

DEMOCRATIC STATE TICKET.

FOR GOVERNOR,
Hon. HESTER CLYMER,
OF BERKS COUNTY.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR THE NEGRO.

Both houses of Congress have passed the Civil Rights Bill, notwithstanding the veto of the President. That this law is unconstitutional, we have the assurance of the most eminent jurists in the country. Senator Cowan said a few days ago, in his speech in the Senate, that he had but one word to describe it—*atrocious*. There can no longer be any question as to the designs of the men who made this law. By its provisions they have conferred citizenship upon the negro and made him the *political equal of the white man*. Nay, they have discriminated in favor of the black and against the white. On this point President Johnson and the majority of his cabinet, including Mr. Seward, are our witnesses. In his message returning the Civil Rights Bill to the Senate, President Johnson says:

"The bill in effect proposes a discrimination against large numbers of intelligent, worthy and patriotic foreigners, and in favor of the negro to whom after long years of bondage, the avenues to freedom and intelligence have just now been suddenly opened. He must, of necessity, from his previous unfortunate condition of servitude, be less informed as to the nature and character of our institutions, than he who, coming from abroad, has to some extent, at least, familiarized himself with the principles of a government to which he voluntarily entrusts his life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Yet it is now proposed, by a single legislative enactment, to confer the rights of citizens upon all persons of African descent born within the limits of the United States, while persons of foreign birth, who make our land their home, must undergo a probation of five years, and can only then become citizens upon proof that they are of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same."

As to the extent of the "civil rights" which this law confers upon the negro, let Mr. Bingham, one of the leading "Republican" members of Congress from Ohio, speak. In a speech upon this identical bill, in the lower house of Congress, Mr. Bingham said:

"What are civil rights?"
"Why, sir, the very origin of the term 'civil' ought to satisfy gentlemen on this point, that it has relation to the rights and all the rights of the citizen. I submit that the term civil rights includes every right that pertains to the citizen under the Constitution, laws and Government of this country. The term 'citizen' has had a definite meaning among publicists ever since the days of Aristotle. He interpreted and rendered that term to signify a person who was a partner in the country. I submit, with all respect, that the term 'political rights,' is only a limitation of the term 'civil rights,' and by general acceptance signifies that class of civil rights which are more directly exercised by the citizen in connection with the Government. Blackstone, whose commentaries on the common law are so exact in definition, uses in that classic of the law the terms 'civil liberty' and 'political liberty' everywhere as synonymous. It never occurred to him that there was a colorable distinction between them."

"If civil rights have this extent, what then is proposed by the provision of the first section? Simply to strike down, by congressional enactment, every State Constitution which makes a discrimination on account of race or color, in any of the civil rights of the citizen. I might say here, without the least fear of contradiction, that there is scarcely a State in this Union which does not, by its Constitution or by its statute laws, make some discrimination on account of race or color between citizens of the United States in respect of civil rights."

Thus, it will be seen that the reserved rights of the States have been stricken down, the Constitution overriden and the will of the people as expressed in the laws adopted for their domestic government, set at naught, in order to place the negroes of the United States upon a political equality with the whites. But, happily for the country, the present Rump will not be the Congress of the United States after the 4th of March, 1867. Happily, too, the "Republican" party have at last thrown off the mask and by their enactment of this law now stand upon the platform of *Black and White Equality*. The people will settle the lash of the men who forced this odious law upon the country, by electing those in their stead who will vote for its immediate repeal. Henceforward, *Repeal* is the watchword.

EX. GOV. W. F. JOHNSON.

He Denounces the Civil Rights Bill.

On Thursday night, 5th inst., there was a large meeting of the "Republican" friends of President Johnson, held in Washington city. Among the speakers at this meeting, was Hon. W. F. Johnson, of Allegheny county, this state, former Governor, who sustained the President in all his vetoes and other public acts. Ex. Gov. Johnson was lately a Radical, but has seen the error of his ways. He spoke of the Freedmen's Bureau and Civil Rights Bills, in the following strong and emphatic language:

"Against that iniquitous law I raised my voice, and I raise my voice against the Civil Rights Bill now being debated in the Senate, and which no man who feels his State should be independent will ever cast a vote for. [Great cheers.]

GLORY ENOUGH!

SHOUT, OH, YE PEOPLE!

LIBERTY, LAW AND JUSTICE!

The U. S. Supreme Court has decided that Military Commissioners and military tribunals cannot try citizens not in the army, or navy of the United States. In the cases of Milligan, Bowles and Horsey, known as the Indiana conspiracy cases, the Supreme Court of the United States, has decided that the writ of *Habeas Corpus* should issue to take the petitioners from military custody. (These men, Milligan, Bowles and Horsey, it will be remembered, were leaders of the Western order known as the "Sons of Liberty," and were given a mock trial, by a kind of drum-head court-martial, which sentenced them to death. The President commuted their sentence to imprisonment for life, but the Supreme Court, thanks to the supremacy of law, has now liberated them, upon the ground that the court-martial which tried them had no right to do so and that they are entitled to the benefit of the *Habeas Corpus*. Chief Justice Chase himself delivered the opinion of the Court.—Thus out of the mouths of their own greatest men, are the Radical conspirators against the liberties of the people, confuted and condemned. Glory! Glory! The day of battles is over. The light of liberty once more illumines the land! Law and Justice once again shed their genial influences upon all alike. Blessed be God, for these His great mercies!

SOMETHING WRONG.

Daniel W. Voorhees, of Indiana, Mr. Baldwin, of Michigan, Mr. Brooks, of New York, and Senator Stockton, of New Jersey, all leading Democrats, have been expelled by the Radicals, from their seats in Congress. The influence and votes of these men, were insuperable obstacles in the way of the Radical conspiracy against the President and the Union. Hence, they had to be gotten out of the way. No matter how their removal was to be accomplished, only so that it would be accomplished, was the secret reasoning of the Radicals. The crime against the people which the conspirators committed in driving the people's representatives from their seats in Congress, is, morally, not a shade less black than the murder of a man in his own house in order to possess his treasure. It bears a wondrous similitude to the bloody baseness of that soulless beast who became King of Denmark by slaying his own brother. Perhaps the diabolism of the Radicals may end likewise as did the conspiracy by which Hamlet lost his father and Denmark its rightful king. Surely, the people must see that there is something wrong in the morality of the so-called "Republican" party. The most prominent men in that party in Congress, have found it inconsistent with their honor, to support the schemes by which the Radical power in that body is maintained. Trumbull, the author of the Civil Rights Bill, and a great Radical himself, spoke for hours against the expulsion of Senator Stockton. Some ten Republican Senators supported him in this attitude. In the House, in the Brooks case, some twenty "Republican," with Washburne, of Illinois, at their head, stood by Mr. Brooks. This shows conclusively, to every reasonable mind, that the majority in Congress are certainly doing some things of very questionable propriety. We call those things by their right names, and dominate them *crimes against popular liberty*. But, those who see through a different political medium, must, at least, recognize *something wrong* in them, if their eyes are honest.

THE GREAT VICTORY IN CONNECTICUT.

In our last issue we stated that Hawley, Radical, was elected Governor of Connecticut, and that the Democrats had gained 3 or 4 senators, &c. The official returns show that Hawley's majority is only 509! Last year Buckingham, Abolitionist, had 11,035 over Seymour, Democrat, showing a net Democratic gain of 10,526 since last April. Instead of gaining 3 or 4 senators, the Democrats have really gained 8, whilst in the House of Representatives they gained 35. They also carried two of the four Congressional districts now represented by Radicals, and came within 122 votes of carrying another. New Haven, which gave an Abolition majority last year, gives this time nearly 2,300 Democratic majority. Hartford, which gave Lincoln a small majority and last year gave Buckingham a large one, this year goes Democratic by 325! Fairfield county, hitherto Abolition, also gives a handsome Democratic majority. We consider this a great triumph over Radicalism, and with the "Republican" Senator Lane, of Kansas, exclaim, "one more such victory as that in Connecticut and the 'Republican' party is unhorsed."

ANOTHER OUTRAGE.

The Radical Directory at Washington do up their work of iniquity with such reckless speed, that it keeps the journalist busy to record their deeds of infamy. But a few days ago, they expelled Mr. Stockton from his seat in the U. S. Senate, against the protest of one-third of the Senators of their own party and against the vote of nearly one half of the entire Senate. This black and damnable tyranny has just been repeated in the lower house of Congress, by the expulsion of Mr. Jas. Brooks, of New York. In this instance, as in that of the ousting of Senator Stockton, a number of leading "Republicans" refused to assent to the perpetration of the outrage. Such men as Farnsworth and Washburne, of Illinois, Dumont, of Indiana, and Loan, of Missouri, all of them Radicals and leaders honored in their party, spoke and voted in favor of Mr. Brooks. On the final vote some twenty "Republican" members voted against the right of Mr. Dodge (Mr. Brooks' opponent at the election) to the seat of Mr. Brooks.—But the low and contemptible partisans whose presence in the halls of Congress, smother every impulse of fairness and blights every influence that is honorable, could not afford any longer to tolerate Mr. Brooks as a fellow representative. "He was a leader of the people, a friend of the President and a Democrat. These facts were enough to damn him in the eyes of these mannikins, and therefore, his fate was sealed. But, what think you, of such conduct on the part of your representatives in Congress, O ye "Republican" voters of the country? When your own leading men, the most high-toned and honorable gentlemen in Congress, protest against such conduct, what do you say upon the same subject? Do you, like so many thoughtless school-boys, applaud the course of mean and dishonorable men in Congress, who expel a member from his seat because he is a prominent Democrat, or do you stand with Washburne, Farnsworth, Loan and the honorable men who have soul enough to do justice to a political opponent?

If the GAZETTE will point out to its supporters President Johnson's policy, this side of rebellion, who do not support Mr. Clymer for Governor, we'll think of the question of repudiating them.—*Franklin Repository*.

Well, sir, for instance, the editor of the *Somerset Herald & Whig*, who is the Collector of Internal Revenue for this district, and who supports Johnson, and Cowan, too, but abuses Clymer like a pick-pocket; what do you say about his case, Colonel? Don't you want the votes of the Johnson and Cowan "Republicans" of Somerset county for Mr. Geary? Will you "think of the question of repudiating them? They don't support Clymer, but they do sustain Johnson and Cowan. Now, you must either get down into the dirt and crave the help of these men, or you must think of "repudiating them." But, we opine you will think a good while on that question, before you come to a conclusion. Again, there is Mr. R. B. Carnahan, U. S. District Attorney, for the western district of Pennsylvania, who is a firm supporter of the President, but who has not yet announced himself in favor of Mr. Clymer's election.—What do you propose to do with him? The late editor of the *Waynesburg Republican*, who has just retired from that concern, because your party organization has given President Johnson the cold shoulder, is a similar instance.—Hon. Joseph R. Flanigen, of the Philadelphia *Daily News*, may also be placed in this category. These are friends of the President whose influence in Pennsylvania is not to be sneered at, and if Col. McClure does not care to have them support Mr. Geary, he can't be very deeply interested in the success of that candidate. At any rate some people would like to know whether the Colonel repudiates Scull, Carnahan, Flanigen & Co?

QUACK! QUACK! Don't you hear the Dead Ducks? Oh! what a squawk there is among them since the passage of the Negro Civil Rights Bill over the President's veto! How they stick their dirty bills, full of garbage gathered in the gutters of Radicalism, into the geese who think they can be Johnson men and yet vote the Radical ticket!—Quack! Quack! goes the editor who "lives and moves and has his being," in the agitation of the Negro. Quack! Quack! responds the scurvy politician who changes his party coat oftener than "live ducks change their feathers. Quack! Quack! repeats the chronic office-seeker who thinks every thing is right that tends toward giving him political position. Go it, Dead Ducks! though you needn't be so assiduous in making the noise peculiar to your kind, for the people will have no trouble in setting you down as Quacks, anyhow.

The glorious proclamation of Peace and Re-Union and of the restoration of the *Habeas Corpus*, will be found on our first page. Read it, every one, and rejoice.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY "CRUMBLING TO PIECES."

It is not the editor of the BEDFORD GAZETTE whomakes this startling, but gratifying announcement; it is the Hon. James H. Lane, U. S. Senator from Kansas. In the Senate, on Friday last, Senator Lane offered some resolutions, upon which he made a speech. In the course of that speech, he made use of the following language:

MR. LANE.—I have no assurance from the President on that or any other subject. (Referring to the acceptability of his resolutions to President Johnson.) But this I do know, that the Republican party, of which I am a member, is crumbling to pieces, and that every day we postpone the reception of these States, insure the destruction of that party.

Here is one of the most prominent and active leaders of the "Republican" party, openly confessing that his party is "crumbling to pieces;" and what is more, he says that the reason of the "crumbling" is their refusal to admit the Southern States into the Union. In other words, it is *Disunion* that is killing the "Republican" party. When men like Jim Lane give the alarm, the ship must surely be in danger of sinking.

THE passage, by the U. S. Senate, of the Negro Civil Rights Bill, notwithstanding the veto of the President, is a stride toward the social and political equality of the white and black races in this country. Things are tending so rapidly in this direction and events in this connection are so sudden, that there is scarcely time for argument, or appeal to the reason and judgment of the popular masses. In fact, it is not necessary to argue this question with the people. They are right in regard to it, and only lack organization to make their principles successful in politics. Such organization must be instituted at once, or it will be too late to catch and crystallize public sentiment. Now is the time to do it, and it can be done right now. Some one asks us, How? Well, you have heard of the society of the Cincinnati, of the Union League, and other similar institutions. They were successfully organized, in a brief period, and so can a *White Man's Union* be organized in a still briefer period. It is now time that all who believe in perpetuating this as a *White Man's Government*, unite together in bonds superior to any ties except those alone of family and religion. Old party lines must not stand in the way. If you would save your country from the fate of San Domingo and Jamaica, throw party to the dogs and unite with those men who are in favor of preserving this Government as it was handed down to us by its founders. Ask no questions as to the political antecedents of those with whom you may be called to act. If they be Democrats, no matter; if they have been Republicans, no matter again. All who are willing to stand up for a *White Man's Government* are worthy to be associated with you, regardless of their former political affiliations. That such organization must and will be resorted to, in order to check the revolutionary proceedings of the Radicals, seems certain to our mind. The sooner, therefore, that it is established, the better.

THE GREAT DECISION.

We find in the *Constitutional Union* of Saturday last, the following decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the "Indiana conspiracy case," liberating from the Ohio Penitentiary, Messrs. Bowles, Milligan and Horsey, which decision was delivered by Chief Justice Chase:

Ex parte.—In the matter of Lambdin P. Milligan, petitioner: The following order is directed by a majority of the court to be entered in this cause, and the like order will be entered in No. 355, *ex parte*, in the matter of William A. Bowles, petitioner, and No. 376, *ex parte*, in the matter of Stephen Horsey, petitioner.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of the United States for the district of Indiana, and on the points and questions on which the said judges of the Circuit Court were opposed in opinion, and which were certified to this court for its opinion, agreeably to the act of Congress in such case made and provided, and was argued by counsel. On consideration thereof the court is of opinion:

First.—That on the facts, as stated in said petition and exhibits, a writ of *habeas corpus* ought to be issued, according to the prayer of said petition.

Second.—That on the facts stated in the said petition and exhibits, the said Lambdin P. Milligan ought to be discharged from custody as in said petition prayed, according to the act of Congress passed on the 3d of March, 1863, entitled an act relating to the *habeas corpus* and regulating judicial proceedings in certain cases; and,

Third.—That on the facts stated in said petition and exhibits, the military commission mentioned therein had no jurisdiction legally to try and sentence said Lambdin P. Milligan in the manner and form as in said petition and exhibits are stated. And it is thereupon now ordered and judged by this court that it be so certified to the said circuit court.

The Chief Justice said he was instructed to say that the opinion of the court in these cases will be read at the next term, when such of the dissenting judges as see fit to do so will state the ground of dissent.

The petitioners, it will be recollected, were found guilty by a military commission of the charge of conspiracy and

condemned to death, but the sentences were commuted by the President to imprisonment for life. They are now in the Ohio penitentiary. The case was heretofore argued by Judge McDonald of Indiana, Gen. J. A. Garfield of Ohio, Hon. Jeremiah S. Black of Pennsylvania, and Hon. David Dudley Field of New York, for the petitioners, and by General B. F. Butler, Henry Stanbury, Esq., of Ohio, and Attorney General Speed for the United States.

SACRILEGE.

The devilishness of the men who have been taught in the school of Radicalism, is showing its cloven foot more distinctly day by day. In the House of Representatives at Harrisburg, on Thursday, April 5, Mr. Sturtevant, a "Republican" member from Crawford county, declared that George Washington was not a greater or a better man than Thaddeus Stevens, or Thomas Williams! It is a wonder that a just God does not visit the punishment of Ananias and Sapphira upon such sacrilegious lying. We give the debate below in which this infamous declaration was made:

Mr. Sturtevant argued that the Constitution was too weak, and the late war proved it to be so, therefore it should be amended by the loyal men of the country. He said the Democratic party were in favor of taxing the United States bonds out of existence, thereby creating repudiation. He said the Union party demanded that the Constitution should be amended to prevent another rebellion. There has been a great deal said about the amendments to the Constitution being as plenty as resolutions at a town meeting, as was said by our accidental President. He would be unwilling to admit any of the Southern States in full fellowship until all the colored, black and white, would have an education. He did not believe any government could exist forever if all men did not have the right to vote. He was in favor of the Chinese in California having the right to vote.

He said, I believe, that the Congress now sitting in Washington is the ablest that ever sat there. I believe that no Congress since this Government began to exist ever possessed so many able men as that in session at the present time.

Mr. Lawrence. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Leave being granted.—

Mr. Lawrence. Did the gentleman say that the present Congress embraced more wisdom than any previous Congress, and that they were wiser than their forefathers?

Mr. Sturtevant assented.

Mr. Lawrence. Will the gentleman name four men of the present Congress as great as four I can name, and who lived in the same age, and acted in the same way?

Mr. Sturtevant. Name them.

Mr. Lawrence. George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry.

Mr. Sturtevant. Yes, sir. I believe there are twenty-five men now in Congress able, or as able, as any one out of the four mentioned by the gentleman from York.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR CLYMER.

The Hon. HESTER CLYMER has resigned his seat in the State Senate.—This is in accordance with the determination he was known to have formed at the time the State Convention adjourned, and is an eminently proper step, in view of the relation he now holds to the people, as the candidate of a great party for the gubernatorial chair. Independent of the fact that it deprives his opponents of the opportunity of reviving the hackneyed cry, "Why don't he resign?" it indicates confidence in the success of the Democracy, and leaves him free to devote himself wholly to the canvass before us.

HARRISBURG, March 30, 1866.
Hon. DAVID FLEMING,
Speaker of the Senate of Pennsylvania.

SIR.—I hereby resign my seat as Senator representing the Sixth Senatorial District of this Commonwealth. I had intended to forward you my resignation on Tuesday, the Sixth day of this month, but on examination of the election laws, I found, that if a resignation takes place at any time before the last fifteen days of the session of the General Assembly, it would be the duty of the Speaker to issue his writ for a special election. As, by a joint resolution, the day of final adjournment has been fixed on the 12th day of April, 1866, I have deferred informing you of my intention until to-day, in order that my District may be spared the expenses incident to a special election, which it is now too late to order.

You will believe, that I sever my long connection with the body over which you preside, with feelings of deep personal regret, constrained thereto by the new relation which I bear to my fellow-citizens.

For you, sir, and every member of the Senate, I shall ever entertain the kindest feelings of personal regard and esteem.

I have the honor to be,
Yours very faithfully,
HESTER CLYMER.

CLYMER AND THE PRESIDENT.—A correspondent of the New York *Tribune* recently stated the nomination of Mr. Clymer was received with marked dissatisfaction by the President. Perhaps the statement was not overdrawn. Be this as it may, we have excellent authority for declaring that Mr. Clymer has been a frequent and welcome visitor at the White House during the last six months.—*Pittsburg Gazette*, Rep.

—The Missouri Democrat of the 27th ult., says: "Within two weeks from to-day, two thousand passengers, principally miners, and three thousand tons of freight, will have left this port on steamboats for the Montana and Idaho mines."

—Surgeon General Phillips, of Pennsylvania, has resigned.

POLITICAL NEWS.

—The Conservatives have carried St. Louis, Mo., by 3,000 majority, electing their candidate for Mayor and three-fourths of the members of Council. St. Louis was hitherto a Radical city, but the influence of Gen. F. P. Blair and other prominent men who have recently left the "Republican" party, has brought it to its senses.

—At the recent election in Connecticut, the Democrats carried two of the four Congressional Districts. At present all four are represented by Radicals. Had an election for members of Congress taken place, two members would have been taken from the Radical column and added to that of the Democrats.

—A Johnson Club has been formed at Washington city, with Hon. Montgomery Blair as President. Such "Republicans" as Senator Norton, of Minnesota, Marcus J. Parrott, of Kansas, and Senator Van Winkle, of West Virginia, are conspicuous among its members.

—The Washington correspondent of N. Y. *Tribune*, says that the President has ordered the Heads of Departments to withhold all advertising from *Forney's Chronicle* and all other papers that oppose the policy of the Administration.

—The radicals of Milwaukee called a convention of "the people" a few days ago, to further some of their pestilent schemes, when the parties invited gathered in such force as to completely rout the callers of the Convention.

—Hon. Hester Clymer, the Democratic nominee for Governor, has resigned his seat in the Senate, preparatory to entering upon the gubernatorial canvass. Mr. Clymer will give the enemy a lively campaign.

—Judge King, of this Judicial District, has fined one of the judges of election in Franklin county, for refusing to receive the votes of reputed "deserters."

—Leavenworth, Kansas, has elected the Conservative ticket over that of the Pomeroy Radicals, by 1,710 majority—a most substantial victory for the President.

—Cincinnati, O., has been carried by the "Republicans," by about 3,000 majority. Last fall their majority in that city was upwards of 6,000.

—The Democrats of Dayton, Ohio, elected their candidate for Mayor. Dayton is the home of Hon. C. L. Vallandigham.

—Aurora, Ill., formerly a "Republican" stronghold, has chosen a Democratic Mayor. The issue was Johnson and Anti-Johnson.

—The Democratic State Convention of Ohio, will meet at Columbus, on the 24th of May.

—Iowa city, Iowa, has gone Democratic by about 100 majority—a large gain. Omaha, Nebraska, ditto.

THE BRUTALITY OF RADICALISM.

On day before yesterday, says the *Age*, of Saturday last, Mr. Hendricks, Mr. Cowan, Mr. Guthrie, and others, in the most respectful and earnest manner, asked a postponement of the vote on the Civil Rights bill in the United States Senate, on the ground that certain members of that body were absent, detained by illness. They solicited but a short delay, and promised to ask for no extension of it, if the sick men were unable to be present at the time fixed for the vote; whereupon they met with this retort from the Senator from Ohio:

Mr. Wade opposed any postponement. If this was an ordinary question he would have no objection. The President had no right to veto their acts, and assuming to do so he was playing the part of a dictator. So far from its being any reason because members were sick who desired to uphold the despotic assumptions of the President that a postponement should be agreed to, he (Mr. Wade) was for taking every advantage which the Almighty has put into their hands. The President had picked this quarrel with Congress, and for the sole reason that he wanted the rebels back here occupying their seats. If he (Mr. Wade) did not oppose this usurpation and take every advantage which the Almighty offered, he would be censured by the people whose representative he was. He was willing to sit here all night and all to-morrow if necessary.

The infamy of this declaration defies comment. It is based on the maxim that the end justifies the means—a maxim which embodies the logic and the ethics of the assassin, but falls with an ungracious sound from the lips of a Senator.

Our Gain in Connecticut.

The great gain for the Democratic party in Connecticut can only be realized by taking the count by Congressional districts; and considering the fact that the State is at present represented by four Abolitionists, the vote by districts is as follows:

FIRST DISTRICT.			
Congress, Counties, Hartford, Tolland,	Hawley, 8,518, 2,578	English, 8,837, 1,867	
Abolition majority,	122	10,874	
SECOND DISTRICT.			
New Haven, Middlesex,	8,409, 2,638	10,640, 2,639	
Democratic majority,	11,347, 1,932	13,278	
THIRD DISTRICT.			
New London, Windham,	5,630, 3,448	4,617, 2,086	
Abolition majority,	9,073, 2,370	6,703	
FOURTH DISTRICT.			
Fairfield, Litchfield,	6,889, 3,796	7,101, 3,675	
Democratic majority,	10,665, 111	10,776	
The result shows a gain of two Congressional districts, and also that a sound Democratic district requires 24,616 voters for a representative, while a strong Abolition district needs only 15,776.			
—Beatty & Co., merchants of New York, suspended yesterday, with liabilities the amount of \$800,000. D. G. Schofield, a petroleum dealer of the same city, has also suspended.			

CONGRESSIONAL NEWS.

SENATE.—A bill amending the act to provide a national currency by a pledge of United States Bonds was referred to the Committee on Finance. Mr. Lane of Kansas, introduced a joint resolution for the admission of representatives from the Southern States, on condition that they should repudiate Confederate debts, recognize the rights of the United States and allow the right of suffrage to all negroes who can read and write, or who own over two hundred and fifty dollars worth of real estate. The Senate resumed consideration of the Civil Rights bill, the question being on the passage of the bill over the President's veto. After a long debate a vote was taken, which resulted in the passage of the bill over the President's veto by a vote of 33 to 15. The bill was sent to the House with the President's message, returning it with his veto and the Senate's action thereon. The Senate then adjourned.

HOUSE.—A communication from the President was laid before the House, enclosing a report from the Secretary of the Treasury and from the Postmaster General, containing lists of the United States officers who cannot take the oath prescribed by the act of July 24, 1862, and declaring that a modification of this oath is necessary in order that the business of their departments may be efficiently carried on in the Southern States. The House concurred in the recommendation, and earlier recommended the subject to the consideration of Congress. The House resumed the consideration of the contested election case of Dodge vs. Brooks. Mr. Brooks concluded his speech of yesterday. Mr. Dawes, Chairman of the Committee on Elections, made a long speech, which closed the debate, and the House proceeded to vote on the case. A vote was taken on the first resolution of the majority report of the Committee on Elections, declaring Mr. Brooks not to be entitled to his seat, which was agreed to—yeas 84, nays 45. The resolution declaring William E. Dodge entitled to the seat was adopted by a vote of yeas 72, nays 52, twenty Republicans voting against the resolution. The oath was administered to Mr. Dodge, who then took the seat vacated by Mr. Brooks. The House then adjourned.

THE PEOPLE FOR THE PRESIDENT.

Election at Leavenworth, Kansas. The Washington *Constitutional Union* has the following cheering dispatch:

LEAVENWORTH, Kansas, April 4.—The significance of our municipal election is not, I apprehend, understood in Washington; the contest was clearly for the policy of President Johnson in admitting the question of negro suffrage to the States, where it constitutionally belongs, as against the interference of Congress upon that question, determining universal negro suffrage. Hon. Thomas Carney, formerly Governor of the State, and administrative candidate, was elected over B. F. Pomeroy, radical Pomeroy candidate, by 1,710 majority. This is a great victory and should be so hailed by every friend of the policy of Andrew Johnson in the country.

The Cincinnati Election.

The *Enquirer* of Tuesday, in noticing the city election, which came off on Monday, after stating the result far exceeded the expectations of the Democracy, says:—The immense republican majority of one year ago has been reduced one-half. It has fallen from 6,000 in 1865, to 3,000 in 1866, and even far below this on a portion of the ticket. The republicans were fully organized, and had possession of the machinery of the Government, local, State and Federal. The Democracy were but imperfectly organized, and had no hope of success in most of the wards. They have, therefore, done exceedingly well under the circumstances. The result affords an earnest call, with energetic work, the county can be carried for the democracy by a handsome majority. In the various parts of the county, the Democracy made a contest, their majority is exceedingly large.

Clymer and his Votes.

We cut the following from the Democratic *Standard*, which is an explanation in full of some of Mr. CLYMER's votes as published in the Republican papers. Voting against considering a constitutional amendment, the President is organized is a very different thing from voting against it on its merits. The votes published are all only on agreeing to consider the resolutions at that time.

It will be remembered that at the meeting of the Legislature of 1863, the two parties in the Senate were equally divided, owing to the absence of Senator Johnson. The Republicans stated that the organization of the previous Legislature be continued, and that they could do business with the old Speaker, Clerks, &c., all of whom were Republicans. The Democrats denied this, demanded a new election, as had always been done, and voted against every proposition that was brought up for the purpose of forcing an election and on a constitutional amendment. The Republicans took advantage of this and brought forward any quantity of resolutions and motions so as to place the Democrats in a false position. The latter voted against every such resolution and motion, not because they were opposed to it, but because all legislation was illegal until the Senate was properly organized. The Republican papers are now publishing some of the resolutions that were then voted on, to make a bad record for Mr. Clymer. This action we conceive to be about as mean a business as men can be engaged in, but not too mean for the party engaged in it. Mr. Clymer and his friends can and will defend his record when truthfully given, and also his action and votes in that disorganized and unconstitutional squabble of the opposition, but the case be fairly and truthfully presented. That is all we ask.

Which is the Union Party?

President Johnson, on the 24th ult., said to several Connecticut gentlemen:—"THE UNION PARTY IS NOT THE PARTY OF THE RADICALS."—"When I said the Union party, I DID NOT MEAN THE MEN WHO ARE ENDEAVORING TO BREAK UP THIS UNION, BUT THE MEN WHO STAND BY ME." "I believe the maintenance of this Union depends upon the policy which I have indicated to Congress, and those who sustain THAT POLICY ARE MY FRIENDS. THOSE WHO OPPOSE THAT POLICY I CERTAINLY HAVE NO DESIRE TO SEE ELECTED TO ANY OFFICE."

The Democratic party sustains President Johnson's policy, and the Radical party does not. Therefore the Democratic party stands by the Union, and the other does not. Hester Clymer was a Union man, and the white man's course, and General Geary does not.—The President's choice between them is, therefore, plain.—*Lancaster Intelligencer*.

—The President's order for the release of Bradley Johnson, was issued at the request of Gen. Grant.