CLEARFIELD REPUBLICAN.

GEO. B. GOODLANDER, Proprietor. PRINCIPLES—NOT MEN. TERMS—$2 per annum, in Advance.

VOL. 39—WHOLE NO. 2054. CLEARFIELD, PA., THURSDAY, JAN. 23, 1868. NEW SERIES—VOL. 8, NO. 26.

Two Days' Rump Proceedings.

The enemies of the Union are just now concentrating their heaviest forces at the National Capital. The waves of revolution roll high, and must soon strike the shore and break. Either the Union or the Radical party must go under. The Disunion leaders are not satisfied with abrogating the Executive portion of the government, but another co-ordinate branch (the Supreme Court,) is just now receiving their particular attention. They have thrust ten States out of the Union, made the President a subject, and are now trying to shape the Supreme Court so as to be able to dictate its decisions, and make General Grant Dictator over this confused and disrupted Republic.

The following proceedings on reconstruction, niggers, &c., took place in the Rump House last week, and will furnish a key to the whole weeks' work:

The House being called to order by the Speaker, the first business in order was bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. Miller, of Pennsylvania, a bill requiring the concurrence of two-thirds of the Judges of the United States Supreme Court to declare a law of Congress unconstitutional. To the Judiciary Committee. Also, for the passage of a tariff law affording adequate protection to the industrial interests of the country. To the Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, a bill to promote agricultural industry in the States recently in rebellion, and to secure homesteads for niggers. To the Committee on Freedmen's Affairs.

Mr. Burr, of Illinois, one pledging protection to all citizens, native born or naturalized, in the enjoyment of all rights of citizenship under the Constitution and laws of the United States. To the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Bingham, of Ohio, one declaring the amendment to the Constitution of the United States, known as the fourteenth article, duly ratified. To the Judiciary Committee.

RECONSTRUCTION.

Mr. Bingham, of Ohio, offered a resolution that the rules be suspended, and that the Committee on Reconstruction be authorized to report immediately. Also, that the House will, to-morrow, proceed to the consideration of the report, and will, at the close of debate on Wednesday, proceed to vote on the same.

The question of suspending the rules was taken by yeas and nays, and resulted—yeas 114, nays 44. The rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. Bingham thereupon reported a bill, additional and supplementary to the act to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States, passed March 2, 1867, and to the acts supplementary thereto, and it was read twice and recommitted.

Mr. Bingham at the same time informed the House that he would not insist on the last clause of the resolution, but would let the debate continue on Wednesday and the next day, if the House desired it. He merely wished to have it made the special order from day to day until disposed of.

Mr. Loan submitted an amendment, which was ordered to be printed. The bill as reported differs somewhat in the first section from the bill as printed in the newspapers. It reads as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That in Virginia, North Carolina and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Florida, and Arkansas, there are no civil governments republican in form, and that the so-called civil governments in said States respectively shall not be recognized as valid or legal State governments, either by the Executive or Judicial power, or authority of the United States.

Mr. Wilson, of Iowa, rose to make a report from the Judiciary Committee, but Mr. Robinson rising to a parliamentary question, asked the Speaker whether the adoption of the resolution altered the rules without notice to that effect?

The Speaker replied that it suspended all rules that stood in the way of its execution.

THE SUPREME COURT.

Mr. Wilson, of Iowa, asked leave to report back from the Judiciary Committee, with an amendment, by way of an additional section, the Senate bill declaring what shall constitute a quorum of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Ross objected, and Mr. Wilson moved to suspend the rules, stating that he did not propose to call up the bill for action for a week, or until the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Williams,) who had first introduced the subject in the House, was present.

The House refused to suspend the rules—yeas, 72; nays, 88.

Mr. Wilson said he interpreted the vote as an expression of the will of the House to have the bill acted upon immediately, and he would therefore modify his motion and move to suspend the rules to allow him to report back the bill for immediate consideration, and that when the House shall order the main question the vote shall be taken without dilatory motions. The question was taken by yeas and nays, and resulted, yeas 115, nays —. So the rules were suspended, and

Mr. Wilson, of Iowa, from the Judiciary Committee, reported back the Senate bill declaring what shall constitute a quorum of the Supreme Court, with an amendment.

The bill declares that any number of the Justices of the Supreme Court not less than five, being in majority thereof, shall constitute a quorum. The amendment declares that no case pending before the Supreme Court involving the action or effect of any law of the United States shall be decided adversely to the validity of such law without the concurrence of two-thirds of all the members of the Court.

Mr. Williams, of Pa., offered an amendment requiring the decision of the Court in such cases to be unanimous. He explained and advocated his amendment.

Mr. Pruyn, of New York, declared that on his return to the House, after a few weeks' absence, it actually seemed to him to-day as if the country was in the midst of a revolution.

The House had before it to-day a proposition of a most extraordinary character. It was proposed by one act to strip ten States of the little authority left to them; to deprive the Executive of its power, and now it was proposed by this act virtually to rob the Court in rendering this decision of Congress, which should be the highest court of the nation, and in which there were over a hundred and sixty lawyers.

Mr. Marshall declared that of all the revolutionary measures brought before the last and present Congress, tending to subvert and destroy the institutions of the country, this was one of the very gravest. It was not only striking a blow at, but subverting one of the co-ordinate branches of the government. It had been a theory of the government that it was a government of checks and balances, and that there was no arbitrary power that could put its foot upon the people and upon other co-ordinate branches of the government.

It was the assertion of an absolutism which the people would repudiate, unless they were willing to be deprived of their liberties, and to have the institutions of their fathers trampled under foot. A more enormous proposition had never been brought before any deliberative body. The very bringing forward of such a measure was a plea of guilty on the part of the majority in Congress, and a confession that its acts were unconstitutional, and that, therefore, they were unwilling to have them brought before the great judicial tribunal of the country. There was no power under the Federal Constitution to pass such a law. It was a most palpable and manifest usurpation, and it was not safe for any party to come forward to trample in the dust that great tribunal, which had established such a reputation under the lead of the great men who had presided in that body.

There was a reverence for that tribunal, for its justice, its learning, its conservatism, its ability, its adherence to the great principles of the government, which would not permit any Congress to trample on and crush it out of existence for partisan purposes. He appealed to gentlemen not to attempt to place their unhallowed feet on the Supreme Court, an institution which was deemed so important for the preservation of the checks and balances of the government, and so absolutely necessary for the protection of the rights of citizens. If this law was passed there would not be one of the guards of the Constitution worth one cent to the citizen.

Mr. Bingham, of Ohio, desired to know whether the gentleman from Illinois was not aware of the fact that the bill reported from the Judiciary Committee proposed no more than was required by the original judiciary act of 1789, under the administration of Washington?

Mr. Marshall was not aware of the fact and desired Mr. Bingham to read the section of the law that he referred to.

Mr. Bingham read from the Judiciary act of 1789 the section declaring that the Supreme Court of the United States shall consist of a Chief Justice, and four Associate Justice, and four of whom shall constitute a quorum.

He argued that when all the members were present it would require four to concur in a decision, which would be two-thirds.

Mr. Marshall declared that he had great respect for the abilities of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, but the claim he had now put forward was one of the most palpable and shameful dodges ever attempted to be imposed upon the House. He was astonished that that gentleman should attempt to palm off the idea that there was any analogy between the act of 1789 and the measure before the House.

Mr. Spalding, of Ohio, supported the bill as reported from the Judiciary Committee. If he were qualified to hold a seat on the bench of the Supreme Court, and if he had that honor, nothing would gratify him more than the passage by Congress of this measure. He did not believe that one judge of that high tribunal would object to it. It relieved the Court of very great responsibility, and it made the decision more satisfactory to those whom the decision affected. He objected, however, to the amendment requiring that each justice should assent to the decision.

Mr. Wilson, of Iowa, moved to add to the amendment reported from the committee a proviso that, if any circuit or district court of the United States should adjudge any act of Congress to be unconstitutional or invalid, the judgment, before any further proceeding were had upon it, shall certified up to the Supreme Court of the United States, and shall be considered therein, and if on consideration thereof two-thirds of the members of the Supreme Court shall not affirm the judgment below, the same shall be declared and held reversed.

Mr. Bingham said he would have preferred the discussion to have been carried on in a spirit different from the partisan spirit exhibited by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Marshall.] That gentleman should not have assumed for himself and the party he represented that they were the only guardians of the Constitution and the people's rights, nor did he recognize the title by which that gentleman assumed to pronounce judgment upon the majority in Congress in the name of all the people of the United States.

It would be a sad day for American institutions, and for the sacred cause, of republican government, if any tribunal in this land, created by the will of the people, was above and superior to the people's power. That Court, he repeated, had disgraced not only itself as a tribunal of justice, but it had disgraced humanity when it dared to mouth from its high seat of justice the horrible blasphemy that there were human beings, either in this land or in any land, whose rights white men were not bound to respect.

Mr. Marshall reminded the gentleman that the Supreme Court had never said such a thing.

Mr. Pruyn, of New York, also desired to make a remark in that connection.

Mr. Bingham, not yielding the floor, said he understood very well the point which gentleman would make. He did not say that the Court held that doctrine. He had only said that it mouthed that horrid blasphemy. He knew that it was no decision.

Mr. Robinson, rising to a question of order, made the point that it was not in order for the gentleman from Ohio to make such a charge against a co-ordinate branch of the government.

The Speaker overruled the point of order holding that he could not declare out of order an attack on another department of the government when made in parliamentary language.

Mr. Robinson, of New York, made the further point of order, that gentleman standing around Mr. Bingham should be made to take their seats.

The Speaker sustained that point of order and requested the gentlemen to resume their seats.

Mr. Bingham went on to say that from that decision of the Supreme Court of the United States an appeal had been taken to the public opinion of the country.

It would not do for any men who ever read the Constitution of this country, to rise in his place here and say that the Congress of the United States could not reduce that tribunal to a single person, or to three persons. If the number of judges was fixed at three, of whom two would be a majority, would it not require these two to concur in any decision? What objection was there to this law? The gentleman from Illinois would have to find some other objection than his *adcaptadum* statement that it was a violation of the Constitution, when he had called that gentleman's attention to the fact that in the First Congress the Judiciary law of '89 was passed, under which no judgement could be pronounced upon any question whatever without the occurrence of two-thirds.

Mr. Marshall, of Illinois, inquired whether the Court had not been so organized that it required the same number of Judges to declare a law valid.

Mr. Bingham admitted that it did.

Mr. Marshall held therefore that there was no analogy between the two cases?

Mr. Wilson, of Iowa, moved the previous question, stating that he would not do so except for the order of the House making a special order for to morrow of the bill reported from the Reconstruction Committee.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered.

Mr. Wilson, of Iowa, being entitled to an hour to close the debate, yielded twenty minutes of his time to

Mr. Woodward, of Pennsylvania, who declared himself opposed to both the bills of the Reconstruction Committee and that of the Judiciary Committee, because he believed them to be unconstitutional. Congress had no more right to dicate to the Supreme Court how it should decide questions, than the Supreme Court had to dictate to Congress. The Supreme Court was a co-ordinate branch of the government, and its decisions were to be made under the the principles of the common law by a simple majority.

Mr. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, inquired whether it was not within the power of Congress to change the common law by a statute law?

Mr. Woodward admitted that it was if the matter were one with which the legislative power had any thing to do. Another objection to the bill was that it would be found impractible in operation.

Mr. Hubbard, of Connecticut, having had five minutes' time allowed him by Mr. Wilson, opposed the bill, declaring that it was a usurpation on the part of Congress. Unless the three co-ordinate branches of the government could be held together the Constitution of the country would no longer exist. The Supreme Court was not the creature of Congress, but was created by the same power that had created Congress. Both came from one parent, and when one child sought to slay the other it was guilty of the same crime of which Cain was guilty in the older world. He denied that Congress had any more right to pass this law than it had to declare that the verdict of a jury should not be unanimous.

It was perfectly well known that this law was intended to reach a particular case, and the House was called upon to vote on it in hot, indecent, indecorous haste. It was urged because there was a rumor that a large majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court were adverse to a particular measure on which Congress seemed determined to hang its political life, it was, therefore, proposed to muzzle the Supreme Court.

Mr. Wilson, of Iowa, closed the debate. He believed that the first section of the bill had not been challenged by any gentleman who had addressed the House. That being so, the whole principle of the bill was yielded.

Mr. Wilson, of Iowa, after replying to some interpellations by Mr. Mungen and other members, declared that instead of this being a radical measure it was a conservitive measure.

Mr. Williams remarked that that was the reason why he was opposed to it.

Mr. Wilson said that Congress in this bill was simply declaring that the Supreme Court should not have legislative power without the occurrence of at lest two-thirds of its members.

The House then proceeded to vote on the bill and pending amendments.

Mr Ross moved that the House adjourn.

The Speaker declined to entertain the motion on the ground that the House was acting under an order made on the suspension of the rules that the vote should be taken without any dilatory motions.

Mr. Robinson appealed from the decision of the Chair.

The question was taken by yeas and nays, and the decision of the Chair was sustained—yeas 126, nays 25.

Mr. Eldridge moved to lay the bill and amendments on the table. Negatived—yeas 38, nays 118.

The question was taken on Mr. Williams amendment requiring the unanimous decision of all the judges, and it was rejected—yeas 25, nays 124.

Mr. Wilson's amendment, adding a proviso to the amendment reported from the Judiciary Committee, was adopted—yeas 111, nays 37, and the amendent as amended was agreed to —yeas 116, nays 39.

Mr. Wilson moved to amend the bill by adding to its words, "and requiring a concurrence of two-thirds of the members of the Court to declare a law of the United States invalid."

Mr. Williams, of Pennsylvania, suggested instead of that to make the amendment read," "and to regulate the jurisdiction thereof."

Mr. Wilson accepted the suggestion, and the title was so smended.

Mr. Garfield, of Ohio, moved to suspend the rules that he might introduce a bill to reduce and improve the military establishment by the discharge of one major-general, the one who was last commisioned in that grade before the 1st of January, 1868, (General Hancock.)

After a very decided indication on the part of Messrs. Brooks, Randall and others that a resort to fillibustering would be had to prevent the bill passing, Mr. Garfield withdrew the motion, giving notice that he would renew it next Monday, and, at half-past six o'clock, the House adjourned.

The next day the House resumed the consideration of the Reconstruction bill.

Mr. Wood, who was entitled to the floor, yielded a few minutes to Mr. Nicholson, who expressed briefly his condemnation of the proposed measure.

Mr. Wood then addressed the House in opposition to the bill. In his judgment the present moment was a crisis of the country. It required very little more to involve the country in national disaster and annihilation. Since last Monday what had the country seen? An attempt to lay sacrilegious hands on the Supreme Court of the United States. That Judiciary department had hitherto remained free from political mutations. By a little further advance in carrying out the principles of the Judicial bill, Congress might declare that the Supreme Court could not decide against any act of Congress. There had been three other propositions made, all of which were calculated to alarm the people. The first was a proposition to degrade one of the most illustrious officers of the army.

Mr. Spalding made a point of order that the gentleman should confine himself to the subject under discussion The House had passed the Judiciary bill, and the bill in reference to General Hancock was not up.

The Speaker *pro tem.*, Mr Garfield, overruled the point.

Mr. Wood proceeded, and enumerated as number three the unprecedented and remarkable transaction which occurred in the executive department In that connection he said that, without the consent of the President, and in violation of an implied pledge on the part of the incumbent in the War Office, Mr. Stanton had been thrust back by the Senate in the position from which he had been displaced. The fourth measure was the bill now under discussion—a bill without a title, a child without a name, and probably without a father; a monstrosity; a measure the most infamous of the many infamous acts of this infamous Congress.

Mr. Bingham made a question of order on the last expression of Mr. Wood.

The Speaker required the words to be taken down.

The expression was written out by the *Globe* reporter, and read from the Clerk's desk.

The words having been read, Mr. Ross suggested jocularly that Mr. Wood use the words "so-called." [Loud laughter.]

The Speaker ruled that the expression excepted to was out of order, and had read by the Clerk the 61st rule of the House, to the effect that if when a member is called to order, the decision be in his favor, he shall be at liberty to proceed; if otherwise, he shall not be permitted to proceed, in case any member object to his doing so, without leave of the House. The Speaker added that the gentleman from New York had a right to proceed if no member objected.

Mr. Bingham—I object to his proceeding at all unless he takes back these words and makes an apology.

[Many members on the Republican side—"That is right."]

The Speaker again informed Mr. Wood that if he desired to explain, he had the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Wood rose and said, Mr. Speaker, I have no explanation to give.

The Speaker—then the gentleman can only proceed with his remarks by the consent of the House.

The Speaker put the question whether the gentleman from New York (Mr. Wood,) should be allowed to proceed, there was an and emphatic no

Mr. Eldridge called for the ayes and nays. The question was taken, and resulted: Ayes 39, nays 108, so Mr. Wood was not allowed to proceed.

Mr. Dawes moved the following resolution:

Resolved, That Fernando Wood, a member of this House from the State of New York, having this day used in debate upon the floor of this House the following words; "A monstrosity; a measure the most infamous of the many infamous acts of this infamous Congress;" deserves therefor the censure of this House, and the Speaker is hereby directed forthwith to pronounce that at the bar of the House.

Mr. Eldridge moved to lay the resolution on the table. Negatived.

The previous question was then seconded, and the House proceeded to vote by yeas and nays on the adoption of the resolution. The vote resulted —yeas 114, nays 38; a strict party vote, so the resolution was adopted and the Speaker, in accordance with it, proceeded to administer a censure.

Mr. Ross inquired whether Mr. Wood, having paid this penalty, was entitled to the balance of his hour.

The Speaker replied that the House had decided otherwise.

Mr. Wood said he would like the House to permit him to finish his remarks. [Derisive laughter from the Republican side.]

The Speaker said it could only be done by a reconsideration of the vote to let the gentleman proceed.

Mr. Wood said: *Sir, I shall finish them before the country.*

Mr. Boyer moved unanimous consent for Mr. Wood to print his remarks, which met with unanimous objection from the Republican side.

Mr. Beck, one of the minority members of the Reconstruction Committee argued against the bill, and read an extract from the argument of Mr. Bingham before the Assassination Military Commission to prove some inconsistency between it and his present position.

Mr. Bingham declared that the language imputed to him was not in the argument in the connection which the gentlemen from Kentucky was using it.

Mr. Beck—I say it is in the speech.

Mr. Wood made a point of order that Mr. Bingham had used unparliamentary language, and charged the gentleman from Kentucky with falsehood.

The Chair, Mr. Hulburd, of New York, overruled the point.

Mr. Beck remarked that he should have answered in very different language if such a charge had been matle.

Mr. Farnsworth spoke in support of the bill, contending that the provision of the Constitution placing the executive power in the hands of the President simply meant that he should exercise that power under the regulations and restrictions of the legislative department of the government.

The gentleman from New York [Wood] had spoken to-day of an onslaught on a gallant officer who had and has some respect for civil powers, if reports from that District are true. He knew very well the reason why that gallant officer had commended himself so greatly to respect of those gentlemen. It was for the same reason that the gallant Phil. Sheridan had secured their condemnation. Sheridan was the ideal of the loyal and negroes of Louisiana and Texas. Hancock, he regretted to say, was the ideal of the disloyal, the rebel, the traitor, the enemy of the Government in that Department, and whoever commended himself to the affections of the rebel element commended himself equally to the affection of their rebel brethern on this floor.

Mr. Mungen, rising to a question of order, objected to the words "Rebel brethern on this floor."

The Speaker decided that those words were not proper to be used in reference to members of the House.

Mr. Mungen remarked that he wanted this thing understood, for he had had enough of it.

The Speaker stated that the words had been decided out of order.

Mr. Mungen required the words to be written down by the reporter and read from the clerk's desk.

That having been done, the Speaker repeated his decision that it was not proper to allude to members of the House as rebels. The gentle from Illinois would proceed in order, unless some member objected.

Mr. Mungen objected, stating that he desired to offer a resolution of censure.

Mr. Farnsworth desired to make an explanation.

Mr. Mungen did not want to accept any explanation [Laughter.]

The Speaker put the qustion whether the gentleman from Illinois should be permitted to explain, and it was decided in the affirmative.

Mr. Farnsworth said: I did not intend to make any personal application of these words. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I am very sorry that the gentlemen should have applied them to themselves. I will withdraw their personal application by leaving out the words "on this floor."

Mr. Ross remarked that if his colleague intended them for the Republican side of the House there was no objection to his doing so. [Laughter.]

Mr. Boutwell moved that Mr. Farnsworth have liberty to conclude his remarks in order.

Mr. Mungen declared that in his opinion the apology was worse than the insult. He added that he had done more to put down the rebellion than the gentleman from Illinois had ever done.

The question on Mr. Boutwell's motion was agreed to.

Mr. Mungen, as a question of privilege offered a resolution that the gentleman from Illinois [Farnsworth] be reprimanded by the Speaker for using the words that had been excepted to.

Mr. Wood expressed the hope that he should enjoy the sole honor of censure, and that the gentleman from Illinois should escape.

Mr. Dawes moved to lay the resolution on the table. The motion was agreed to without division, only two members sustaining the demand for the yeas and nays.

Mr. Farnsworth, resumed the floor, said; In addition to what I have said in relation to the officer in command in New Orleans, I wish to say this much. I have based the remarks I have made in reference to him on information in my possession, on letters and other facts that have come to my attention. I am sorry to believe any of the reports. I wish to say that having always regarded him as a gallant officer and personal friend, it surprised me perhaps as much as any other gentleman in Washington when I read his orders, and when I received by letters and newspapers reports and accounts of the joy with which he had, as is alledged, filled the hearts of the rebels in his Department. I wish to say further that after that gentleman had been ordered to relieve Sheridan at New Orleans, (and this is what makes the whole thing a matter of more surprise to me,) I met him in Washington on his way South. Speak-to him, as I know him well, for I fought by his side in the field, I said: "Well, General, you are going to New Orleans, are you?" "Yes," said he, "and some people have got an idea that because I am sent there to relieve Sheridan, I am a copperhead; but they will find themselves greatly mistaken. I have fought the rebels too long in the field to be their tool now," or words to that effect. I had a right, therefore, to be surprised when I read the first order which he issued, and still more when I read the second.

Mr. Randall—I ask the gentleman from Illinois whether that was not a private conversation, and whether he is justified on this or any other occasion to bring before the public a private conversation?

Mr. Farnsworth—I did not regard it as a private conversation. There were one or two gentlemen standing by at the time. I did not regard it so at that time, for I repeated it two days afterwards in a public meeting in the gentleman's own city of Philadelphia.

Mr. Randall—I do not think myself that the General is a Copperhead, but I object to the use the gentleman makes of a private conversation, I do not gainsay him, but that Gen. Hancock is not a Copperhead.

Mr. Getz—May I ask the gentleman from Illinois whether he thinks Gen. Hancock had proved himself a Copperhead from the simple fact that he has proclaimed that civil law shall be supreme in his Department?

Mr. Farnsworth—If it is true that he has filled the hearts of the rebels in his Department with joy, and that they hail him with cheers whenever he appears at the theatre or in public, while he has filled the hearts of loyal men and freedmen with mourning, I leave it to the gentleman himself to judge whether he is a Copperhead or not.

Mr. Getz—If I knew what the word "Copperhead" meant, I might answer the question.

Mr. Farnsworth—The order of Gen. Hancock with reference to the civil authorities filled me with very great surprise and alarm. It is certainly surprising that a subordinate officer, sent to command a district, should set at defiance an act of Congress under which he went there, and set above it this law of a bogus Government, which that act of Congress had declared illegal. The civil law which it is his duty to recognize, is the act of Congress under which he went there. In addition to what I have already stated, Gen. Hancock said to me, "I am going to New Orleans to execute the laws of Congress."

Mr. Eldridge—Has he not done so.

Mr. Farnsworth—He certainly has not done so, if the reports are true, and if the answers to the petitions for his intercession that are made to him between rebels and loyal men; and to save loyal men from the oppression of rebels, by referring them to the juries and sheriffs and constables and rebel magistrates there, I think he is not executing the laws of Congress by any manner of means, for the law of Congress makes it his duty not only to keep the peace, but to see that every man there has equal justice without reference to color. We know very well that no loyal man or freedman can get justice in these States.

Mr. Paine obtained the floor, but yielded to a motion for adjournment.

Mr. Butler gave notice of an amendment authorizing the several Constitutional State Conventions in the late insurrectionary States to appoint all civil officers heretofore provided by the laws of such States, making it the duty of the several district commanders to conform such appointments, and install such persons in office, and providing that such State Governments shall continue in office until the States are admitted into the Union or other State officers are appointed and qualified.

Mr. O'Neill offered a resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to communicate the report of the commission for examining into life-saving apparatus, which held sittings in New York in 1867. Adopted.

The Speaker presented a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, with the draft of a bill to authorize the coinage of five cent nickel pieces in New Orleans. Referred to the Committee on Coinage. Adjourned.

The Clearfield Republican.

Terms of Subscription.

If paid in advance, or within three months ... $2 00
If paid after three and before six months ... 2 50
If paid after the expiration of six months ... 3 00

Rates of Advertising.

Transient advertisements, per square of 10 lines or less, 3 times or less ... $1 50
For each subsequent insertion ... 50
Administrators' and Executors' notices ... 2 50
Auditors' notices ... 2 50
Cautions and Estrays ... 1 50
Dissolution notices ... 2 50
Local notices, per line ... 15
Obituary notices, over five lines, per line ... 10
Professional Cards, 1 year ... 5 00

YEARLY ADVERTISEMENTS.

1 square	$5 00	1 column	$25 00
2 squares	8 00	1 column	40 00
3 squares	9 00	1 column	75 00

Job Work.

BLANKS.

Single quire	$2 50	6 quires, per quire	$1 25
3 quires, per quire	2 00	Over 6, per quire	1 50

BANDBILLS.

½ sheet, 25 or less	$1 50	¼ sheet, 25 or less	$1 50
½ sheet, 25 or less	2 50	1 sheet, 25 or less	3 00

Over 25 of each of above at proportionate rates.

GEO. B. GOODLANDER,
Editor and Proprietor.