in whose charge the law had placed such matters. He had no other reliable source of information. It would not be safe, as a rule of conduct here, to look to any less responsible source. True, his colleague, [Mr. HOLMES,] a little before the vote was taken, had informed him that some engineer had reported an additional sum to be requisite; and although he (Mr. W.) felt all becoming respect for the opinions of his colleague, [Mr. HOLMES,] and those of any engineer he might recommend as worthy of confidence, he yet concluded it would be a more warrantable course to look to the department and the committee for information, though he confessed his mind did somewhat hesitate.

But there was a great mistake in supposing these appropriations were for the State of South Carolina, or for the people of Charleston. They were for the public works of the Government. Charleston is not the proprietor of Fort Moultrie, or of the custom-house in that city. The United States have a fort near Charleston, and a custom-house in Charleston; but appropriations for these structures are not, therefore, to be called appropriations for South Carolina. These works are the property of this Government, and within its jurisdiction.

He made these remarks, because the language of the debate was calculated to produce the impression on the public that Congress had been making an appropriation for the benefit of South Carolina. His State had never received any of the bounties of this Government, and desired none.

If his colleague [Mr. H.] had intended to convey the idea that his State was likely to be influenced in her course in the Presidential election, by the hope of receiving bounties from this Government, in any shape or form, directly or indirectly, he took the liberty of saying that gross injustice had been done the character of the State. He (Mr. W.) felt bound to repudiate the idea that any such hopes would operate upon the State of South Carolina. Indeed, he did not hesitate to say that, other things being equal, the candidate from whom she had most to hope in this respect, would be least apt to get her vote. She is opposed to internal improvements.

He did not mean to intimate that there was anything to choose between parties on this subject. If he might judge from the votes of members on a late bill, vetoed twice by the President, and after-