

THE NEW YORK PRESS.

EDITORIAL OPINIONS OF THE LEADING JOURNALISTS UPON CURRENT TOPICS—COMPILED EVERY DAY FOR THE EVENING TELEGRAPH.

Retaliation in Mexico.

From the Tribune. We published in yesterday's Tribune a card from Mr. O'Sullivan to Senator Sumner, so the condition of affairs in Mexico. Mr. O'Sullivan visited Mexico in 1864, was courteously received by Maximilian, succeeded in obtaining from him certain valuable grants and the object of his mission; and he very naturally and properly expresses his favorable opinion of the Austrian Prince. We will take Mr. O'Sullivan's word for it that Maximilian is a polite and cultivated gentleman. So were Bulwer's highwaymen, of the "Paul Clifford" school. But that did not make their calling lawful; and it is with the calling of the would-be Emperor of Mexico that we have to do, and not with his personal character.

What brought him there? The Emperor of the French, as early as July, 1862, wrote officially to General Forey, informing him why he wished "to found a regular government in Mexico." It was not to recover a paltry debt of a few millions; no one believes that; it was, as with wonderful candor he avowed, "to restore to the Latin race on the other side of the Atlantic all its strength and prestige." He explained to the Minister of State that it was not for the interest of France that the United States "should take possession of the whole Gulf of Mexico and be the sole dispensers of the produce of the New World." To carry out these ideas was Maximilian's calling in Mexico. What were the Mexican people about when Louis Napoleon, in violation of solemn treaties, broke in on their domestic tranquillity? They had just got rid of the overshadowing temporal power of unscrupulous churchmen; they had a rebellion; they had elected the Chief Magistrate of their choice. Everything looked well. Our Minister, Gen. Forey, wrote to Mr. Seward:—"The present Government, so far from being in danger of falling, at this time is, in my judgment, stronger than at any former period of its existence." It showed its strength. It was a year and a half after the invaders landed before they reached the city of Mexico. It was a raid on a large scale. The troops were too numerous, and the leader who sent them to too high rank, to be called buccaners. In May, 1863, General Forey issued a decree ordering confiscation of the real and personal property of all "citizens of the republic who bear arms against the present Government, or who are in the regular army or in bands of guerrillas;" and this was strictly carried out. During the same month Forey issued a military order reciting that a French Zouave had been killed in Tlalpala, a village within sight of the city of Mexico, upon what provocation is not stated; and commanding, first, that a fine of \$6000 be levied on the inhabitants; second, that a number of Liberals be imprisoned as hostages, who, if another murder occur, "shall respond for it with their heads;" third, declaring "if that is not sufficient the village will be destroyed." But this was before Maximilian arrived. He has been but a little more than a year in Mexico when, in October, 1865, he published a formal decree, signed by himself and his Cabinet. Articles 1 and 2 provide that all persons found in arms against the Empire, "whether they proclaim or not any political principles, and whatever their number, organization, or character," shall, within twenty-four hours after their capture, be tried summarily by court martial by the officer who captured them, and, "if found guilty, if even only of the fact of belonging to the band, shall suffer death by firing squad." And Article 15 prohibits any request for pardon being made. Then there is another article providing that any person who shall supply the Liberals with money or other means, or "put within their reach subsistence," shall suffer death as in Article 1 provided. Were these mere paper mannaes? Far from it. Mr. Seward, under date November 28, 1865, wrote to our Minister in Paris, that of the prisoners taken by the Imperial forces under General Mendez at Santa Anna Amatlan, there were 2000 men, 1000 of whom were Salazar, Colonels Diaz, Caracho, Villanueva, Perez Milena, and Villano, five lieutenants, eight commanders, and a number of subordinate officers, all of the regular army of Mexico. This was one of many cases. There is additional proof that these decrees were not issued against thieves and robbers; for a separate Article (12) treats specially of them, providing that "thieves shall be tried and sentenced in conformity with Article 1, no matter what the nature and circumstances of the theft." A man driven to despair by hunger may steal twenty-five cents' worth of bread; he is to be summarily tried by court-martial, and put to death in twenty-four hours!

All this is official—of record. We could fill a dozen columns with stories of outrages said to have been committed by the invaders; stated as circumstantially as Mr. O'Sullivan's complaints of Liberal cruelty. But we doubt their accuracy. Such pictures are usually overdrawn—always, when vindictive feelings exist in the minds of the narrators. Of what were not Northern troops and Northern Generals accused by the Confederates? It was not Beauregard alone who talked of "beauty and booty." No crime so infamous but was committed by the hated Yankees. Do we say all this to excuse the cruelties which seem to have been recently exercised against Imperial prisoners? By no means. There is no excuse for cold-blooded murder; none, in our view of it, even when it takes the respectable name of capital punishment. If the Mexican Liberals desire to win the respect of civilized nations, they must learn that to imitate wrongdoing is to be oneself a wrong-doer. But we say it to show how terrible the provocation under which these Liberal leaders have sinned. How should we feel if foreign troops were to overrun and desolate our country, and then to condemn every patriot taken in arms in her defense to a felon's death? How did the Rebels feel when they considered their country invaded and pillaged by what they called Lincoln's Hessians? Is it certain that atrocities worse than any which come reported to us from Mexico were not perpetrated in the South on captured Union soldiers by the hundred? We believe there is good evidence that there were. Let us not act as Pharisee, thanking God that we are not as other men, or even as these Mexicans. Counsel we believe they need; let it be temperately given. We have already intervened to save Maximilian from the fate to which his unholiness doomed thousands of men, for no other crime than that of defending their native country. That is well enough. "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth" is Jewish doctrine, not Christian.

But as for further intervention in Mexican affairs, we have small faith either in its justice

or its efficacy. The symptoms of the case do not seem to us to warrant Mr. O'Sullivan's prescription of twenty thousand United States troops, headed by Banks and Sherman. Men, to attain permanent freedom, must themselves work it out. Reforms forced upon a nation by outside pressure are evanescent, and have no hardihood or growth. Let us give the Mexicans a fair chance. Let us wait and see whether, when the first heat of the blood subsides, they do not correct the errors they are now committing; and let us not officiously number them with help till we are quite sure they need it.

The London Conference—Its Probable Doings and Results.

From the Herald. The truth seems at last to have been arrived at. Our cable news has made it clear that the Conference has been agreed to, and it has at the same time explained how a certain doubtful telegram originated. In closing the North German Parliament, King William very prudently refrained from making any allusion to the Luxembourg question. The omission was not only rashly interpreted, but rashly telegraphed without the attendant circumstances. A later despatch confirmed the accuracy of the intelligence, which we had previously acted. The announcement of Mr. Stanley in the British House of Commons warrants us now to look at the Conference as a coming fact, and to speculate on its probable doings and results.

Ostensibly the deliberations of the Plenipotentiaries are to be limited to the one question of Luxembourg. What will satisfy France? what will satisfy Prussia? and how are the territory and fortress of Luxembourg to be finally disposed of? These are the questions which the Conference is to be called upon to decide. It is manifest at a glance, however, that these questions open up a wide field over which discussion will freely range. It will be impossible to lay down rules which will prevent the different members of the Conference in the interests of the different Governments which they represent from looking beyond the confines of a mere border Duchy, and touching on certain events which have recently transpired, and on certain other events, which, if not forcibly checked, are sure to transpire in the early future. It is well to limit the programme, but directly members proceed to business the programme will be found to have enlarged itself, and to have opened up a conceivable field for discussion in the reasons why she desired to annex Luxembourg to the Empire, will be silent either in regard to the increase of territory and power which Prussia has made during the last year, or to the various means by which that increase has been secured? Is it conceivable, on the other hand, that Prussia, in defending the course she has taken, will have nothing to say, not only about the rights of the German people, but about the unification of Italy and the annexation of Nice? Is it impossible that the question of Rhine boundaries will be revived by Napoleon, and perhaps even prosecuted with greater success than ever? In view of the complete unification of Germany, will Austria be able to preserve silence in regard to the future of her German provinces? Will no voice be raised in defense of the rights of the Danish population of Northern Schleswig? And are we justified in inferring that the treaty of Prague will be allowed to pass, in all its entirety, unquestioned? The possibilities of the Conference overleaping the limits of the programme cannot be said to be either few or small.

Of the probable result, it is necessary to write as yet with caution and reserve. The dismantling of the fortress of Luxembourg may be found to be a matter of less difficulty comparatively than the future and final disposal of the Duchy. That it is in some sense proclaimed neutral is absolutely necessary, and may already be considered certain; but whether it shall remain a separate State with a separate and independent Government of its own, or be annexed to Belgium, to which it lies contiguous, or be made to form an integral part of the kingdom of Holland, are questions on any one of which it is little likely uniformity of sentiment will prevail. The population is German, German in race, German in language, German in sympathy; and if they are barred for the present from more formal union with their brethren of the Fatherland, it is difficult to say which of the three courses just indicated would by themselves be deemed preferable.

Separation and independence would leave the Duchy isolated and weak. Union with Holland would place it in the awkward position of a province which, though not remote, would have no territorial connection with the kingdom of which it would form a part. Annexation to Belgium, if agreeable to the population, appears to be the most natural course, and commends itself not merely by the fact that the boundaries are contiguous, but by the additional circumstance that the northern portion of the Duchy is already held by Belgium in virtue of the treaties of 1839. Annexed to Belgium, therefore, Luxembourg would, in a certain sense, be restored to her former self. In our anxiety for peace, we cannot afford to be indifferent to the welfare of the population most deeply interested. Our hope, therefore, is that the Conference may result in some such arrangement as that peace will be maintained, and the people satisfied.

There are other outstanding questions of interest and importance which it might be well for this convention of great powers to consider and determine. What, for example, is the use of allowing this everlasting Eastern question to hang like a nightmare before Europe, keeping the entire continent in a continual state of excitement and terror? It could be easily settled—settled to the advantage of all, and to the disadvantage of none. The great powers have but to agree among themselves, to give the Turk respectful notice to quit, to reorganize the Christian populations, placing them under a fresh, vigorous, central government, and that which is now a waste under Turkish misrule will reappear as the garden of Europe. No sooner will this Conference meet than it will be the object of universal interest; intelligent and thoughtful minds in the Old World and in the New will watch its progress and canvass its results; but if it accomplish nothing grander than the settlement of the Luxembourg difficulty, important as that is, its fruit will be small indeed.

Indebtedness of the States.

From the Times. Of the amount of the national debt, as one of the legacies of the war, the people have as distinct a conception as can be derived from figures. The idea is not very specific when the figures run up to thousands of millions, nor does it carry a very definite appreciation of the weight or probable duration of the taxation which the debt entails. But with more or less clearness, everybody comprehends the fact that the Government owes somewhat more than \$2,500,000,000; though everybody does not remember that the result-

ing taxation per head renders us the most heavily taxed people in the world.

In judging of debt and its incidence, however, we are apt to overlook the fact that the States, which are apt to be included in the States, which estimate of the financial condition of the country. On this head, unfortunately, it is not easy to obtain trustworthy information. There is no official exhibit, at short intervals, as in the case of the National Treasury, telling what each State owes, and what form the indebtedness of each has assumed. The only sources of enlightenment are the reports of State officers to the State Legislatures, and these reveal but a portion of the truth. They show, indeed, what the States owe as States, but they take no cognizance of the liabilities contracted by counties, cities and towns, which, in some instances, it may be feared, exceed the liabilities of the States themselves, necessarily affecting their financial character and their ability to sustain accruing burdens.

As to the State debts, the Financial Chronicle of this city has taken pains to construct, from reports of local officials, a comparative statement of the amounts owing, respectively, in 1860 and 1865. The comparison embraces thirty-two States, whose aggregate indebtedness shows an increase of \$96,304,881. In 1860 they owed \$255,849,709; in 1865, \$352,154,590. The debt of the State of New York has grown from \$34,182,975 to \$51,753,082. Massachusetts presents a larger proportionate increase, having advanced from \$7,175,978 to \$25,556,747. Connecticut, which in 1860 owed a modest \$50,000, now staggers under \$10,000,000. New Hampshire, which six years ago thought \$82,148 debt enough, now submits patiently to \$4,169,818. Rhode Island and Vermont, which formerly did not owe a dollar, are now indebted, respectively, of \$3,028,500 and \$1,567,500. In the West Wisconsin has risen from \$100,000 to \$2,252,191; Iowa from \$322,296 to \$622,296; Missouri from \$23,923,000 to \$37,145,928. Of the border States, Tennessee is the most heavily indebted, its debt having swelled from \$16,643,666 to \$25,277,347. The war debts of the Southern States were wiped out with the cause they espoused, and their increase of debt is, therefore, with one or two exceptions, for the most part confined to the accumulation of overdue interest.

The debt of Alabama has risen from \$5,448,000 to \$6,304,975; that of Florida from \$383,000 to \$638,865; that of Louisiana from \$10,023,903 to \$13,357,959; that of North Carolina from \$9,129,505 to \$11,433,000; that of Virginia from \$33,248,141 to \$45,119,741; while the debt of Arkansas has grown but nominally, and Texas, which was wont to print a simple nil, now confesses to \$230,360. Some of the States are enabled to boast of diminished indebtedness. Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania belong to this category. The explanation is, that in these instances the war expenditures were met principally by the municipalities, of whose indebtedness we have no account. That these debts are large may be inferred from the honorable part which these States played in the conduct of the war, and the lavish expenditures with which their names are associated. Even in States whose indebtedness has increased, formidable liabilities have been separately incurred by their cities and towns. Thus, while the State of New York has enlarged its debt to the extent of \$17,570,107, the city of New York has also added ten millions to its debt, and other municipalities in the State have experienced corresponding additions.

When an attempt is made, therefore, to estimate the financial condition of the country, it is necessary to add to the \$2,500,000,000, often reported by Mr. McCulloch, the \$352,154,590 which is owed by thirty-two of the States, and the undefined but confessedly enormous amounts in which county and town organizations are separately indebted. It is extremely desirable that some early and official effort be made to accumulate data for a complete statement on this subject. The country will then be in a position to realize the load it is required to carry, and the recklessness of those who would augment it by hundreds or thousands of millions for any purpose whatever.

This increase of debt would be of less importance if it had been accompanied by an increase of resources, or even an increased development of the resources we had. The statistics collated by the Financial Chronicle, while insufficient for anything like a minute calculation, amply prove a great decline in the taxable valuation of property in the Southern States; and in the North and West the increase is slight in comparison with the growth of debt. These statistics, if our contemporary reports are correct, "useful" as the opinion strongly held by some reflecting minds that during the war, we consumed much more than we produced, and came out of it with a heavy loss of accumulated resources." The North American Review recently argued that the debt of the country represents a total and an absolute loss—a deduction of so much from our available resources; and we apprehend that the position is much nearer the truth than the opposite view, which alleges a growth of riches in a ratio greater than the growth of debt. An expenditure on account of war may be properly considered an irrecoverable loss.

The Message of Governor English.

From the World. The inaugural message of Governor English to the Connecticut Legislature, delivered on Wednesday, is a document that will repay perusal. A large portion of it is devoted to national issues, the discussion of which is clear and conclusive. The Governor takes strong Democratic ground, but in terms so dignified and so courteous as not to offend any but his most bitter partisan opponents. Apparently anticipating criticism for treating of these topics at such length, Governor English says—"I have particularly brought to your attention acts of the Federal Congress, because in my judgment their tendency is to revolutionize the character of our Government, and, therefore, they vitally concern the people of Connecticut." One paragraph in this connection presents two points so forcibly that we reproduce it entire:—"Will the precedent thus set by Congress be forgotten? Will the Constitution, which is imposed to restrain the fury of a majority to day, become the subject of a majority vote for the minority to-morrow? Will the sword which is so easily drawn to establish a constitution now, be allowed to rest in its sheath if needed to overthrow a constitution which has been overthrown and just glory of the soldier without a war and a stripe broken—but which has been the sword of the people long retain their faith in constitutional government? If the charter of our liberties has been broken, nothing has been won. More than ever, at the present time, should any infraction of the Constitution be regarded as a public calamity. By the vast increase of our public indebtedness, every question which concerns the Government, credit comes home to every person in the land; that credit all values are measured. It lies at the foundation of our wealth, our industry, of society itself. No calamities of the past can exceed those which will result if the public credit should give way. But how is it to be preserved? The prime law of the land is itself repudiated in what manner of the world is that government trusted which is betrayed by revolutionary factions, intent only upon the gratification of

ambitions or the indulgence of partisan resentments? Had the Government been properly directed, the industry and trade of the whole country would long since have felt the benefit of its success, and the public credit been strengthened."

An exhaustive exhibit is given of the condition of the affairs of Connecticut, whence it appears that the total liabilities of the State, over and above all its assets, amount to \$7,601,477-96.

Attention is called to the usury laws recently passed by the Legislature of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, and a similar modification of the usury laws of Connecticut is suggested. It is also stated that the number of marriages in the State during the last year was greater than the number reported in any previous year; and that the number of births was larger than that of the preceding year, and greatly in excess of the deaths. Respecting the labor question, which formed an important element in the late political canvass, Governor English is true to the pledges of his party before election, and recommends an amendment of the general statutes so "as to make eight hours of labor done and performed in any one day by any one person in any mechanical or manufacturing establishment a lawful day's work, unless otherwise agreed by the parties." He also urges the "due enforcement of the existing statute to protect children of tender years from such oppressive labor as deprives them of the advantages of a common school education."

The account which we gave of the ceremonies attending the inauguration at Hartford on Wednesday, shows that the Governor is generally very popular among his fellow-citizens, and from the high tone of his message we look for a successful administration of the affairs of the State—provided, of course, that the Legislature, which is politically opposed to him, does not follow the example of Congress, and thwart, as far as possible, his every effort for good.

Charles Sumner's Views.

From the Independent. SENATE CHAMBER, April 20.—"My Dear Sir:—You wish to have the North 'reconstructed,' so at least that it shall cease to deny the elective franchise on account of color. But you postpone the day by insisting on the preliminary of a Constitutional amendment. I know your vows to the good cause, but I ask you to make haste. We cannot wait."

Of course, we can always wait for the needful processes; but there are present reasons why we should allow no time to be lost. This question must be settled without delay. In other words, it must be settled before the Presidential election which is at hand. Our colored fellow-citizens at the South are already voters. They will vote at the Presidential election. But why should they vote at the South, and not at the North? The rule of justice is the same for both. Their votes are added at the North as well as at the South. There are Northern States where their votes can make the good cause safe beyond question. There are other States where their votes will be like the last preponderant weight in the nicely balanced scales. Let our colored fellow-citizens vote in Maryland, and that State, now so severely tried, will be fixed for human rights forever. Let them vote in Pennsylvania, and you will give more than twenty thousand votes to the Republican cause. Let them vote in New York, and the scales, which hang so doubtful, will incline to the Republican cause. It will be the same in Connecticut. I mention these by way of example. But everywhere the old pro-slavery party will kick the beam. Let all this be done, I say, before the next Presidential election.

Among the proposed ways of doing it is by a new Constitutional amendment. But this is too dilatory. It cannot become operative till after the Presidential election. Besides, it is needless. Instead of amending the Constitution, we should amend the laws. Another way is by moving each State, and obtaining through local legislation what is essentially a right of citizenship. But this again is too dilatory, while it turns each State into a political maelstrom, and submits a question of national interest to the chances of local controversy, and the timidity of local politicians. This will not do. Emancipation was a national act, proceeding from the National Government, and applicable to all the States. If it be left to the States individually, the result, besides being tardy, will be uncertain and fragmentary.

There is another way, which is at once prompt, energetic, and comprehensive. It is by act of Congress, adopted by a majority of two-thirds in spite of Presidential veto. The time has passed when this power can be questioned. Congress has already exercised it in the Rebel States. I do not forget its hesitations. Only a year ago, when I insisted that it must do so, and introduced a bill to this effect, was answered that a Constitutional amendment was needed, and it was voted down. A change came, and in a happy moment Congress exercised the power. What patriot questions it now? But the power is unquestionable in the other States also. It concerns the rights of citizenship, and this subject is as essentially national as the army or the navy.

Even without either of the recent Constitutional amendments, I am at a loss to understand how a denial of the elective franchise simply on account of color can be otherwise than unconstitutional. I cannot see how, under a National Constitution which does not contain the word "white" or "black," there can be any exclusion on account of color. There is no such exclusion in the Constitution. Out of what text is this oligarchical pretension derived? But, putting aside this question, which will be clearer to the jurists of the next generation than to us, I vouch the authoritative words of the Constitution, making it our duty to guarantee a republican form of government in the States. Now the greatest victory of the war, to which all other victories, whether in Congress or on the bloody field, were only tributary, was the definition of a republican government according to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. A government which denies the elective franchise on account of color, or, in other words, sets up any "qualifications" of votes in their native inalienable, cannot be republican; for the first principle in a republican government is equality of rights, according to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. And this definition, I insist, is the crowning result of that war which beat down the Rebellion under its feet. It only remains for Congress to enforce it by appropriate legislation.

But there are two recent Constitutional amendments, each of which furnishes ample and cumulative power. There is, first, the amendment abolishing slavery, with its clause conferring on Congress the power to enforce it by appropriate legislation, in pursuance of which Congress has already passed the Civil Rights act, which is applicable to the North as well as to the South. Clearly, and most obviously beyond all question, if it can pass a Civil Rights act,

it can also pass a Political Rights act; for each is appropriate to enforce the abolition of slavery and to complete the work. Without it the work is only half done.

There is yet another amendment recently adopted by three-fourths of the loyal States, which is itself an abundant source of power. After declaring that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are "citizens," this amendment proceeds to provide that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States;" and Congress is empowered to enforce this provision by appropriate legislation. Nothing can be plainer than this.

Here, then, are three different fountains of power in the Constitution itself, each sufficient; the three together three times sufficient; each exuberant and overflowing; the three together three times exuberant and overflowing. How, in the face of these provisions, any person can doubt the power of Congress, I cannot understand. But, alas! there are dolefuls always.

I have already sent you a copy of my bill to settle this question by what I call "the short cut." Give us your vote. Of course, you will. Believe me, my dear sir, very faithfully yours, CHARLES SUMNER.

Theodore Tilton, Esq. Yes, Mr. Sumner has our vote. He has always had it; he is always likely to have it. "How did Roger Sherman vote?" asked our forefathers. They believed it was safe to vote with Roger Sherman. It is just as safe to vote with Charles Sumner. During the last fifteen years no American senator has been so uniformly right, none so conspicuously single-minded, none so stubbornly uncompromising, as the author of this letter. Therefore let heed be given to what he says.

Long ago we proposed, and at various times since have urged an amendment to the Federal Constitution establishing equal civil and political rights in all the States—both for whites and blacks; both for North and South. Mr. Sumner, seeking the same end, proposes different means. Instead of an amendment of the Constitution, he urges a law of Congress. "How any person," he says, "can doubt the power of Congress, I cannot understand." Mr. Sumner knows that we do not doubt the power of Congress; not at all. Our doubt is, not of its power, but of its courage. Its power is undeniable. Both civil and political rights flow from one and the same fount. If Congress has any power to enact civil rights, it has equal power to enact political rights. It has done so far, established civil, but neglected to establish political rights. Mr. Sumner properly asks it to complete its duty by establishing both.

What need, then, of an amendment to the Constitution?

Suppose both civil and political rights to be duly decreed by act of Congress. We shall still ask for the amendment. We cannot help considering that all the rights of American citizens, whether civil or political, are on a stronger foundation when written in plain and direct terms in an amended Constitution, than when, as now, they are inferentially deduced from the more vague statements of the present Constitution by explanatory and supplemental acts of Congress. It is to make assurance doubly sure that we have asked, and shall continue to ask, for such an amendment. Moreover, we do not agree with our distinguished friend that such an amendment could not be triumphantly and speedily adopted. On the contrary, we believe the country is amply ready for it. This opinion we share with Mr. Greeley.

But, whether an amendment is needed, or not—and whether it can be passed, or not—we go heartily for Mr. Sumner's bill. Look at the bill. It is as follows:—

"Whereas, The Constitution of the United States abolishes slavery everywhere within the jurisdiction thereof, so that all constitutions, laws, or regulations of any State or Territory in aid of slavery, or growing out of the same, are null and void; and whereas, the same Constitution, by its express provisions, recently adopted, declares that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; and whereas, also, Congress is empowered by appropriate legislation to enforce these several provisions, which cannot be done without securing the elective franchise to every citizen of every State and Territory; and whereas, the rights of citizens of the United States, and of the descendants of slaves, or who are deprived of equal rights by reason of race or color; and whereas, the rights of citizens of the United States, and of the descendants of slaves, or who are deprived of equal rights, shall in every State and Territory have the same rights as to the elective franchise as are enjoyed by the citizens of the United States who are not so deprived; and whereas, the principles of the Declaration of Independence, now the basis of the Republic, are hereby declared null and void."

Now, whether the above be a constitutional amendment or an act of Congress—or one, or both—it is just, expedient, and indispensable; it is equal in its operation, North as well as South; it provides one and the same beneficial law for the whole land. Shall it be adopted? If we could speak with a hundred tongues, they should all cry Amen. The negro now has less law on his side in Connecticut than in Mississippi. Congress, reassembling in July, ought to provide for his immediate relief. There was an outcry against giving the negro his civil rights; but when the deed was done, the whole land acquiesced. There is a similar outcry against giving him his political rights; but once given, there will be a general approbation of the gift. If negroes who have been brought up in slavery are allowed to vote in the South, why shall not negroes who have been brought up in freedom be allowed to vote in the North?

Not only is Mr. Sumner right as to the power of Congress in the present case, but long ago he was right as to the power of Congress to govern the unconquered States as conquered provinces. He then stood almost alone in the Senate in an opinion which he has since seen adopted by his brother Senators. We trust his compeers will agree to his present bill. We happen to know that Thaddeus Stevens—who, even when sick, is more well than most men—is preparing on his sick bed, an argument in support of Mr. Sumner's plan. We happen to know, also, that Chief Justice Chase agrees with Mr. Sumner's view. Let the midsummer Congress adopt the bill as a Fourth of July message. Its passage will thrill the country. It will banish the pall-bearers, light the torches, and fire the fuses. It will rekindle the glorious enthusiasm which followed Abraham Lincoln's Decree of Emancipation. "Blow, bugle, blow! Set the wild echoes flying!"

SPECIAL NOTICES.

HEALTH OFFICE. In accordance with a resolution of the Board of Health, adopted April 18, 1867, proposals will be received at the Health Office, No. 114 Chestnut Street, for the removal of all nuisances as may be directed by said Board. A number of Health within the respective districts, to-wit:— First District, comprising the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, and 15th Wards. Second District, comprising the 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22d, 23d, 24th and 25th Wards. Third District, comprising the 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th, 30th, 31st, 32d, 33d, 34th, 35th, 36th, 37th, 38th, 39th, 40th, 41st, 42d, 43d, 44th, 45th, 46th, 47th, 48th, 49th, 50th, 51st, 52d, 53d, 54th, 55th, 56th, 57th, 58th, 59th, 60th, 61st, 62d, 63d, 64th, 65th, 66th, 67th, 68th, 69th, 70th, 71st, 72d, 73d, 74th, 75th, 76th, 77th, 78th, 79th, 80th, 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, 88th, 89th, 90th, 91st, 92d, 93d, 94th, 95th, 96th, 97th, 98th, 99th, 100th, 101st, 102d, 103d, 104th, 105th, 106th, 107th, 108th, 109th, 110th, 111th, 112th, 113th, 114th, 115th, 116th, 117th, 118th, 119th, 120th, 121st, 122d, 123d, 124th, 125th, 126th, 127th, 128th, 129th, 130th, 131st, 132d, 133d, 134th, 135th, 136th, 137th, 138th, 139th, 140th, 141st, 142d, 143d, 144th, 145th, 146th, 147th, 148th, 149th, 150th, 151st, 152d, 153d, 154th, 155th, 156th, 157th, 158th, 159th, 160th, 161st, 162d, 163d, 164th, 165th, 166th, 167th, 168th, 169th, 170th, 171st, 172d, 173d, 174th, 175th, 176th, 177th, 178th, 179th, 180th, 181st, 182d, 183d, 184th, 185th, 186th, 187th, 188th, 189th, 190th, 191st, 192d, 193d, 194th, 195th, 196th, 197th, 198th, 199th, 200th, 201st, 202d, 203d, 204th, 205th, 206th, 207th, 208th, 209th, 210th, 211st, 212d, 213d, 214th, 215th, 216th, 217th, 218th, 219th, 220th, 221st, 222d, 223d, 224th, 225th, 226th, 227th, 228th, 229th, 230th, 231st, 232d, 233d, 234th, 235th, 236th, 237th, 238th, 239th, 240th, 241st, 242d, 243d, 244th, 245th, 246th, 247th, 248th, 249th, 250th, 251st, 252d, 253d, 254th, 255th, 256th, 257th, 258th, 259th, 260th, 261st, 262d, 263d, 264th, 265th, 266th, 267th, 268th, 269th, 270th, 271st, 272d, 273d, 274th, 275th, 276th, 277th, 278th, 279th, 280th, 281st, 282d, 283d, 284th, 285th, 286th, 287th, 288th, 289th, 290th, 291st, 292d, 293d, 294th, 295th, 296th, 297th, 298th, 299th, 300th, 301st, 302d, 303d, 304th, 305th, 306th, 307th, 308th, 309th, 310th, 311st, 312d, 313d, 314th, 315th, 316th, 317th, 318th, 319th, 320th, 321st, 322d, 323d, 324th, 325th, 326th, 327th, 328th, 329th, 330th, 331st, 332d, 333d, 334th, 335th, 336th, 337th, 338th, 339th, 340th, 341st, 342d, 343d, 344th, 345th, 346th, 347th, 348th, 349th, 350th, 351st, 352d, 353d, 354th, 355th, 356th, 357th, 358th, 359th, 360th, 361st, 362d, 363d, 364th, 365th, 366th, 367th, 368th, 369th, 370th, 371st, 372d, 373d, 374th, 375th, 376th, 377th, 378th, 379th, 380th, 381st, 382d, 383d, 384th, 385th, 386th, 387th, 388th, 389th, 390th, 391st, 392d, 393d, 394th, 395th, 396th, 397th, 398th, 399th, 400th, 401st, 402d, 403d, 404th, 405th, 406th, 407th, 408th, 409th, 410th, 411st, 412d, 413d, 414th, 415th, 416th, 417th, 418th, 419th, 420th, 421st, 422d, 423d, 424th, 425th, 426th, 427th, 428th, 429th, 430th, 431st, 432d, 433d, 434th, 435th, 436th, 437th, 438th, 439th, 440th, 441st, 442d, 443d, 444th, 445th, 446th, 447th, 448th, 449th, 450th, 451st, 452d, 453d, 454th, 455th, 456th, 457th, 458th, 459th, 460th, 461st, 462d, 463d, 464th, 465th, 466th, 467th, 468th, 469th, 470th, 471st, 472d, 473d, 474th, 475th, 476th, 477th, 478th, 479th, 480th, 481st, 482d, 483d, 484th, 485th, 486th, 487th, 488th, 489th, 490th, 491st, 492d, 493d, 494th, 495th, 496th, 497th, 498th, 499th, 500th, 501st, 502d, 503d, 504th, 505th, 506th, 507th, 508th, 509th, 510th, 511st, 512d, 513d, 514th, 515th, 516th, 517th, 518th, 519th, 520th, 521st, 522d, 523d, 524th, 525th, 526th, 527th, 52