

The Waynesburg Republican.

WAYNESBURG, PENNA. Wednesday, Sept. 11, '67.

DISTRICT AND COUNTY TICKET.

SUPREME JUDGE HON. H. W. WILLIAMS, Of Allegheny County.

ASSISTANT JUDGE JOHN STUBBS, Of Allegheny County.

SHERIFF JOHN WILSON, Of Allegheny County.

CLERK OF COURTS JOHN WILSON, Of Allegheny County.

COMMISSIONER JOHN LANTZ, Of Allegheny County.

JURY COMMISSIONER JOHN LANTZ, Of Allegheny County.

POST OFFICE COMMISSIONER JOHN LANTZ, Of Allegheny County.

JUDGE SHARSWOOD ON LEGAL TENDERS.

Extract from His Opinion in the Case of Bore vs. Trost.

On the whole, then, I am of the opinion that the provisions of the act of Congress of February 25, 1862, do not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money.

It is unnecessary that I should refer to the other question which has been raised by the act of Congress of February 25, 1862, in relation to the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money.

It may also be found in the "Legal Tender" issue of the 11th of March, 1862, page 10.

In the same issue of the "Age" a carefully prepared copy of the Judge's opinion is given in which is the following:

"Judge Sharswood reasons upon and decides the case as follows: 'The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money.'

Will not the holders of greenbacks and other bonds consider the Judge's opinion as a basis on the Supreme Bench?

OUR CANDIDATE Hon. Henry W. Williams.

(From the Pittsburgh Post, June 24.)

WORTHY CANDIDATE.

"The nomination of Henry W. Williams as a candidate for Judge of the Supreme Court is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

"The nomination of Judge Williams is a great honor to him and to the State."

CALIFORNIA.

The news from this State is unfavorable, although it is attributed to corrupt party leaders and the paralyzed condition of having two candidates for Governor by the Republican Party.

There was no cause, other than these, why we should not have had a victory as complete as that of last year. It was a determination on the part of the people to rebuke profligate legislators and will have no significance beyond the encouragement it gives the Copperheads of the North and the rebels of the South.

MAJ. RUSSELL ERRET has been nominated for State Senate by the Republican convention of Allegheny county, in place of Hon. T. J. Bigelow, the present incumbent. Mr. Bigelow, has been a true representative for Allegheny, and a serviceable member for the State. He will have an equally able successor in Maj. Erret, for a more devoted lover of Republican principles does not exist.

THE Philadelphia Press puts the question thus: The journals of the Democracy object to Judge Williams because he is a Connecticut man by birth. We object to Judge Sharswood because he is a South Carolinian by principles, politics, and prejudices. Is it better in the eyes of Democrats for a man to adopt our Commonwealth or to renounce it? Shall we prefer a man who comes to us, or one who, born among us, repudiates us and abandons our ideas of political and constitutional law for those of Calhoun?

MONDAY'S papers contain the President's amnesty Proclamation, which is in point substantially as epitomized in our news columns. It seems to create but little remark as his late acts have convinced the people that he is capable of doing anything. They are awaiting, Micawber like, for "something to turn up." Something that will bring the President to his senses.

THE Repudiators love to talk of the stealings of shoddy army contractors, and corrupt officials under the Administration during the war. They have forgotten(?) all about the thefts of Floyd, Buchanan's Secretary of War. He stole more than it would have cost to prosecute the war year after one pull! Thus opening the way for these small operators.

THE President has issued a proclamation calling for the respect and enforcement of the law in the Carolinas. It is "sound and fury, signifying nothing."

SHARSWOOD vs. JACKSON.

The Sharswood Democracy claim to be great admirers of Gen. Jackson, though of late years, and especially during the war, they held opinions in regard to State Sovereignty diametrically opposed to Gen. Jackson's views. In their candidate for the Supreme Bench they have a man directly opposed in principle to Old Hickory on this fundamental question. The following extracts show Judge Sharswood's views on State Sovereignty, and those held by General Jackson as far back as 1832-34:

Extracts from Judge Sharswood's Opinion in the Case of Bore vs. Trost.

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

"The act of Congress of February 25, 1862, does not require the issue of legal tender of the kind to be lawful money, and a legal tender of the kind to be lawful money."

CALIFORNIA ELECTION.

Large Democratic-Gotham Election. Haight's Victory. Haight's Victory.

SAN FRANCISCO, September 5.—Partial returns from less than half the counties in the State, but including the most populous, show large Democratic gains everywhere. Haight has from two thousand to twenty-five hundred majority in San Francisco. It is doubtful if Gotham's majority in the interior will aggregate to overwhelm this. Of the general Union there is probably elected at least two Congressmen. The Democratic legislative ticket in San Francisco and Sacramento is probably elected in great part. It is thought this defeats the re-election of Senator Conness. It is uncertain if the Union majority is retained in the Legislature. If lost, Governor Low is expected to call an extra session of the present Legislature to ratify the Constitutional Amendment.

The total vote of San Francisco is 17,365, about 6,000 less than the registered vote. Some thousand Union votes were lost through the apathy resulting from disgust at abuses in the party.

It is impossible to give reliable estimates of the general result.

SAN FRANCISCO, September 5.—Further returns from the interior are more favorable to Haight, and render his election tolerably certain. Nothing more is known of the fate of the general Union ticket, though it is believed to be ahead.

Helps, Union candidate for Congressman in the San Francisco district, is probably defeated. The Union local tickets are generally ahead in counties formerly Union, so far as known. The vote for Fay, Independent Union, is very small, but helped the general ticket.

It is the opinion of Union men that if Bidwell had been nominated, instead of Gotham, the State would have gone twenty thousand Union, and that the partial defeat is altogether owing to the disaffection in the Union ranks. A great effort will be made to consolidate the Union strength for victory at the judicial election next month, but the Democrats claim the State irrespective of Union discussions, although they admit they could have done little against Bidwell.

SAN FRANCISCO, September 5.—San Francisco gives Haight a majority of thirty-eight hundred and forty eight. To the surprise of everybody, every ward went Democratic. The whole Democratic county and municipal ticket, except two or three, is elected.

Returns from twenty-six counties show Haight over five thousand ahead, with scarcely a possibility that Gotham can catch up.

The Union press deny any political significance in the result.

The Evening Bulletin, which opposed Gotham, says Haight's success is due wholly to the determination of the masses of the Union party to rebuke an immoral system of party management, and break down corrupt combination schemes and demagogues, which threatened to alienate honorable public property wrongly and impose extra burdens on tax payers for the benefit of speculations.

LATER.—Fuller returns from the most populous counties, including the stronghold, continue to swell Haight's majority, and make the Northern Congressmen uncertain.—Ella Gazette.

SAN FRANCISCO, September 7.—Haight's majority in San Francisco now stands over 4,000. This might have been overcome if the full vote had not been prevented by apathy. The same apathy prevailed in the interior. Nevada county, one of the strongest Republican counties, polled only 3,500 out of 5,700 registered, giving Haight 75 majority. This is a representative instance. Several small counties are to-day reported for Gotham by majorities averaging less than one hundred, but do not change the result announced. Haight, Union, for Congress is 700 ahead.

A SINGLE dispatch from Louisville, Ky., last week contained the following record of bloodshed: The body of a man named Hicks was found on the 27th hanging in the woods near South Danville. A man charged with the rape of a young girl was taken from Harrodsburg jail Sunday night by a party of regulators and hanged. An anti-lynch society, organized in Marion County, captured and paroled several persons not to return to their homes. They hanged a man near Haystack, named Parker, to-day. It is reported that one of the murderers of Major Bridgewater was hanged near Crab Orchard to-day. Jerry Singler stabbed Wan Lee, probably fatally, at Bacon to-day. James Lackey disappeared mysteriously from Upton last week.

Effects of the Bankrupt Law.

Speaking on this topic an exchange says: The shrewdest of our financiers have