

### The Adoption of the Constitutional Amendment.

To the Editors of the New York Evening Post:

As a faithful reader of the Evening Post for many years, I have perused your article insisting that all present effort for guarantees of national security and national faith must be postponed in order to obtain the ratification of the Constitutional Amendment, by which slavery is abolished throughout the United States. If the Constitutional Amendment were not already ratified by the requisite number of States, I should doubt if even this most desirable object could be a sufficient excuse for leaving national freedom and the national creditor exposed to peril, when our exertions now can save them. But, allow me to inquire if you do not forget that, according to the usage of the National Government, in analogous cases, this Amendment has been already ratified by the requisite number of States, so that at this moment, it is valid, to all intents and purposes, as a part of the Constitution? There was a butcher once who looked everywhere for his knife, forgetting that he held it then between his teeth. There also was Southey, good "Doctor," who was in love without knowing it, and you have laughed, I assure, at the story to, illustrate this condition, where traveler, asking how far it was to a place called "The Pan," was answered, "You are in the Pan now." It seems to me that, like the traveler, the doctor, and the butcher, you already have what you desire; so that even according to your programme, the way is clear for insisting upon those other things embraced under "Security for the Future."

The Constitution of the United States decides that "the Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem necessary, shall propose amendments to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes of part of this Constitution, which ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States."—On these words the simple question arises:—What constitutes the quorum.

But the usage of the National Government in analogous cases has determined that the quorum is founded on the States actually participating in the Government. This has been decided in both houses of Congress. The House of Representatives led the way in fixing its quorum according to actual representation, or, in other words, at a majority of the members elected and qualified. The Senate, after careful consideration and protracted debate, followed in establishing a similar rule. The Constitutional amendment was originally adopted by both houses organized according to this rule. The national debt has been sanctioned by both houses thus organized. Treaties also with foreign powers have been sanctioned in the Senate thus organized.

Applying this rule, the quorum of States requisite for the ratification of the Constitutional Amendment is plainly three-fourths of the States actually participating in the Government, or in other words, three-fourths of the States having "Legislatures." It may be still a State; but it cannot be practically counted in the organization of Congress; and I submit that the same rule must prevail in the ratification of the Constitutional Amendment. The reason of the rule is the same in each case. If you insist upon counting a rebel State having no "Legislature" you make a concession to rebellion. You concede to a mutinous State the power to arrest, it may be, the organization of Congress, or, it may be, amendments to the Constitution important to the general welfare. This is not reasonable. Therefore, on grounds of reason as well as usage, I prefer the accepted rule.

If this conclusion needed any support in authority, it would find in the declared opinion of one of our best law writers, who is cited with respect in all the courts of the country. I refer to Mr. Bishop, who, in the third edition of his Commentaries on the Original Law (vol. 1, p. 276), published within a few days, discusses this question at length. In the course of his remarks he uses the following language: "If the matter were one relating to any other subject than slavery, no legal person would ever doubt that, when there are States with Legislatures and States without Legislatures, and the Constitution submits a question to the determination of Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, she meaning is three-fourths of the States who have Legislatures. In fact, it does not require either legal wisdom or legal acumen to see this, provided we look at the point disconnected from the peculiar subject of slavery." The learned author then proceeds to illustrate this statement in a manner to which I can see no answer.

To my mind all this seems so plain that I am disposed to ask pardon for arguing it. Of course there is no question whether a State is in the Union or out of the Union. It is enough that it is without a "legislature," and on this point there can be no question. Being without a legislature it cannot be counted in determining the quorum.

Therefore unless I greatly err, the Constitutional Amendment has been already ratified by the requisite number of States; so that slavery is now abolished in name—first, by the proclamation of President Lincoln; and secondly, by Constitutional Amendment. It remains that we should provide supplementary safeguards, and complete the good work that has been begun, by taking care that slavery is abolished in fact as well as in name, and that the freedmen are protected by irrevocable guarantees. Without this further provision, I see small prospect of that peace and reconciliation which is the object so near our hearts.

I am, sir, your obdt servt,  
CHARLES SUMNER.  
Boston, 28th Sept., 1865.

Solemn masses are said in the principle churches of Madrid, to implore deliverance from the visitation of cholera.

It is said that Wilkie Collins is almost as great an opium eater as DeQuincy was.

There is only one mail contract said a young lady, that she would care about embracing or embarking in, and that is a promise of marriage.

### Thanksgiving Day in Pennsylvania.

The following is Governor CURTIS'S proclamation, setting apart a day for thanksgiving:

Pennsylvania, S. S.—In the name and by the authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Andrew G. Curtis, Governor of the said Commonwealth.

#### PROCLAMATION.

With feelings of the most profound gratitude to Almighty God, I invite the good people of the Commonwealth to meet in their places of public worship, on Thursday, the 7th day of December next, and raise their hearts and voices in praise and thanksgiving to him, not only for the manifold ordinary blessings which during the past year He has continued to heap upon us, for abundant and gathered harvests, for thriving industry, for general health, for domestic good order and government, but also most expressly and fervently for His unequalled goodness in having so strengthened and guided our people during the last four years that they have been enabled to crush to earth the late wicked rebellion and to exterminate the system of human slavery which caused it.

As we wrestled in prayer with Him in the dark time of our trouble—when our brothers and sons were staking life and limb for us on many a bloody field, or suffering by torture and famine in the Hells of Andersonville or the Libby—so now when our supplications have been so marvellously and graciously answered, let us not withhold from Him the homage of our thanksgiving. Let us say to all, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve, but as for us and our house we will serve the Lord."

Come then ye people whom He hath so helped and led—come ye war-worn and mutilated men whom He hath spared to return to your dear homes—let us through the gates of His temples—let us throw ourselves on the knees of our hearts with awful joy at the foot of His throne, and render aloud our praise and thanksgiving to Him, because He hath made the Right to prevail—because He hath given us the victory—because He hath cleansed our land from the stain of slavery—and because He hath graciously shown forth in the eyes of all men the great truth that no Government is so strong as a Republic, controlled, under His guidance, by an educated, moral and religious people.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State at Harrisburg, this 7th L. S. day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, and of the Commonwealth the nineteenth.

By the Governor, ED. SLEEFER,  
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

### Why not Support the Democratic Ticket.

The Evening Post—long a most ardent efficient champion of the Democratic party—gives the following excellent reasons for opposing its success at this election:

"It is not yet sufficiently clear of the point to command an implicit confidence. It still permits such speakers as Montgomery Blair, James W. Gerard and Horatio Seymour to entertain its audiences. Its newspaper organs are still filled with the old virus of pro-slaveryism. Forgetting few of their old prejudices, they learn little from the progress of events.

"It is very certain that the greater number of those who are opposed to the reconstruction of the nation on the only secure basis of freedom and popular rights, will do their best to elect the 'Democratic' ticket. It is quite certain that all those who used to be opposed to 'secession,' who said that if it were attempted 'the fighting would be north of Mason and Dixon's line,' who insisted all through the war either that the slaveholders could not be or ought not to be conquered; who called our gallant volunteers 'Lincoln's Hessians' and the 'minions of despotism,' who denounced the late martyred President as a usurper and a tyrant, and opposed nearly every act of his to put down the pro-slavery revolt; who characterized the present Chief Magistrate as a 'boor,' a 'low clown,' a 'drunken tailor'—the synonym of 'Caligula's horse,' who in solemn convention proclaimed the war a 'failure,' and asked for 'immediate efforts for a cessation of hostilities,' who supported Vallandigham, the author of the bill to divide the Union into four parts, as a leader; who belong to the Knights of the Golden Circle, a secret organization in the interests of Secession, who hailed the infamous riot in this city as an uprising of the people, or who took an active part in it—in short, all who were openly or secretly opposed to the assertion of our National integrity, will vote for the ticket called 'Democratic.' Others better than these—men who are not yet able to rise above their party ties, will also vote for it; all parties have their good men. But to counteract these, to prevent the success of a bad or doubtful element, let the Union ticket be upheld."

### The Naked Truth.

The Florida Times, issued at Jacksonville, with reference to the conflict of assertions respecting free negro labor, has the following transcript from its experience:

"We daily come in contact with representatives of the two classes, and it is instructive to listen to their expressions and contrasting their experience. One comes in from driving his 'niggers,' and with despairing, haggard, vexed countenance, declares, 'the use—d niggers wont work, and there is no in trying them—I pay fifteen dollars per month, and rations more than they can consume, and one of them wont do as much work as two slave—they wont work—we can raise no cotton by free labor.' Another planter replies, 'I have no difficulty—I work fifty hands, pay them ten dollars per month, and two of them do more work than three slaves? It is the way you treat them. I find no difficulty.'"

"An intelligent slaveholder, a gentleman of cultivation and liberal views, met a large planter foaming, fretting, cursing, despairing—the country was ruined, no more cotton could be raised, 'niggers' wouldn't work, his plantation was valueless. &c., &c. 'What will you take for your plantation?' asked the gentleman,

after vain attempts to induce him to reason. 'Twelve thousand dollars,' said the planter. 'I'll take it.' The property was transferred and the new proprietor immediately placed it in charge of the negroes, the former slaves of the old proprietor, who, to the number of 90, entered into contract to cultivate the farm upon shares—they receiving one-third the crop. They assure the new proprietor that they will 200 acres more cotton than ever before.

"If all our people would accept the results of the war, and gracefully conform to the requisitions of necessity, yielding all theories and prejudices and obedience to their interests and the common good, there would be a measure of prosperity and advancement in the State that would astound its most sanguine and hopeful friends."

### The Orphan's Homestead.

The late struggle for the life of the Republic is succeeded by many new and onerous duties. Of these, one of the imperative is our care for those over whose prospects orphanage has brought desolation and gloom. We know that many thousands of the children of our gallant dead are now looking to the humane people of the country for that support which their fallen fathers would have given them. In behalf of these orphaned little ones thus left upon the country's care, an Association, represented by the undersigned, has been organized to raise a fund to found an Asylum in a central locality. The Institution is designed to be erected, as far as practicable, by the Sabbath-schools of the land—a national memorial of our perpetrated Union.

As a means of interesting the schools therein, they are furnished with photographic copies of the historic picture recently grasped in the hands of the dead soldier of Gettysburg (Sergeant Hunnicutt), together with copies of the beautiful song composed upon the touching incident—"The Children of the Battlefield." Schools taking "shares" in the Homestead will receive, if desired, the value of their contributions in copies of these affecting relics of the war.

It is proposed that each Sabbath-school contributing to the fund twenty-five dollars, shall be said to hold one share in the House, and shall be entitled to name one orphan for admission into it; as also to have one vote in selecting the spot where the Institution shall stand—whether on Cemetery Hill, at Gettysburg, or near Valley Forge, of Revolutionary renown.

Our Sabbath-schools are nurseries of patriotism, as well as of piety. It is earnestly hoped that superintendents will promptly second this appeal in behalf of the soldier's orphan, and as early as practicable have their schools to co-operate in our interesting, patriotic and humane enterprise.

But we must appeal also to the general public to aid in our undertaking. Having already an available fund of twenty-two thousand dollars (\$22,000), we propose at once to receive orphans under the care of the Association, in a temporary way in the city, until the fund may warrant the choice of the country site and the permanent erection of the Homestead.

JAMES POLLOCK, President.  
P. B. SIMONS, Treasurer.  
J. FRANCIS BURNS, M. D., Sec.  
No 330 Walnut street, Philadelphia.  
October 21, 1865.

Grand Jurors, Dec. Term, 1865  
E. Maunhoff, Esq., Saxonburg; John Millford, Allegheny; John Adams, Slipperyrock; Henry Carrhan, Brady; David Millinger, Oakland; Andrew Stoughton, Concord; Henry Ekas, Clinton; Wm Cross, Worth; Henry Albert, Centre; John Bolinger, Cherry; Robert Bartley, Jefferson; Wm Kennedy, Penn; William Hay, Middlesex; Robert Gilbraith, Buffalo; Samuel Parks, Adams; John Wimer, Muddyrock; Jonathan Andra, Fairview; Philip Vogel, Butler; Wm. Smith, Winfield; Jefferson Allen, Clay; John Berg, Sr., Bro. Butler; Thos. Mahood, Washington; Jacob Dumbaugh, Cranberry; Hugh Smith, Connoquessing.

TRAVERSE JURORS—FIRST WEEK.  
Wm. Speer, Adams; Samuel M'Kamey, Allegheny; Thos. D. Bryan, Brady; Wm. H. Carson, Buffalo; David Borland, Butler; Jacob Ziegler, Centre; John Wilson, Clay; Wilson Thompson, Cherry; Owen M'Brice, Clearfield; John Glasgow, Clinton; Nelson Sutton, Concord; Moses Freeman, Cranberry; Wm. Allen, Connoquessing; Samuel Thornburg, Donegal; George Thorn, Fairview; Wm. Albert, Franklin; Samuel C. Douthett, Forward; Thos. Wilson, Esq., Jackson; John Dougherty, Jefferson; Casler Ullman, Lancaster; Samuel McConnell, Marion; Jas. Buchanan, Mercer; John Law, Middlesex; Thos. M'Collough, Muddyrock; Jno. H. Millinger, Oakland; Jacob Fetter, Penn; Wm. Say, Parker; H. H. Vincent, Slipperyrock; Henry Dougan, Summit; George McLaughlin, Venango; Isaiah N. Meals, Washington; H. H. Bicket, Winfield; John Craig, West; Geo. Weckbar, Bro. Butler; Samuel Morrison, Centreville; Chas. Hoffman, Saxonburg; Ernesnt Bentel, Zelienople; A. J. Evans, Forward.

TRAVERSE JURORS—SECOND WEEK.  
Francis Covert, Harmony; Wm. Morrison, Harrisville; Jacob Rosebaugh, Prospect; Ebenezer Graham, Millertown; Saml. Breuneman, Portersville; Andrew C. Stewart, Adams; Geo. M'Lehland, Allegheny; Jas. C. Carnahan, Brady; Thos. W. Killot, Buffalo; Jacob Boos, Butler; Michael Thompson, Centre; Jos. Thorn, Clay; Sam'l P. Hays, Middlesex; Pat'r McLaughlin, Clearfield; John Jones, Clinton; Wm. Starr, Concord; Jas. Covert, Cranberry; Alex. Walling, Connoqu; Conrad Wick, Donegal; Wm. Rodgers, Fairview; Sam'l Anderson, Franklin; John S. Dambert, Forward; John Waitase, Jackson; Daniel Duffy, Jefferson; Jacob Wise, Lansaster; Dominic McLaughlin, Slipperyrock; John Febay, Muddyrock; John McElwee, Oakland; R. M. Douthett, Penn; Thos. A. Shryock, Parker; Robert H. Weakly, Slipperyrock; Isaac Double, Worth; John McKain, Venango; Wm. Rumbaugh, Washington; Sam'l Snyder, Winfield; Jas. A. Balph, Bro. Butler.

### The American Citizen.



THOMAS ROBINSON, - - Editor.  
M. W. SPEAR, Publisher.  
BUTLER PA.  
WEDNESDAY NOV. 15, 1865.

Reconstruction.  
In the Herald of last week is an article on this subject which, although containing some truths, is upon the whole, so illogical in itself and displays such a want of consistency in the Herald, that we deem it worth a passing notice. The very first sentence, although technically true, is intended to convey a falsehood. In it we are told that "Individuals in certain States South, rebelled against the constituted authorities of the United States." This is intended to convey the idea that the States did not revolt. Again we are told, that "the punishment of a State, because its citizens rebelled, is an absurdity." Now what are we to understand by a State? Certainly it don't mean simply the territory of which it is composed. The territory, or physical geographical boundaries composing a State had its existence long before the State had its existence. The organization of a State is a political act, and is always consummated by act of Congress. Now the question is, has the Rebel States revolted against the Government of the United States or has "individuals" only rebelled? The former, we think is the correct view. The latter, we think is the correct view. The winter of '60 and '61 found all the States occupying their "proper relations to the Federal Government." Their Governors, their Legislatures, and their members of Congress, had all been elected under the laws and constitutional guarantees of the United States. They did not revolt in an irregular way as "individuals," but they used the already existing machinery of the State Government to effect their disloyal purpose. They pass their ordinance of secession, by their State Legislature—their Governor signs the ordinance. Their members of Congress are requested to withdraw from Washington and repair to Montgomery. And all this is done not by "individuals" only, but by States in their sovereign capacity. Now, was not this conduct on the part of these States sufficient to justify the Government of the United States in treating them as Rebel States, at least after their adhering to their treason so long? But says the Herald, "The ordinance of secession, and, in short, every act done under rebel authority was a nullity." Why then is it not treated as a nullity? Why is it that the several loyal legislatures of these States deem it necessary to repeal it,—thus treating it as a valid enactment, subject to modification or repeal just as other valid enactments? Why is it necessary to bring so much "pressure and persuasion" to bear, in order to have the rebel debt repudiated? If all their enactments are a usurpation, all this pressure to undo what has been done, is unnecessary. The question, in that view of the case would properly belong to the Courts. But again, our neighbor inclines strongly to the opinion that these States by their treason, have forfeited their political rights as States. Congress first extended to them the great boon—their political character. They used it to overthrow the author of their being—in so doing they forfeited all their rights, not only political but civil; and can in the future only enjoy such as a conqueror pleases to give. During the last four years, we have heard a great deal about the tyrannical exercise of power, on the part of the President of the United States. But that was when President Lincoln was using the powers vested in him by the Constitution, for the suppression of the rebellion and the destruction of its authors. Of course, it was natural that Northern Democrats should howl; the more so that they could not bite. But as soon as they begin to believe that President Johnson intends standing between those rebel States and justice (we cannot believe it yet) they pounce forward and, patting him on the back shout, "bravo! bravo!" We have yet to believe that the President feels much flattered by their caresses. But if their theory is right now, it was right last year. Tennessee, Louisiana and Arkansas were all reconstructed. They got up an electoral ticket, and were, in the exercise of their sovereign rights, going into a political canvass, when the Democracy opened their Presidential campaign. What position did our neighbor, in common with his party then hold? For what reason did they refuse to allow delegates from the reconstructed States, to occupy seats in their national convention? For what did they adjourn that convention to meet at the call of the Chairman, any time between the time of its adjournment

and the fourth of March following? We hope our neighbor will answer these important questions. But we are now told that to admit that a State is out of the Union, is to admit the right of secession, and that to admit that, is to admit "that this war was waged for conquest and power, and not for the preservation of the Union." This refined logic, we deem of a kind with a case supposed. Suppose an individual guilty of some heinous crime is lodged in jail, privately armed by the assistance of friends, he overcomes the jailor and makes his escape. The jailor is given, and pursuit is made, for the escaped culprit. At this stage of the case, a "limb of the law," more profound than the most of his fellows, informs the pursuers that it is not best for them to charge that he had "escaped," because that to admit the fact of his escape was to admit also that he had a "right" to escape; whereupon it was decided to abandon the original charge of his escape, and to allege that he "sustained an improper relation" to the jail! What a sublime distinction, especially when it is likely to prove a shield to those who, by their repeated acts of treason, have forfeited all their rights under the Constitution, except the right to be hung. While we have thus intimated our views of the situation, we are not at all prejudiced against others; nor are we well persuaded that President Johnson is wedded to any particular policy. He has told us that he is experimenting upon the Southern States. He still holds military control, and can by a single order revoke all that he has done, in case he thinks it best to do so. What view he takes of the result of the recent elections we are not advised. Should he so far forget his duty to the Constitution, to his country and to his race, as to betray them all, he can only in that case, cover his own head with infamy, but cannot hinder the march of progress of the eventful period in which he lives. The right and the power of impeachment lies in the peoples' representatives. But we have little fears of the future, The President! must be a much weaker man than we give him credit for, if he joins his fortunes with a party that can't bring to his support, a single State in the Union. Let us wait and see.

Victory! Victory!!  
The last hopes of the Democracy have gone for ever. It was thought by some that the burthens itailed by the war, would naturally, enough produce a disunion in the people, the more so, that these burthens, as well as all matters calculated to stir up a want of confidence, on the part of the people in their rulers, would be pressed upon them by a set of hungry office-seekers and rebel sympathizers. These considerations had led some to suppose that under this state of things some of the fall elections might be carried by the Democracy. They, too, in a last effort to break the "Union line," had determined, at the sacrifice of consistency and honor, to throw away not only their principles, but their own men; (in both of which they knew the people had no confidence.) In New York for instance, they put upon their ticket one of the present Republican officers, Placing Gen. Slocum, a successful Republican General, at the head of their ticket.—This was a strange movement on the part of a party led by such men as the Woods, Seymours, &c. The mark and file of the party understood it, however, to be a "military necessity," and so submitted quietly, feeling that if they could, even in this way, break the back-bone of the Republican party, they could afterwards come in for a share of the spoils themselves. The Republicans boldly took issue with them on their loyalty, charging them with having conspired with the British Minister in the interest of the rebel cause—with having been against the Government, during the pendency of the great civil strife so gloriously terminated—charged them with being unsafe receptacles of the peoples' power, and unfit to be intrusted with the care of the interests and destiny of a great nation.

The result of the issue thus made up was looked for with great interest, and is now before us in the decided majority of 25,000 for the Republican ticket—carrying both branches of the State Legislature. Thus ends one of the most interesting campaigns witnessed for some time.

The decision of the Empire State, therefore, is that the men who stood true to the Constitution and the Union in the days of darkness and peril, are the safest to intrust its interests to in times of peace as also that the Van Burens, the Woods and the Seymours, have been tried and found wanting. Henceforth, those Conservative statesmen are laid on a shelf, to be kept there as a relic of a selfish race, now no more to disturb the wholesome progress of the nineteenth century.

But great as is the joy felt in the success of the Republicans in New York, the result in New Jersey, is still more so. Two years ago the Democratic ticket was elected by 14,000 majority; that is about equal to a majority of 50,000 in Pennsylvania. Last year, M'Clellan carried it by 7,000 over Lincoln. The Democrats being in a majority in her Legislature, the Constitutional Amendment, abolishing

slavery throughout the United States, was defeated last winter by a strict party vote. This was therefore made an issue this fall. With what great joy then, will the friends of freedom learn that New Jersey, too, has gone for the Constitution, the Union and "impartial freedom to all." Yes, New Jersey is now redeemed, electing a Republican Governor by 2,500 majority—with one of a majority in the Senate and a handsome majority in the house. One of her first acts, therefore, will be to adopt the Constitutional Amendment, thus placing herself squarely in the "Union column." Elections were held, on the same day, in Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Missouri, Maryland and Michigan, all of which went as usual, Republican New Jersey was the last; the only foothold of Democracy on free soil, and that foothold is now gone forever. Nor do they appear to share a better fate in the South. Their favorite candidate for Governor of South Carolina, Gen. Hampton, is defeated, although first accounts were different. The only spot to which they can now turn with a ray of hope is Louisiana. The Democracy of that State—mainly returned rebel officers and soldiers—are organizing with a view to gain power. They have nominated Ex-Gov. Allen, who was Governor when the State seceded. He is now in Mexico, and, it is said, holds an official position under the Government of Maximilian. But it is said by his friends, that this don't disqualify him from acting as Governor of a reconstructed State.—Should these Radical Democrats succeed in gaining power in the South, we may look for a great exodus of Northern politicians of the Copperhead persuasion, to that section, if that would fail, they will be likely to follow the example of Gov. Allen, and seek the favor of the Imperial Government of Mexico. If they should be unwilling to meet their fate in this way, it will then be a question for the loyal millions to decide whether Montgomery Blair's "deportation" policy would not be advisable, applied to a few of their leaders at least.

The Duty of Congress.  
Never did Congress meet under graver responsibilities than will the present Congress meet on the fourth of next month. Some were of opinion that Congress, representing as it does, the whole people should have been convened immediately upon the inauguration of President Johnson. We were not of that number. We thought it best that the country, being still under martial law, the Executive should be allowed to try the temper of the late rebels in as liberal a policy as he found safe to pursue. In this way the country, and Congress, are enabled to see exactly how much loyalty still remains; and can therefore act the more wisely when they come to act upon the subject. In our judgement our late State convention was justified in resolving that the Southern people had not manifested a disposition to accept in a proper spirit, the liberal terms of reconstruction offered them by the government. All right minded men appear to agree that the reconstruction of the Southern States should be of such a character as to secure peace and unity to the country at large, and justice to all its citizens. The Democratic principle was intended to be the corner stone of our political edifice. Webster defines a Democrat to be "one who adheres to a Government by the people or favors the extension of the right of suffrage to all classes of men." Now many of our wisest statesmen believe that this principle should be liberally applied in the Southern country. They believe that the elective franchise should be extended to all loyal citizens of that section, without reference to birthplace or color, who are of sufficient intelligence to vote. Some, however, object to this, alleging that this is a "whiteman's country," although President Johnson says it is a country "belonging to all. One of two things we are in favor of,—either the elective franchise should be extended to all loyal citizens of sufficient intelligence, or else we should have the constitution so amended as to fix the ratio of representation on the popular vote and not on this number of inhabitants. As the matter now stands the Late Slave States have about 18 votes in Congress on their slave population. Those slaves are now free. And, unless a change is made in the meantime, they would have that representation increased 16, being a total representation of 34 members on the late slaves. Now if this representation is to be sent into Congress to kill the votes of 34 representatives of Northern freemen, the people thus represented, should have the choosing of their own representatives. At any rate those persons lately in rebellion should not have the electing of those members who are admitted to represent the laboring classes of the South. In our opinion Congress should in no way recognize the reconstructed states until this question is finally settled. Should it be settled in favor of universal suffrage, there need be no danger apprehended in reference to that section of its return to barbarism or secession. But should this question be determined in the negative then, we take it to be the duty of Congress to hold these States as they are, until it has passed a constitutional amendment providing that in the future the actual vote of a State shall be

made its basis for representation in Congress, and in the electoral college. Simple justice demands this at the hands of the present Congress. Such an amendment could be put through Congress in twenty-four hours and could pass the legislature of every loyal State within a few weeks—including Kentucky and Missouri. We trust that Congress will at once take hold of this matter and settle it in such a way that if in the future, rebel Generals and politicians are allowed to return to the halls of Congress, they will be allowed only to represent their loyal followers, and not perpetrate a great wrong, in addition, by misrepresenting the loyal millions of a country they strove in vain to destroy.

Organization of Congress.  
As the time for the organization of the 38th Congress is at hand, and as there is an effort being made to force in full delegations from the late Rebel States, people naturally enough begin to enquire, how does Congress stand politically?—Can the united voice of the South, strengthened by the Democratic members from the loyal States, control the body?

To ally all apprehension we would inform our readers that the Senate will stand 38 Unionists to 11 opposition.—Supposing it possible to admit the whole Southern delegation, 22, and add to it the 11, and we have 33; leaving us five of a Republican majority. The House will stand as follows:

Union, Dem.	Union, Dem.	Union, Dem.
Maine	Kentucky	Union, Dem.
New Hampshire	Ohio	17
Massachusetts	Indiana	8
Rhode Island	Illinois	11
Connecticut	Michigan	6
Vermont	Wisconsin	6
New York	Minnesota	2
New Jersey	Iowa	6
Pennsylvania	Missouri	6
Delaware	California	3
Maryland	Nebraska	3
West Virginia	Oregon	1
Kansas	1	1

Unionists, 143; Democrats, 41.  
The whole delegation from the late Rebel States, if admitted, would only amount to 58. This added to the Democratic strength from the North, would only make 99, leaving us a clear majority of 44. From this examination it will be seen that we have little to fear, even from this coalition. But these delegations are not yet admitted to the floor of Congress, nor are they likely to be soon. Hon. J. S. Foster, of Connecticut, will call the Senate to order, as President, and J. W. Foye, of New York, will act as Secretary, while the Clerk of the last House, Mr. M'Pherson, of this State, will call the House to order and preside over it till properly organized by the election of a Speaker, which, in all probability, will be Hon. S. Colfax, of Indiana, Speaker of the last House.

List of Causes.  
Trial List for December Term, 1865.  
FIRST WEEK.  
Ann Cappellet vs Wm. Adams,  
Wm. Story vs Wm. Adams,  
Nancy Carnahan vs George M'Callister,  
Mrs. Susan C. Sullivan vs Jacob Slungert,  
John Gallaher vs Dr. S. S. Christy,  
Philip Storrier vs Jacob Long, et al.,  
Neal M'Cool vs Patrick Bergan.

SECOND WEEK.  
G. W. Crozier, Adm'r of Dr. James Graham, dec'd, vs Jacob Ziegler,  
Mordcaim Johns vs R. H. Slater,  
G. H. Puffer vs Ziegler, Faler & Co.,  
Wm. Stewart vs Robert Allen,  
Wm. Leithold by his father and next friend, G. E. Leithold vs Christian Bauman,  
Christopher Rasmann vs Andrew Hecker,  
Robert Smith vs Andrew Addleman et al.  
David Emery vs Jesse Joseph, Esq.,  
Robert Bowers Esq'r of Wm. M'Guk deceased vs Margaret T. Guk et al.,  
Mary Turk vs Joseph M'Clain,  
James B. Matthews, Adm'r vs J. N. Matthews,  
Commonwealth Ex'r Rel Overseers of Jackson tp vs Keeling,  
Eleanor Hines vs Jacob Wimer, jr., et al.  
Wm. Dunn for use vs A. Blakely,  
WAL STOPS, Prob'ly;  
Prothonotary's Office, Nov. 8, 1865.

MARRIED.  
On the 5th inst., by Rev. C. A. Linnberg, at the residence of Mr. Christian Siefert, Mr. Robert Bernhard Canham of Pittsburgh, to Miss Mary Elizabeth Greenwald, of Butler tp, Butler Co., Pa.  
On the 6th Oct. 1865, by Rev. Wm. H. Jamieson, at the residence of the bride's father, Miss Sarah A. Ramsey, of Butler tp, to Mr. George Brannaman, of Gettysburg, both of Butler county, Pa.  
On the 7th inst., at the residence of the officiating minister, Wm. H. Jamieson, Esq., of Gettysburg, to Miss Kate W. Wolf, both of Harmony, Butler Co., Pa.  
On the 7th inst., at the residence of the bride's parents, by Rev. Wm. H. Jamieson, to Miss Caroline W. Hamilton to Miss Caroline Roberts, all of Butler Co., Pa.

DIED.  
September 25th, 1865, Alexander Hamilton Maxwell, son of Newton and Priscilla Maxwell, aged six years and two months.  
"Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

LOST!  
THE undersigned will liberally reward any person who will give him such information as will enable him to find a FUR-TRUNK, which he lost between Butler and Michael Nigger's Hotel, on the Prospect road, on Saturday last, containing three \$100 Government Bonds. Such information can be communicated to E. M'Junkin, Esq., or the Postoffice, if found, can be left with him.  
November 15, 1865.  
THOMAS CHRISTY, T. D.

Stray Mare.  
CAME to the residence of Adam Shirs, Washington, Pa., on the 24th day of October, A. D. 1865, one fine brown GRAY MARE, supposed to be fifteen or sixteen years old. She had round, about 16 hands high, thin ribs. The owner is requested to come forward, prove property, pay charges, otherwise she will be disposed of according to law.  
Nov. 15, '65.  
THOS. T. CHRISTY, T. D.

Vendue.  
THESE will be exposed to sale at public outcry, at the house of the undersigned, in Jefferson township, Butler county, Pa., on  
Tuesday, November 28th, 1865,  
the following property, viz: One span of horses, one span of mules, two 6-year old colts, harness, five long stumps, household and kitchen furniture and other articles too numerous to mention.  
Sale to commence at 10 o'clock A. M. Conditions made known on day of sale. Jefferson township, Nov. 15, 1865.  
HASLUS BERNINGER

To the Soldiers of 1861-62  
A MEMORIAL in Congress for the equalizing of army and navy bounty has been left at the Prothonotary's Office in the Court House for signatures of all soldiers of 1861-62. Call and sign immediately.  
W. STOPS,  
O. A. CRYSTO BALZ,  
W. P. ROGEE.