THE NEW YORK PRESS.

EDITORIAL OPINIONS OF THE LEADING JOURNALS UPON CURRENT TOPICS.

COMPILED EVERY DAY FOR EVENING THEIGRAPH.

Southern Restoration-Curious Array of Disturbing Forces.

From the Herald. Wendell Phillips, in the State House at Boston the other day, devoted himself to an argument against the ratification of the pending Constitutional amendment by Massachusetts, on the ground that while its adoption will be binding on the North, it will be practically a dead letter in the South. The third section, distranchising certain classes of Rebels, he holds, cannot be executed in the South. The only remedy, he contends, is to put seven hundred thousand negro votes into the scale. He is in favor of disfranchising prominent Rebels; but if he can give the negro the ballot he will be willing to trust Wade Hampton. He says nothing of fixing in the Constitution, as this amendment proposes, the binding obligations of the national debt, and the repudiation forevermore, as utterly illegal, null and void, of all Rebel debts and all claims for emancipated slaves, and he overlooks the condition which requires the concession of the suffrage to the blacks by the several States, in order to count them in the popular enumeration for Representatives to Congress. truth, from certain declarations of Phillips heretofore, he is ready for the alternative of universal repudiation, if he cannot obtain universal suffrage, as the all-healing panacea of Southern restoration.

All this means that Phillips is opposed to any scheme which promises a speedy settlement of this vexed question. He has his own theory of the advantages to be gained by delay. He has his own visionary projects of reconstruction, which can only be reached by reducing the country to chaos, and then in beginning anew. There are various other leaders and factionists and fanatics who are driving for the same point of departure, although by different roads. The leaders of the Northern Democracy are opposed to the pending amendment, because they think that in staving off this settlement "something will turn up" to bring them, in conjunction with the South, again into power. The ruling old proslavery class of the South are opposed to the amendment because they entertain similar expeciations. President Johnson himself may be placed in the same category. Greeley, according to his last pronunciamento on the subject, is with Phillips as to the infallible specific of universal negro suffrage, but shrinks with fear and trembling from President Johnson's im-peachment, which Phillips holds to be the first ndispensable step to "liberty, equality, and

Such are the disturbing forces operating against the pending amendment—the Northern abolition facatics of the school of Wendell Phillips, the weak-kneed reformers represented by Greeley, the old hide-bound Northern Democratic leaders, the old ruling class of the Rebel States, President Johnson and the hold-over Dred Scott expounders of the Supreme Court. These disturbing elements, in many things con-flicting, and arising out of different objects, are all working together for delay in the settlement of our existing troubles. Phillips and Greeley desire to sacrifice the amendment in order to secure universal negro suffrage; Vallan ligham and the Seymours, Wade Hampton, and all the old Southern political managers still remaining on hand, together with the Administration, are laboring to defeat the amendment, because, if adopted, it will inaugurate a new dispensation an entirely new organization of parties, and because under President Johnson and the Supreme Court the hope is cherished of still another reign of the Bourbons, State rights, slavery and all. Thus it is that the main body of the dominant party in Congress is confronted on every side by hostile factions, and thus, among other dangers, this dominant party is threatened with dissensions and divisions which encourage all these opposing forces to hold

How is Congress to baffle and overthrow all these opposing combinations? Not by delay nor masterly inactivity; for this is their game. Not by hedging and ditching to the end of President Johnson's term of office; for that is his policy and theirs, to bring the Rebel States, stand, into Congress and the next Presidential election, under a decree from the Supreme Court. There remains to Congress, then, only the policy of pushing through the amendment as the basis of Southern restoration; and as it is now made manifest that the amendment is mainly blocked by President Johnson, his impeachment and removal will become the dist and the main question with the new Congress which meets in March. Whatever else Congress may deem necessary in the way of reconstruction, the securities of this mendment must be fixed in the Constitution. Otherwise, with Southern restoration a repulifia-tion party will at once be developed North and South. It is binted that Chief Justice Chase and Greeley favor a compromise on negro suffrage with the President; we know that Phillips goes for his impeachment to secure negro suffrage; but there can be no security for anything short of the adoption of this amendment. How the Republicans now stand in the two Houses upon this question we cannot tell, but with the meeting of the new Congress fresh from the people we expect that, mainly in behalf of this pending amendment as the great issue of the recent elections, the impeachment will be pushed to the removal of President

Upon this line there will be force and consistency in the impeachment; but in diverging to negro suffrage as the only issue to be set led. as the only security needed for the future, Wendell Phillips, as of old, is again playing into the bands of Wade Hampton, and Greeley is strengthening the rejected policy of President Johnson. Upon the basis of the amendment the party in power will be supported by the North even, to the removal of the present Executive and a reconstruction of the Supreme Court. Then, with the settlement completed and with the South restored, we shall have a reconstruction of parties involving new issues, new men, and new combinations of sections and factions and whites and blacks. Let Congress, on the other hand, try the substitute of negro suffrage as presented by Phillips and Greeley, and it will prove to the Republicans the admis-sion of the wooden horse within the walls of Troy, and a restoration of the Bourbons. Nay. more, we must fix the amendment in the stitution or prepare for the new party and the chaos of universal repudiation, as the price which Wade Hampton is ready, no doubt, to exact, and which Wendell Phillips is ready, we conclude, to pay for universal negro suffrage.

The Democratic Party and the Late Rebellion.

From the Tribune. The circumstance that a member of Congress is branded a liar for stating in his place that very many Democrats were sympathizers with and virtual allies of the late Rebellion, compels as to ask attention to certain historical facts.

If any one contradict them or break their force, we beg him not to hide his candle under a bushel:-

I. Secession was first inaugurated in South Carolina, directly after the popular choice of Presidential Electors early in November, 1860, whereby the accession of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidency was assured. The men who inaugurated it were all Democrats—that is, they had supported for President Van Buren in 1840, Polk in 1844, Cass in 1848, Pierce in 1852, Buchanan in 1856, and J. C. Breckinridge in 1860. There may have been one or two exceptions, but we know of none. There was certainly no Republican among them, whether in that or any other State. And whatever their impulse to secession, their pretext for it was the tri-numph of the Republicans in the choice of Mr.

II. Other States—at least ten of them—followed South Carolina in herso-called secession. Two or three more pretended or were claimed to have done so. In every instance this so-called to have done so. In every instance this so-called secession was substantially the act of the De normite party of those States respectively. That is to say, the great body of those who had previously "run" the Democratic machine were early and aident secessionists, while the mass of the opposite party was either adverse or lukewarm. Thus, every Democratic Governor of a State, those of Delaware and Kentucky excepted was at the head of the hunt for disunion; and of the exceptions, each openly contemned all forcible resistance to the movement.

III. The Federal Government was then wholly

in the hands of the Democratic party, save that the House of Representatives was tied—William Pennington (moderate Republican) having at length been chosen its Speaker by one majority. But in no single department did that Government oppose any earnest resistance to secession. President Buchanan, in his message of December 3, 1860, squarely proclaimed that Congress had no right to use force to prevent the with-drawal of a State from the Union, nor to compet her to yield obedience to its laws. To do this, he argued, would be to make war on a Nate, which Congress had no constitutional power to do. (See "American Conflict," Vol. I, p. 376.) This proclamation of national anarchy was backed by a formal opinion from his Democratic Attorney-General, Jeremiah S. Black, who was afterward his Secretary of State, who affirmed that the use of strength restrictions. she affirmed that the use of armed mee to enwho affirmed that the use of armed men to enforce the laws, in the existing state of things, would be "wholly illegal." He further urged that an attempt to make a seconded State fulfil her Federal obligations "would be, ipse facto, an expulsion of such State from the Union." (The very sophistry which we hear every day from the Demographs of 1867). from the Democrats of 1867.)

IV. During that memorable winter Demo-

cratic conventions were held in several Statesthat in this State (held in Tweddle Hall, Albany, January 31, 1861) being one of the ablest and strongest that was ever convened. But from none of these conventions, nor from the Democrats in Congress, nor from the thousand to fifteen hundred Democratic Journals pub-lished in the country, was a voice raised in deprecation of, or dissent from these disorga-nizing doctrines. On the contrary, they were generally re-echoed and almost universally ac-

quiesced in. V. Seven States having seceded before Mr. Buchanan's term expired, their Democratic members vacated their seats in Congress, with very rare exceptions. Of their few anti-Democratic members, nearly or quite every one re-

mained to the close. VI. Mr. Lancoln was inaugurated on the 4th of March, 1861; and his inaugural Address was mainly devoted to the inculcation of doctrines reparding secession and coercion the exact opposites of Messrs. Buchanan and Black's, Mr. Lincoln was well known to hold (as we did and do) the right of the people to modify or change their form of government as transcent scending all written constitutions or charters but he, with great clearness and cogency, yet in periect kindness, demonstrated that a President must, to the utmost limit of his abbity, cause the laws of the Union to be respected and obeyed in every State and Territory—that, should a collision of forces result, his position would be strictly defensive and conservative— that the consequent war would be made upon him, not by him. Never was a manifesto more firm and lucid; never was one less irritating. Either its doctrines were sound, or any State might at any time dissolve the Union. Yet, of the five hundred Democratic journals within our reach, we believe no single one approved and sustained the positions of Mr. Lincoln.

VII. Throughout that winter and the ensuing spring, all the organs of Democratic opinion within our observation reprobated Mr. Lincoln and the Republicans as disturbers and disunion ists, because of their intent to oppose force by orce, if that should become necessary to maintain the integrity and authority of the Union. We can recall no instance of Democratic repulse to those who were openly, ostenrationaly con-spiring and arming to resist the Union, which they proclaimed already dissolved.

VIII. A Confederacy of the second States having been formed, leading Northern and Western Democrats openly advocated the secession of their several States from the Union and their accession to the Southern Confederacy. 'It the Union is to be dissolved," said Judge George W. Woodward (Democratic candidate for Governor in 1863), "I want the line to run north of Pennsylvania," Ex-Governor Rodman M. Price, of New Jersey, wrote and printed a letter elaborately urging that New Jersey should forthwith unite her fortunes with those of the slaveholding Confederacy, (See it in "American Conflict," volume I, p. 430.) And ex-Governor Horatio Seymour, of this State, privately argued that New York should likewise unite with that Confederacy whose bead was Jederson Davis. It was held by leading Democrats that the Union might thus be reconstructed without bloodshed or convulsion—only New England, and perhaps two or three of the more fanatical States of the Northwest, being excluded therefrom, as unacceptable to our Southern brethren.

IX. Actual hostilities were commenced by the Rebels-not by firing on Fort Sumter, as is often asserted, and as Pollard now pretends, out months before, while Mr. Buchanau was yet President. They seized and appropriated the torts, arsenals, armories, ordnance, arms, munitions, custom-houses, post-offices, sub-treasuries, etc., throughout nearly half the Union, without a shadow of resistance—his Democratic Secre-taries of War and the Treasury being conspicuous, active disunionists, and he himself, with most of his counsellors, playthings in hands. Before Texas was out of the Union. according to Rebel computation, the bulk of our little army had been betrayed by its com-mander, General Twiggs, and surrendered to three Rebel Commissioners—Feb. 18, 1861—a fortnight before Mr. Buchanan went out of office. If ever a Government forbore till smitten on both cherks, and till tobacco juice had been spit into its eyes, that did the Federal Government before grappling with the slaveholders' Rebellion. And yet, from first to last, the Democratic journals and canvassers represented the war for the Union as waged by Mr. Lincoln and the Republicaus, and assumed that the Rebels were assailed and standing on the detensive! defensive!

X. Democratic protests and remonstrances, public and private, against the war as cruel, fratricidal, wicked, revolting, abborrent, etc. etc., were abundant throughout the struggle; not one of them, so far as we can recollect, addressed to the Rebel chiefs, but all assuming that Mr. Lincoln and the Republicans were waging hostilities needlessly, if not wantonly, and might have an honorable peace whenever they would. Thomas H. Seymour, of Connecti cut, was the author of one of the earliest of paralyzing missives; and he was nominated by acclamation by the Pemocrats of Con-necticut as their candidate for Governor in 1863. and his election enthusiastically supported by

the party.

XI. In this city, one of our Democrate journals, the Daily News, was an open, unqualified contemner of the war on our side and champion of the Rebellion, from first to last. It did its best to prevent enlistments in the Union armies, culogized the Rebel chiefs, and proclaimed that they could never be subdued; systematically magnified their successes and denied or belittled their reverses; and was well understood to be their stipendiary and tool. In full view of these facts, its editor was in 1862 made the regular Democratic candidate for Congress in one of our strong Democratic districts, running on the same ticket with Governor Seymour and re-ceiving nearly the full vote of his party; and he

has since been chosen by that party to a seat in our State Senate. our State Senate.

XII. As to the propositions, speeches, acts and votes of Vallandigham, Bayard, Bright, May, Josh. Allen, Jack Rogers, and other Democrats in Congress, including Benjamin G. Harris' vaunt that the Rebellion never could nor ought to be put down, we leave them to Mr. Ashley, or whoever shall see fit to answer Messrs. Winfield and Hunter, not according to their folly. Justa word, however, to the former their folly. Just a word, however, to the former their folly. Just's word, however, to the former of these gentlemen. One of the very foremost Democrats in his district is (or was) General Archibald C. Niven, who, very early in the war, wrote a letter to his nephew who meditated en-

listment to fight for the Union, urging him not listment to fight for the Union, urging him not to do so, and representing the war on our side as cruelly oppressive and unjust. That letter was published; and thereuvon General Niven was made the Democratic candidate for Senator (in Mr. Winfeld's precise district) and received the full Democratic vote, by which he was returned elected; but the Senato, on a contest, gave the seat to his kepublican competitor, Judge Low.

Jodge Low.

—We might multiply such facts to infinity; but need we? Suffice it that, as the result of a most arxious, intent contemplation of the history of our great struggle, we do most undoubtingly believe that the Democrate, as a party, were not at heart for the Union in its terrible struggle with sec-ssion—that they did not rejoice at its triumphs nor deplore its defeats. We do not say that a majority of them wished We do not say that a majority of them wished the Union permanently dissolved—we know, and have often stated, that they did not—but they believed that Union defeats and disasters would discredit and destroy the Republican ascendancy, and that they would thereupon come into power and coax the Rebels back into the Union by all manner of conces prostrations to the slave power. They had no notion that the Union could (or should) be saved otherwise than by letting the slaveholders have their way in it; and the road to this, they realized, lay not through Union victories, but

Firmly grounded in this conviction, are we at hiberty to proclaim it? Do we deserve to be knocked down and stamped on whenever we say what we believe? or only to be branded as liars? What say you, Messrs, Winfield and Hunter? Hunter?

Reconstruction Question in Congress. From the Times.

It is evident that the reconstruction question ts not making headway in Congress, Twothirds of the session are over, and the Constitutional amendment still stands the only authorized and tangible form of sectional adjustment. Denials of its sufficiency have been heard in both Houses, but in neither has a single step been taken in the direction of its repudiation. Mr. Sumner's resolutions explanatory of the principles which in his judgment should govern reconstruction, rest on the table of a Senate Committee. In the other branch an indepnite number of bills have been introduced. all pointing to reconstruction on a radical basis, but indicating by their differences the great diversity of opinion that prevails among those who deem the amendment too moderate for the occasion. Mr. Stevens, Mr. Ashley, and the authors of the half-dozen other reconstruction bills of which we have heard, agree simply is regard to the insufficiency of the amendment

The moment they attempt to embody their views in specific provisions, the contrariety of opinion touching the means to be employed becomes apparent. The least objectionable of all these measures—the bill to establish a loyal Government in North Carolina—introduced by Mr. Stevens at the instance of representative men from that State, has seemingly been dropped. At any rate, it has made no sign since the moment of its introduction, and its sponsor has evinced his dissatisfaction with its tempe rate provisions by devoting his energies to a general and more extreme measure. That he is not sanguine of its success, and that he realizes the difficulty of uniting the Republican party on any radical plan, may be interred from s remarks on Thursday last and again on

He feels that in the present temper and posttion of Congress, a scheme for territorializing the South is a foriorn hope, which he is hardly justified in prosecuting during the brief remain-der of the session. For the consideration of this or any similar bill, Mr. Asbiey calculates that but twenty working days are left; and as it is clear that only a part of these days could be devoted to the subject without neglecting much important work, we conclude that the adoption of any new plan of reconstruction, prior to the 4th of March, is virtually impossible.

The circumstance is not a cause of regret, still less of reproach. On the contrary, it is a source of satisfaction, since it indicates the unwillingness of the governing party to rush into extremes, and the unwillingness of its most radical members to receive the contract of the contra cal members to precipitate a rupture for the sake of testing their peculiar views. The party is in no haste to throw overboard the terms of restoration adopted last session; and Mr. Stevens and his friends are less disposed than then to The difficulties of the reconstruction question are more fully comprehended; obstacles are re-cognized that were before unbeeded; and the necessity is felt of so shaping legislative action that it shall command the support of the whole party. These are not signs of change or infirmity of purpose. They in no degree capty an abatement of the determination of Congress to clain the settlement of the question in its own ands, or a relinquishment of its resolve to exact efficient guarantees as conditions precedent of restoration. They merely show that the party which has power to set aside vetoes, and to carry into effect any policy it may enac, is conscious of its responsibility, and the wisdom of "making baste slowly" in the presence of

termidable difficulties.
For this besitancy and delay there is ample justification in the reception accorded to the amendment by the Legislatures of the governing States. The autumn elections were coutested and won on the merits of the amendment, as the groundwork or restoration; and already the Legislatures of eighteen States bave ratined it, in every case by large majori-ties. Pennsylvania, Nevada, and California will as surely ratify it before the session close : more than completing three-fourths of the States which now compose the Government of states which now con pose the Government of the Union. A pian which is thus indisputably indersed by the people whom the majority in Congress represent, cannot with propriety be superseded by other measures. In the majority of the States, ratification has taken place in full view of the rejection of the amendment by the South. All that Congress has been asked to consider as a reason for going further than the amendment, was known by the Northern the amendment, was known by the Northern Legislatures antecedent to railfication.

They have, however, in good faith given effect to the declared will of their constituents, and it is not probable that the Congressional majority will recede from the position, or advance beyond it, without a more satisfactory discussion of the general question than has yet been had. The provisions of the amendment commend themselves to the indement of the people—so much is certain. They may not cover the entire ground. An absolute guarantee against future attempts at secession, as Mr. Raymond has elsewhere suggested, may be desirable in addition. We think, too, that the country would accept the enforcement of colored suffrage as more than an equivalent for a large modification in the disqualifying clause in the amendment, and as infinitely preferable to any scheme of Rebel disfranchisement, as now in practice in Missouri and Tennessee. But to discard the amendment altogether, and to begin the reconstruction question de novo, according to the territorializing process of Mr. Ashley or Mr. Stevens, would not be justifiable in the present stage of the discussion.

the discussion.

It is hardly possible to do more this session than to consider the general aspects of the question, with the view of facilitating the labors of the next Congress. The month that remains might not suffice for the passage of any bill the details as well as the principles of which the details as well as the principles of which must necessarily be experimental; but it would admit of some definite understanding concerning the general principle of the reconstruction policy. If Congress intends to set aside the amendment because the South refuses compli-ance, it should so declare. It it is prepared, in certain contingencies, to discard the Southern certain contingencies, to discard the Southern State organizations, and to reconstruct on the territorial principle, it should proclaim its intention. Or if it hold that the amendment becomes a part of the Constitution when ratified by three fourths of the States now represented, it should put that interpretation upon record. The essential point to be gained is the adoption of some distinctly defined line of action, that the principles and purposes of the present Cor gress may be intelligible to its successor. The question of reconstruction will not thereby be settled. But the country will be

able to estimate the progress made, and the new Congress will enter upon a path comparatively

Especially is Congress bound to declare whe ther it will consider the ratification of the amendment by three tourins of the governing States all that is required to make it a part of the Constitution. Doubts and differences have arisen upon this head. Mr. Seward is consured for having submitted the amendment to thirtysix instead of twenty-six States, though he had no alternative in the absence of law to the contrary. It should now be stated, authoritatively, whether the amendment is a influre because rejected by the South, or whether it is to be effi-cacious despite the South. The Congress which ubmitted the amendment is the proper exponent of its will in regard to it; and until the point be determined, little will be gauged by the discussion of other measures. For on the de-cision must turn the question of adopting ulterior measures, or of accepting the satua-tion as qualified by the adoption of the amend-

ment.

Without venturing to decide the constitutionality of Mr. Bingham's view of the subject, we admit that it harmonizes with common sense, and with the unavowed but practically adopted theory of the dovernment during and since the Rebellion. The States which relinquished their share in the Government, and which are still excluded from it, can scarcely be said to participate in the sovereignty which is said to participate in the sovereignty which is implied in a change of the Constitution. They were not consulted in the framing of the amend-ment, and on that ground deny its constitutionality; and if their right to govern continues forieited or suspended, their right to say yea or nay to the amendment is at best questionable. The prima facie right belongs exclusively to the States which formed the Government during the Rebellion, which have enacted laws, and which dictate terms on which the excluded States shall resume their places in the Union. On this hypothesis three-fourths of the represented States may render the amendment valid, in perfect consistency with admitted facts. The parties who impugn the constitutionality of such a proceeding are most likely to be those who deny the constitutionality of all laws enacted during the exclusion of the South; and their opposition is not entitled to more respect in one case than in the other.

But, whatever it be, let Congress so declare its purpose that there shall be no room for further doubt. The present uncertainty is pregnant with mischief to all parties. The South obstinately refuses to act, trusting blindly to what the Executive and the Supreme Court may do in its behalf, the North, meanwhile, growing more radical and its interests more depressed. The Republican majority is strong enough for the emergency, and should be prac-tical enough to meet its urgent requirements.

The Hour Rule.

From the Independent. It may seem paradoxical to suggest that there s any deficiency in the amount of talk at Washington. And, perhaps, in the actual quantity of words and syllables there is no lack. But it is as certain as anything can be that the stream of talk is artificially and viciously forced into the wrong channels, and that what should be a fertilizing river, enriching even by its overflowing, has been cut up into sluggish ditches and pools, without beauty and of little use. Constitutional government is essentially a logooracy, or a government by speech, and the freest liberty of speech is essential to the proper workmg of such a government. It may appear strange to many unobservant persons to say that there is less freedom of speech in the House of Representatives than in any deliberative body in any country where there is any preterse of having any at all. We think that the Corps Legislate of France even is not an exception—at least since the gag has been mer-surably taken out of the months of the members. There is more real communication of thought and impulse from the French Tribune

than from the floor of the House. This state of things dates from about a quarter of a century back, when the Whigs came nungry into power after a long famine, and were afraid of losing some crumbs of the official board. To limit interraption from their adversaries they adopted the one hour rule, so as to apply the process of Procrustes to the mind, and reduce all utterances to precisely the same length. The consequence has been that there has been scarcely a readable speech made House since then-one that will make part of history. It was the application of the principle of the Trades' Union to debate; and, as the strikers demand that the clumsy artisan shall receive precisely the same wages as the skillful, so these statesmen ordained that the most powerful and fullest minds should have no more time to utter themselves than the dreatiest once that an intatuated constituency might be it to make their representative.

The consequence has been that there has been baroly such a thing as a debate proper in the House since the adoption of the rule, although momentous legislation in our history has been had since then. There has been a certain amount of talk, pro and con, but without the life and life-sustaining induced of a true behate. All of that has to be looked for in the senate, where fortunately the attempt to introduce the rule was not made-not for want of will, but because it was understood, if we re-member Mr. Benton's account of it, that it would be resisted unto blood. It has made the House the paradise of the mediocrities; but that is not the object for which the House was established by the people. That object was legislation, after full delibe-

ration and discussion—a condition which it is safe to say has never been fulfitled since the adoption of the rule. It is absuredly impossible for a man of abilities and cultivation, who has made the study of the subject a matter of debate which should qualify him to treat of it, to discuss any topic of great importance in an hour. What great speech in parliamentary annals, on either side the Atlantic, has been compressed into that space? Where would have been the same of Pitt, and Burke, and Sheridan, or Clay, and Randolph, and Webster, if they had made their great orations with the hammer of the Speaker hanging over their heads, ready to fall the moment the hands of the dial-plate showed that sixty minutes had gone? And where would have been the ed-ucating power which inhered in Congressional utterances of able men, on which side soever they spoke? All the stimulus to thought, all the direction of opinion that has come forth from Congress for the last quarter of a century, has proceeded from the Senate Chamber, and not the House. And for the sufficient reason that there is freedom of speech at one end of the Capitol, and not at the other. It may be well doubted whether anything has been gained even in the way of the suppression of bores, by this smothering of men who really had something to say.
In effect, the one hour rule has delivered over

the House to the dominion of the bores, instead or limiting them to their legitimate share of its time. Bores are essential concomitants of free discussion; but they are abundantly compensated for by the life and animation given to debate by able minds, and the benefits flowing therefrom. Compare the debates of even thirty years ago-not to say of fifty and sixty-with those of the last fifteen, when the crucial test has been applied to our institutions, and see the difference! The debates in the Senate dur-

The effect of this tyrannical limitation of dis-cussion, combined with the more tyrannical abuse of the previous question, has been to change the House from a true deliberative body to a mere large committee to accept the laws proposed to it by the sub-committees. The laws

previous question do not cut it utierly short; but it is curtailed of its fair proportions and its innate vigor by the constraint which these abuses put on the powerful minds, and the freedom which they give to the weak ones. Hence has come almost all the crude and discreditable legislation, which has to be done over again, or else remains an intestipe and cleaving mischief, it is truly astonishing that the hour rule and the previous question, as an instrument of almost daily use for the crushing of debate, should have been permitted to continue in force so long. It is only because no majority is wilo tong. It is only because no majority is willing to act as if it could become a minority gain, and give up its power of silencing and exerpowering its adversaries. No other coun ry, possessing a representative body, would offer it thus to put the gag into its own mouth, and to destroy the very reason of its existence.

The only reason why greater muchiefs than more hasty and foolish legislation have not come of it is, that free folscussion does exist outside the walls of the House, and makes melf felt through them. The Representative will do good service to his country who shall make it his business to make continual claim for freedom of speech in the House, and record a continual protest against its suppression, until the sense of the public shall be enough enlight-ened to demand that men whom it appoints for deliberation and discussion shall deliberate and discuss in public, and not increly register the have renounced their own inalienable rights of thought and its utterance.

FINANCIAL.

3-10s,

ALL SERIES

CONVERTED INTO

5-20s of 1865, January and July,

WITHOUT CHARGE.

BONDS DELIVERED IMMEDIATELY.

DE HAVEN&BROTHER. 10 2 YEAT NO. 40 SOUTH THIRD St.

WILLIAM PAINTER & CO. BANKERS.

No. 36 South THIRD St.

JULY, and AUGUST

7-30s

CONVERTED INTO FIVE-TWENTIES

And the Difference in Market Price Allowed. BONDS DELIVERED IMMEDIATELY, [12 26 3m]

Misselfooms, To Se. Sd St., (& Nassue St.

Philada. Mew Vork. Dealets in Il. S. Lecutities and Foteign Erchange, and membets of Freck and Gold Exchanges in with cities. Accounts of Banks and Bankets received on livetal

U.S. Bonds a Specialty.

DAVIES BROTHERS. No. 225 DOCK Street,

BANKERS AND BROKERS BUY AND BELL UNITED STATES BONDS, ALL ISSUES AUGUST, JUNE, and JULY 7 3-10 NOTES. COMPOUND INTEREST NOTES.

AUGUST -10 NOTES CONVERTED INTO NEW 5-20 BOADS. Mercantile Paper and Loans on Collaterals negotiated Brock Bought and Sold on Commission.

IRCULAR.

OF FICE LEHIGH VALLEY RAILROAD COMPANY,

NO. 412 WALNUT Street,

PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1867.

The Stockholders of this company are hereby notified that they are entitled to subscribe at par, for one share of new stock forteach live shares of stock standing in their respective names on the books of the Company on the first day of January, 1867, to be pany as follows:—Ten deliars per share at the time of subscribing—which must be on or before the fifteenth say of February next—and ten dollars per share on or before the fifteenth days of April, July, and October, 1867, and January, 1868.

Instalments will not be allowed interest nor dividend until converted into stock, which, when all the line alments are pad, may be done by presentation at this office on rud siter the fifteenth day of January, 1888.

Those btockholders who fail to subscribe within the time mentioned, or neglect to pay the several instalments at ar before the time they severally fail due, will lose their fight to the new stock.

Stockholders who have less than five shares or who have tractices of the shares, may, at the time of subscribing, pay for a proportional e part of a share, for which scrip will be issued; which scrip, after the fifteenth oay of January, 1868, may be converted into stock when pressured at this office in sums of fifty cellars; but the arrived in the stock when pressured at this office in sums of fifty cellars; but the arrived conversion into stock.

1 15tut1812t

Treasurer.

FIREAND BURGLAR PROOF SAFES EVANS & WATSON

MANUFACTURERS OF

FIRE AND BURGLAR-PROOF

SAFES. DESIGNED FOR

Bank, Mercantile, or Dwelling-House Use.

Established Over 25 Years. Over 24,000 Safes in Use. The only Safes with Inside Doors. Mover Lose their Fire-Proof Quality. Guaranteed free from Dampness. Sold at Prices Lower than other makers. WAREROOMS:

No. 811 CHESNUT Street, PHILADELPHIA. 9 5 59

WATCHES, JEWELRY ETC

LEWIS LADOMUS & CO HAMOND DEALERS & JEWELERS. WATCHES, JUNELAY A SILVER WATE. 802 Chestnut St., Phila-

CHRISTMAS MOLIDAY

BRIDAL PRESENTS. Have on hand a large and beautiful Watches. Jeweiry, and Silverware, suitable

n as Holiday and Bridal Presents Particular attention solicited to our large associment of Diamonds and Watches, Gold Chains tor lagles' and gentlemen's wear. Also, Sleeve Buttons, Studs, and beal Rings, in great variety, all of the newe styles.

FANCY SILVER-WARE,

ESPECIALLY SUITED FOR BRIDAL GIFTS.

We are daily receiving new goods, selected expressly for the holiday sales. Our prices will be jound as low, if not lower, than the same quality can be purchased classwhere. Furchasers invited to call. Diamends and all precious stones, the old Gold and Silver, purchased or taken in exchange. 5154p

WATCHES, JEWELRY, W. W. CASSIDY.

No. 12 SOUTH SECOND STREET Offers an entirely new and most carefully selected RAMERICAN AND GENEVA WATCHES,

JEWELRY. SILVERWARE, and FANCY ARTICLES OF EVERY

DESCRIPTION, suitable fo BRIDAL OR HOLIDAY PRESENTS. An examination will show my stock to be usu passed in quality and cheapness.

Particular attention paid to repairing.

BOWMAN & LEONARD.

MAMUFACTURERS OF WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DEALER

Silver and Silver-Plated Goods, No 704 ARCH STREET,

PHILADELPHIA. Those in want of SILVER or SILVER-PLATED Wash will find it much to their advantage to visit our STORE bears making their purchases. Our long experience in the menulacture of the above kinds of goods enables us to dely comperition. We keep no bods but those which are of the FIRST CLASS, all of Jur own make, and will be said at reduce prices.

(MUSICAL BOXES Large and small; sizes, playing from 2 to 12 atrs. [and costing from \$5 to \$300. Our assortment comprises suc

choice melodies as-"Home. Sweet Home "The Last Rose of Summer.

"Anid Lang Syne. '

'Star Spangled Banner." "My Old Kentucky Home," etc. etc., Besides beautiful selections from the various Operas. Imported direct, and for sale at moderate prices, by

FARR & BROTHER,

Importers o Watches etc., Il 11 mtbirp] No. 324 CHESNUT St., below Fourth.

SILVER-WARE

BRIDAL PRESENTS. G. RUSSELL & CO. No. 22 North SIXTH St.,

Invite attention to their Choice Stock of SOLID SILVER WARE, suitable for CHRISTMAS and BRIDAL PRESENTS.

HENRY HARPER, No. 520 ARCH Street,

Manuacturer and Dealer in

Watches, Fine Jewelry, Silver-Plated Ware,

Solid Silver-Ware.

CH JEWELRY. JOHN BRENNAN.

DEALER IN DIAMONDS, FINE WATCHES, JEWELRY. Etc. Etc. Etc.

13 S. EIGHTH ST., PHILADA. MEDICAL. DR. J. S. ROSE'S ALTERATIVE.
THE GHEAT BLOOD PURPIER
If you have corrupt, disordered, or vittated blood, you are sick all over. It may appear as pimples, sores, or as some active disease or it may only make you feel languid or depressed; but you cannot have good health if your blood is impure. Dr. Rose's Attentive removes all these impurities, and is the remody that will restore you to health.

It is unequalled for the cure of all diseases of the glands, scroinia, tubercular consumption, and all eraptions of the skin. Frice \$1. Sole agents,

No 232 North SECOND Street.

DR. DYOTT'S ITCH OINTMENT

DR. DYOTT'S ITCH OINTMENT
will cure every form or itch, and is superior to any other remedy for the cure of that disagrees ble and tormenting complaint. Price 25 cents. Sent per mail, 40 cents.

DYOTT & CO.,

No. 232 North SECOND Street.

DR. J. S. ROSE'S EXPECTORANT. For the cure of consumption, coughs, coids, asthma, catarrh, influenza, spitting of blood, bronchitis, and all diseases of the lungs.

This syrup having stood the test of many years' experience as a runedy for irritation or any inflammation of the lungs, throat, or bronchia, is sexulowiceged by all to be a remedy superior to any other known compound used for the relief and cure of coughs and consumption. Price \$1. Bole agents.

DYOTT & CO No. 232 North SECOND Street.

DIARIES. 1867. 1867.

50 Styles and Sizes, at Low Prices.

Visiting and Wedding Cards, the latest novelties. Initials, Monograms, etc., stamped on paper and envelopes, in colors, gratis. A large stock of English, French and American Pape

and Envelopes. BLANK BOOKS or the best anufacture, on hand and made to order.

R. HOSKINS & CO., Manufactulers of Black Books. Stationers, Engravers, and Printers,

No. 913 ARCH Street. V U NITED STATES REVENUE STAMPS.—
Principal J epot. No. 304 CHESNUT Street
Central Depot. No. 1638. FIF1H Street one door below
Chesnut Established 1862
Revenue Stamps of every description constantly on
hand in any amount hand in any amount
Orders by Mail or Express promptly attended to.