plaintiff, because the arbitrator "could not decree a dissolution," and that the arbitration clause did not apply to a case where It was charged that "the partnership articles had been broken through." The complainant being clearly entitled to a hearing in this court, I shall proceed to consider the averments of his bill.

The first four sections have been already

stated.

The fifth section charges that the defendant Vankizk "has the exclusive control of the financial business of said firm."

The sixth section relates to the protests already disposed of, and the paragraphs numbered from 7 to 17, inclusive, contain charges of acts alleged to have been committed by the defendant Vankizz "in fraud" of complainants.

The eighteenth section avers that the com-

The eighteenth section avers that the commiles the business of the said firm is at once wound up, and the management of its affairs taken from the said Joseph T. Vankirk, it will in a short time become in-olvent."

The nineteenth paragraph contains the present for an account a processer and account a present and account a processer a

prayers for an account, a receiver, and an

will consider these different parts of the bill in their proper order, first disposing of those sections as to which no evidence has been offered.

The fifth section, as already stated, charges that defendant Vankirk has "the exclusive con-

trol of the financial business of said firm."

If by this averment it is meant to allege that the complainant has been excluded from what has been called a partner's "fail share in the management of the concern" (2 Ashm, 236), then it must be regarded as unsustained by the No witness speaks of any act of exclusion.

The evidence, it is true, shows that the de-tendant Vankirk had the "general manage-ment" of the finances, but some division of duty is generally observed in all copartnerships. In this case it no more proves an exclusion of the complainant than the fact that he faithfully superintended his department establishes an exclusion by complainant of his copartners.

By exclusion the law does not understand a quiet, unopposed monopoly by one partner of all the labor in a certain department, or indeed

all the labor in a certain department, or indeed of all the departments, but some act or word in depial of the rights of his copartmer.

Namy examples might be cited to illustrate this position, but one will suffice. In Gowan vs. Jeffries (2 Ashm. 300), the complainants charged that the defendant had instructed the servants "not to hold communication with him," and further, that the defendant had "refused to give the complainants information of the state of the concern."

These were acts of exclusion, and were so regarded by Judge King, who always grappled with the heart of a case,

Other illustrations might be added, but it is trusted that what has been said will suffice to demonstrate that having the "general management" of a business or of a department thereof is not of itself an exclusion of a copartner.

There is no testimony beyond this, and I am therefore compelled to regard this section of the bill as unsupported by proof.

bill as unsupported by proof. The same remark applies to all the averments contained in the paragraphs numbered from 9 to 17 inclusive. The only attempt at proof under any of these sections applied to transactions of the year preceding the formation of this copartnership, and were admitted to be insuffi-

cient to sustain this bill. The eighteenth averment of anticipated insolvency is also unsustained by the evidence, and our inquiry is thus limited to the allegations contained in the seventh and eighth paragraphs of the bill. The complainant, at the hearing, relied almost exclusively upon these branches of his case, and they present matters for grave inquiry and comsideration. The evidence, which in great part bore upon these points, has taken a wide range, and is presented to us in upwards wide range, and is presented to us in upwards

of ninety pages.

I will endeavor to apply it to the charges.

The sections of the bill now under consideration allege that the detendant Vankirk has "used the funds of the firm," and has "given the firm's notes" in payment of his private debts and in fraud of complainant.

This is directly denied by the answer of the

detendant charged. His co-detendant answers each article specifieally that he does not admit, and does not believe it to be true as therein charged.

The Examiner's Report establishes very

elearly the following points:I. That the defendant Vankirk has given the firm notes and used the funds of the partner ship in payment of his individual debts.

II. That the notes thus issued and the funds thus used largely exceed in amount the salary which each partner was allowed by the articles

to draw.
III. That all these transactions were regularly entered upon the books, and the proper debits charged to detendant Vankirk on the day of

each occurrence. IV. That the capital which defendant Vankirk was required by the partnership articles to contribute, was at no time impaired by these operations, but after deducting the debits re-ferred to, it has always been and still is largely

in excess of the sum named in the agreement.

V. That the complainant knew of Vankirk's standing obligations when the present partner ship was formed; for they existed during the life of a former partnership, and were then, as now, met by Vankirk's use of the firm's checks, and as those transactions, like the present matters of complaint, are all regularly entered upon the books, it is fairly to be presumed that the complainant knew of them at the time of their

currence. VI. That the complainant has also drawn more than the salary allowed by the articles, and has slightly reduced his share of the capital as established by the partnership agreement.

The legal question of the case is, whether

these facts justify or require the dissolution of an existing partnership, and the thereupon inevitable consequence of the appointment of a

The use by a pariner of the moneys or credit of the firm for his private purposes is, perhaps, of too frequent occurrence. It should always be condemned. Uberrima Files should be required from each member of a firm, and he should ever remember that he is a trustee for copartners, and under the highest obligations of honor to protect the common property from a diversion for his individual use or peraonal profit.

While this is undoubtedly true as a general principle, care must be taken here as in every case, to apply it so that no injustice shall be worked. That which might be a gross wrong it done secretly, may be stripped of all its appearance of orine by circumstances of apparent farness—op-nness—and notice to, and consent

of, the party complaining.

The legal principles to be applied to a case like the present have been long established and

Mr. Justice Story, in treating of the power of a Court of Equity "to dissolve a partnership during the term for which it is stipulated," says (Story's Eq. Juris., § 673):—"Such a dissolution may be granted in the first place on account of the impracticability of carrying on the undertaking either at all, or according to the stipulations of the articles."

"In the next place, it may be granted on account of the insanity or permanent incapacity of one of the partners." "in the next place, it may be granted on account of the gross misconduct of one or more

of the partners."
"But trifling faults and misbehavior, which do not go to the substance of the contract, do not constitute a sufficient ground to justify a

decree for a dissolution."

To the same effect is "Adam's Equity" (242, 243); "Gow on Partnership" (114); 2 "Waterman's Eden on Inj." (262, 263); "Collyer on Partnership" (Book II, Ch. III, \$297), and the

cases there cited. To these may be added our Pennsylvania authorities, Gowanys, Jeffries (2 Ashm., 296) and

Sloan vs. Moore (1 Wright, 217).

The case of Stockdale vs. Utlery (1 Wright, 485) establishes the right of a partner to enjoin against the use of the partnership assets for payment of the private debts of another mem-

ber of the firm.

As the acts charged against this defendant like ha are all relevable to the third class of cases wards or referred to by Mr. Justice Story, the exact ques drawn.

tion upon which this controversy turns is whether the several matters proved in this case amount to "gross misconduct," and therefore require a decree for a dissolution.

Don this point a careful review of the able arguments of the counsel on both sides, and of all the authorities I have been referred to, or have been able to find, has led my mind to a conclusion adverse to the complainant.

The testimony shows that in every instance the defendant Vankirk was debited with the exact amount chargeable against him. That his capital has, notwithstanding these debts, largely increased. That the complainant had notice by the books of the former firm that Mr. Vankirk was using the notes and checks of the torse. was using the notes and checks of that partner-ship for the payment of his outstanding obligations given for the purchase of machinery, etc., and that the complainant has not regarded the authority to draw a salary of \$2000 as a limitation, for he has himself exceeded that amount,

The other partner is here protesting against a dissolution. The complainant can readily secure a winding up of the firm, if he so desires, by giving the dissolution notice provided for in the articles. A sudden stoppage of a large and ap-parently flourishing business, requiring a heavy outlay of capital, might be attended with most disastrous results, and I have felt that this strong arm of equity and jurisprudence ought not to be extended except in a case clearly falling within the principles laid down by the authori-

within the principles laid down by the adductives I have quoted.

The case of Harrison vs. Tennant (21 Beavan, 482) goes far beyond all prior decisions in decicing a dissolution before the expiration of the partnership articles—in the absence of any breach thereof—and merely upon the ground of a change of circumstances, forieiting confidence, and consider mistrust.

nd creating mistrust.

But the facts in that case were very peculiar, and it was deemed impossible to carry on the

usiness without injury to all.

I have examined the cases referred to by the est writers, under the head of "gross misconduct," as a cause for a dissolution, and I do not find a single authority for such a decree upon the present state of facts. This will appear the more clearly by the following analysis of

In Master vs. Kiston [1796] (3 Vesey, Jr.'s, Reports, 75, the Master of the Rolls, Sir Richard Pepper Arden, decreed a dissolution of a banking urm, the defendant having allowed a friend, "contrary to the opinion and desire, and without the consent of the other partner, to draw upon the partnership to the extent of

In Norway vs. Rowe [1812] (19 Vesey, Jr.'s, Reports, 160, the delendant was a tenant in common, and was charged "with wasting the property, or excluding those who were entitled with him to the benefit of the license." Lord

Eldon refused the motion, although there was some appearance of exclusion.

In Waters vs. Taylor [1813] (2 Ves. and Beames, 304, the partnership in the operahouse was dissolved by Lord Eldon, "the conduct of the partnership in the conduction of the partnership in the conduct of the partnership in the partnership in the partnership in the conduct of the partnership in the partnership i duct of the parties making it impossible to carry it on upon the terms stipulated."

In Goodman vs. Whitcomb [1820] (1 Jacob and Walker's Ch. Rep., 560), the charges against the defendant were that he had "prevented the plaintiff from inspecting the books, and had sold goods at an under price and exchanged others for household furniture, which he had appropriated to his own use." It was further charged that "he had refused to enter receipts in the books," Lord Eldon called this receipts in the books." Lord Eldon called this last charge "a circumstance of great impropriety;" but he retused the motion for an injunction. He asked, with great force, "What right has the Court to appoint a receiver and make itself the manager of every trade in the kingdom?" and added, "Where partners differ, as they sometimes do, when they enter into another kind of partnership, they should recollect that they enter into it for better and worse, and this Court has no jurisdiction to make a separation between them because one is more sullen tion between them because one is more sullen or less good tempered than the other." As to the case before him, he said that to justify a dissolution "there must be conduct amounting to an entire exclusion of the partner from his interest in the partnership." In Chapman vs. Beach (Ibid. 578), the same Judge said the Court would not appoint a receiver unless "there had been such an abuse of good taith as the court to the religious transfer.

to entitle the plaintiff to a dissolution."

In Marshall vs. Colman [1820] (2 Jacob & Walker's Rep., 261), the plaintiff applied for an injunction to restrain the firm from omiting his name to letters, etc., the articles requiring all papers to be in their joint names. Lord Eldon retused the injunction without costs, because he doubted his right to enjoin without decreeing a dissolution, and because the neglect had not been "studied, intentional, prolonged, and continued." He also laid stress upon the fact that the complainant had signed his name

for self and partners.

Referring to cases in which a partner raises "money for his private use on the credit of the firm," he said "the Court interferes then because there is a ground for dissolving the partnership, but then the danger must be such, there must be that abuse of good faith between the mem-bers of the partnership, that the Court will try the question whether the partnership should

not be dissolved in consequence. In Loscomb vs. Russell [1830] (4 Simon's Rep. 11). Vice-Chancellor Shadwell said:—
"With respect to occasional breaches of agreements between partners, when they are not of so grievous a nature as to make it impossible that the partnership should continue, the Court

In Hall vs. Hall [1850] (3 Macnaughten and Gordon's Rep. 79), Lord Truro dismissed the motion for a receiver.

The charge against the defendant was, that he The charge against the defendant was, that he had "interiered with the plaintiff exercising his hights as a partner, and had in several particulars acted contrary to the articles, specifying among such particulars a refusal by defendant to open a joint banking account according to the terms of the articles."

It was rolled that a receiver would be appreciated to the second that are received to the second that are r

It was roled that a receiver would be ap-pointed where "the conduct of the defendant endangers the existence of the partnership

In Smith vs. Males [1851] (J. Hare's Rep., 556), one of the defendants was charged, amongst other things, with ac omission to enter receipts. The Vice-Chancellor held that this was not of itself sufficient, but that it should be shown "that the omission was knowingly and wilfully The dissolution was decreed on other grounds.

These cases are referred to by the text writers. In addition thereto may be cited the recent decision in Anderson vs. Anderson (25 Beavan, 199), as opposed to the doctrine of dissolving partnerships upon slight grounds. There the defendant was clearly guilty of a breach of the partnership article, for he had given a guarantee without his partner's consent, and the agreement expressly prohibited this under the penalty of a dissolution. But the decree was refused because of the trifling amount of the guarantee.

Our Penus Ivania cases have already been

referred to. In Sloan vs. Moore (1 Wr., 217), the partnership had expired at the date of filing the supplemental hill, and the defendant had attempted to sell out the whole concern. In Gowau vs. Jeffries (2 Ashm., 300), there was a clear case of exclusion and insolvency. Apply ing to the present case the principles thus eliminated from these decisions. I fail to find in the evidence any proof against the defendant Van-kirk of "exclusion," "of conduct making it im-possible to carry on the partnership upon the terms stipulated," "of knowing and wilful omis-

sions to enter receipts," or "of abuse of good falth, requiring a dissolution." The complainant's construction of the evidence charges that the defendant Vankirk drew nearly \$7000 beyond his salary. This is denied, and the defendant's calculation reduces the debits to \$2300. But charging him with the \$7000, this is plantally overhalment by the debits to \$2300. But charging him with the \$7000, this is largely overbalanced by the credits to which he is entitled according to the books and balance-sheet, in excess of his capital. Deducting the whole of the alleged overdraft, the books still show that the defendant Vankirk is largely in advance of his quota of capital. There has been no evidence offered to impeach the entries to his credit. I am bound, therefore, to accept them. Deducting from them the \$7000 of which the plaintiff complains, if would still appear that the defendant Vantage of the strength of the complaints of the complaints of the complaints of the complaints. if would still appear that the defendant Van-kirk has put in, over and above his capital, up-wards of \$20,000 more than than be has with-

The articles contain no clause prohibiting a partner from drawing in excess of the salary. The complainant himself interpreted the agreement as allowing the partners to draw more than the salary, and so long as the defendant Van-kirk maintained his capital not only intact, but in advance of what the articles required, it is difficult to convict bim of "fraud," or to conclude that "it is impossible to carry on the partnership upon the terms atipulated." Where this "impossibility" does not exist, it seems to be the duty of a Court of Equity "to stand neater."

Besides, it the defendant acted improperly, the complainant is also in fault, and can I balance wrong against wrong to see who com-

balance wrong against wrong to see who com-mitted the greater error, and then grant relief to one who, sharing the culpability, was only less in fault upon the column of dollars? I would not hesitate in a proper case to restrain the use of the firm name for private purposes, but the fact that the complainant has impaired his capital, although slightly, and that he had knowledge of the transactions of the defendant Vankirk in the prior firm of the same character as those complained of here, would cem to deprive him of even the right to an

Injunction.

I have not considered the argument urged against the complainant, that his interest was only one-tenth; for however small his investment it is enti-led to the protection of the law. I have also disregarded the accusations against the defendant Vankirk in reference to the removal of certain continues in the resulted. injunction. moval of certain castings in the year 1865, as to the alleged error in the balance-sheet of June,

to the sileged error in the balance-sheet of June, 1866, and the omission of the book-keeper to enter an item of \$21,000 on the proper day, or until months after the occurrence.

The removal of the castings took place several months before the formation of the partnership of July, 1865. We are now dealing with a partnership formed January 8, 1866.

I see no fraud in the deduction of 5 per cent. from the valuation of the finished stock. The complainant says that it is proper to deduct 15 per cent., and that the lower deduction exhibits a larger amount of profits than the truth warranted. Granting all this, it cannot affect the real points in controversy; it is no evidence of fraud; and is in no way imputable to the defendant Vankirk. ant Vankirk.

So, too, an entry made June 30, 1866, contains this memorandum:"This entry was omitted on January 5, 1866.

on which day the transaction occurred. The detendant Vankirk was not the book-ceper. There was no evidence that he had ordered the clerk to withhold this entry, or that he was in any way chargeable with the omission he was in any way chargeable with the omission to put it upon the books in its proper place. Nor was there any testimony offered to disprove the fact stated in the books, that the defendant Vankirk had by "mutual consent" withdrawn machinery, etc., to the value of \$21,000, and had also by "mutual consent" replaced it and contributed that amount to the firm. On this point, the entry is the only item of proof, and it is impossible to infer fraud from it.

from it,

A full consideration of the case, and a review of the able and learned arguments on both sides, has led me to the conclusion that this bill should be dismissed, but without costs. It may be proper to add that this Court may a future cases be compelled to follow the practice recently adopted by the Supreme Court, of referring cases, after the closing of the testi-mony, to a master, to report an abstract of the

pleadings, the material facts in dispute, and his opinion thereon. The case then comes before the Court pre pared for brief argument and speedy decision. In the present instance the discussion of the testimony occupied over two sessions of the Court, and, in the absence of a master's report, it has been no light task to dispose of the cause in time for the approaching session of the Supreme Court, in order that any error into which I may have fallen may find its procedure correction. speedy correction.

New Hampshire Republican Convention. Concord Jan. 8.—The Bepublican State Convention met here to day to nominate State officers. An unusual degree of interest was felt in the result, as it was suppored the delegates were nearly divided between Messrs. Stearns and Harriman, the two leading candidates for the nomination. There were about 700 present. General Griffin presided. A letter was read from Governor Smythe declining a renomination. The Convention then proceeded to ballot for a candidate, with the following result:

Mr. Onslow Stearns.

318
General Walter Harriman,

Scattering,

The nomination was made unanimous.

General Walter Harriman, 549
Scattering, 5
The nomination was made unanimous.
General Harriman was then introduced to the Convention, and in a speech accepting the nomination, thanked Heaven that the country was comparatively at peace. He hoped the security for the future would be demanded on the basis of reconstruction, and that traitors should take back seats, and loyal men, black and white, should be called to the front.

The following is an abstract of the resolutions adopted: The first renews the pledge of fidelity to the principles of liberty.

The second compliments Congress.
The third recognizes the struggle of the Irish for liberty.

berty. The fourth notices the prostration of the Democratic The fourth notices the prostration of the Democratic party and its causes.

The fifth declares in favor of aiding disabled soldiers. The sixth recognizes the services of Gen. Smyths. The seventh expresses confidence in the nominec. The resolutions were unanimously adopted, and after the appointment of a State Central Committee the Convention adjourned.

The Ohio State Democratic Convention. COLUMBUS, O., January 8 .- The Ohio State Democratic Convention met to-day. The districts were well represented. Dr. J. M. Christian was appointed temporary Chairman, and A. J. Williams temporary Secretary. The usual committees were appointed, one from each district. A Committee on Resolutions was appointed, on which was C. L. Vallandigham. A motion was then made to refer all resolutions to the Committee without debate. This was referred to the Committee on Rules.

A communication from the Kentucky State Central Committee, asking the co-operation of the I emocracy of Ohio to call a National Convention next summer at Louisville, was referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

The Convention then took a recess. George H. Pendieton will be the permanent President. Judge Thomas will probably be the nominee for A grand Jacksonian banquet takes place tonight at the Neil House.

Railroad Accident.

Chicago, January 8.—A passenger car on the llinois Central Railroad, going North on Sun-day afternoon, ran off the track near Munster. Mrs. M. Wilson, of Akron, was instantly killed, and several other passengers were injured.

CURTAINS, SHADES, ETC. RICH LACE CURTAINS.

The Subscribers have now in Stock, and are re-

AUCTION SALES IN NEW YORK.

Nettingham Lace Curtains,

From Ordinary to Rich Style.

French Lace Curtains.

From the Lowest to the Highest Quality, some of them the RICHEST MADE.

Vestibule Lace.

reiving from the late

Embroidered Muslin Curtains, Jacquard Muslin Curtains, and Curtain Muslins in great variety

SHEPPARD, VAN HARLINGEN & ARRISON

9 14 wfm/6mrp) No. 1008 CHESNUT Street,

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

NORTH AMERICAN TRANSIT INSURANCE COMPANY. No. 33 South FOURTH Street

PHILADELPHIA.

nnual Policies issued against General Accidents Insurance effected for one year in any sem from \$100 to \$10,000, at a premium of only one-half per cent, securing the full amount insured in case of death, and a compensation each week equal to the whole premium paid mum paid
blurt time Ticketsfot. 3, 3, 7, or 10 days, or 1, 3, or
6 months, at 10 contsait. nsuring in the sum of \$2000,
or giving \$16 per week! Hashed to be had at the
General Office, No. 188 S. FOUETH Street, Philadelphia, or at the various Railroad Ticket offices. Be sure
to purchase the tickets of the Berth American Transi Insurance Company.

For circulars and farther information aprly at the Genera Office, or of any of the authorized Agents of the

Genera Office, or of any of the authorized Agents of the rempary.

LEWIS L. HOUPT, President.

JAMES M. CONRAD, Treasurer BENEX C. BRUWN, Secre say.

JUHN C. BULLITT, Solicitor.

LIRECTORS.

L. L. Houpt, late of Fennsylvania Radroad Company

J. E. Kingsley, Continental Hotel.

Ramuse C. Faimer Cashier of Com. National Bank.

B. G. Leisenring, Nos. 237 and 239 Dock street,

James M. Courad, Sim of Courad & Walton, No. 62

Maiket street.

Enoch Ecwis, late Gen. Sup't Fenns R. R.

Andrew Mchefley, S. W. corner of Third and Walnut reets.

G. C. Franciscus Gen. Agent Penna. R. R. Co. Thomas K. Peterson, No. 3336 Market street. W. W. Kurtz, firm of Kurtz; & Howard, No. 25 8 Third street. 1829-CHARTER PERPETUAL Franklin Fire Insurance Co.

PHILADELPHIA. Assets on January 1, 1866. \$2,506,851'96.

UBSETTLED CLAIMS, INCOME FOR 1886 \$11,467 53.

LOSSES PAID SINCE 1829 OVER \$5,000,000.

Perpetual and Temporary Policies on Liberal Terms. Charles & Bancker,
Tobias Wagner,
Samuel Grant,
George W. Hichards,
IsaacLea,
OHARLES M. BANCKER, President
EDWARD C. DALE, Vice-President.
JAS. W. MCALLISTEE, Secretary protem.

MOVAL

The Girard Fire and Marine Insurance Company

HAVE REMOVED TO THEIR

NEW OFFICE

NORTHEAST CORNER

CHESNUT and SEVENTH Streets. PHILADELPHIA.

LIVERPOOL AND LONDON AND

GLOBE INSURANCE COMPANY. Capital and Assets, \$16,000,000. Invested in United States, \$1,500,000.

Total Premiums Received by the Company in 1865, \$4,947,175. Total Losses Paid in 1865, \$4,018,250 All Lesses promptly adjusted without reference t ATWOOD SMITH,

General Agent for Pennsylvania. OFFICE, No. 6 Merchants' Exchange

PHILADELPHIA

DROVIDENT LIFE AND TRUST COMPANY
OF PHILADELPHIA
No. III South FOURTH Street.
INCORPORATED 36 MONTH 22d., 1865.
CAPITAL, \$150,000, PAID IN.
Insurance on Lives, by Yearly Premiums; or by 5, 10, 07 to year Premiums, hon-tortelture.
Endowments, payable at a luture age, or on prior decease, by Yearly Premiums, or 10 year Premiums—
both carbes Non tortelture.
Annuites granted on favorable terms.
Term Policies. Children's kindowments
This Company, while giving the insured the security of a paid-up Carlai, will divice the entire profits of the life business among its Policy holders.
Noneys received at interest, and paid on demand.
Authorized by charler to execute Trusts, and to actis Executor or Administrator, Assignee or Guardian, an in other fiduciary capacities, under appointment of any Court of this Commonwealth, or of any person or or some, or bodies pointe or corporate.

SAMUEL R. SHIPLEY, RICHARD CADBURY, JEREMIAH HACKER, HENRY HAINES, JOSHUA H. MORRIS, T. WISTAR BROWN,
RICHARD WOOD, WM. C. LONGSTRETH,
CHARLES F. COFFIN.

SAMUEL R. SHIPLEY, ROWLAND PARRY,
President, Actuary
THOMAS WISTAR, M. D., J. B. TOWNSEND,
TT'S Medica Examiner, Legal Adviser,

FIRE INSURANCE EXCLUSIVELY,—THE PENNSYLVANIA FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY-Incorporated 1825—Charter Perpetual—No. 510
WALNUT Street, opposite Independence Square.
This Company, inversely known to the community for over forty years, continue to insure against loss or damage by his on Public or Private Buildings, either permanently or for a limited time. Also on Furniture, Stocks of Goods, and Merchandise generally, on liberal Their Capital, together with a large Surplus Fund, invested in the most careful manner, which enables them to offer to the insured an undoubted security in the case of loss.

Daniel Smith, Jr.,
Alexander Henson,
Issae Hazlehurst,
I homas Robbins,
Daniel Baddock, Jr.,
DANIEL SMITH, Jr., President,
Conwell, Secretary,

M PANY

HENIX INSURANCE COMPANY OF PHILADELPHIA.

INCORPORATED 1864—CHARTER PERPETUAL.

No. 224 WALBUT Street, opposite the Exchange. In addition to MARINE and INLAND INSURANCE this Company insures from loss or damage by FIRE. or iberal terms on buildings, merchandise, furniture, etc., for imited periods, and permanently on buildings, by deposit or premium.

The Company has been in active operation for more than IXIY X EaRs, during which all losses have been promptly adjusted and paid.

John L. Hodge, Directors.

John L. Hodge,
b. B. Maheny,
John T. Lewis.
William S. Grant
Robert W. Leaning,
D. C'ark Wharion,
Samuel Wilcox,
JOHN WULHERER, President
SAMUEL WILCOX, Secretary.

UNITED STATES REVENUE STAMPS.— Principal Depot. No. 304 CHESNUT Street. Central Depot. No. 168 S FIFTH Street, one door below Chesnut. Established 1862

Revenue Stamps of every description constantly on hand in any smount.
Orders by Mail or Express promptly attended to.
United States Notes Draw on Philadelphia or New
York, or current funds received in payment.
Particular attention paid to small orders.
The decisions of the Cowmission can be consulted, and any information regarding the law cheerfully given

PHILADELPHIA SURGEONS
BANDAGE INSTITUTE, No. 14 R
NINTH Street, above Market.—B. C.
guarantees the skind adjustment of his Prantium
Fatent Graduating Freesure Truss, and a variety of others. Supporters, Elastic Stockings, Shoulous Braces
Crutches. Suspensories, etc. Ladies' spartments conucted by a lady.

6705

WATCHES, JEWELRY ETC.

LEWIS LADOMUS & CO DIAMOND DEALERS & JEWELERS. WATCHES, JEWELRY & SILVER WARE. WATCHES and JEWELRY REPAIRED. 802 Chestnut St., Phila.

CHRISTMAS MOLIDAY

AND BRIDAL PRESENTS. Have on hand a large and beautiful assertment of Watches, Jewelry, and Silverware, suitable for Christn as Holiday and Bridal Presents.

Particular attention solicited to our large assortment of Diamonds and Watches, Gold Chains for ladies' and gentlemen's wear. Also, Sleeve Buttons, Studs, and Seal Rings, in great variety, all of the newest styles.

FANCY SILVER-WARE, ESPECIALLY SUITED FOR BRIDAL GIFTS. We are daily receiving new goods selected expressly for the holiday sales. Our prices will be found as low, if not lower, than the same quality can be purchased also where
Fu chasers invited to call.
Diamonds and all precious stones, also, old Gold and
Si ver, purchased or taken in exchange.

WATCHES, JEWELRY. W. W. CASSIDY.

No. 13 SOUTH SECOND STREET Offers an entirely new and most carefully selected

JEWELRY, SILVERWARE, and PANCY ARTICLES OF EVERY

SAMERICAN AND GENEVA WATCHES,

DESCRIPTION, suitable for BRIDAL OR HOLIDAY PRESENTS. An examination will show my stock to be unsur passed in quality and cheapness. Particular attention paid to repairing.

BOWMAN & LEONARD, MANUFACTURERS OF WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DEALER

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

Those in want of SILVER or SILVER-PLATED WARE, will find it much to their advantage to visit our STOHE before making their purchases. Our long experience in the manuscture of the above kinds of goods embles us to dely competition.

We keep no goods but those which are of the FIRST-CLASS, all of Jar own make, and will be sold at reduced prices.

(MUSICAL BOXES

Large and small sizes, playing from 2 to 12 airs, and costing from \$5 to \$300. Our assortment comprises such choice melodies as-"Home, Sweet Home

"The Last Bose of Summer. "Auld Lang Syne." 'Star Spangled Banner." "My Old Kentucky Home," etc., etc., Besides beautiful selections from the various Operas Imported direct, and for sale at moderate prices, by

FARR & BROTHER. Importers of Watches, etc.,

1) Hamthirp] No. 324 CHESNUT St., below Fourth. HOLIDAY PRESENTS. Seventeenth and spring Garden,

JACOB HARLEY, (SUCCESSOR TO STAUFFER & HARLEY),

No. 622 MARKET ST.

A fine assortment of Watches, Diamonds, Jewelry,

Silver and Silver-plated Ware, suitable for Holiday and Bridal Presents. 12 Il tutbsim SILVER-WARE

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

Invite attention to their Choice Stock of SOLID 81LVER WARE, suitable for CHRISTM Ab and BRIDAL PRESENTS. HENRY HARPER, No. 520 ARCH Street,

> Fine Jewelry, Silver-Plated Ware,

Manuscturer and Dealer in

Solid Silver-Ware. RICH JEWELRY.

Watches

JOHN BRENNAN. DEALER IN DIAMONDS, FINE WATCHES, JEWELRY

9 205 13 S. EIGHTH ST., PHILADA. HOUSE-FURNISHING GOODS.

Etc. Etc. Etc.

EXCELLENT OPPORTUNITY TO SECURE BARGAINS.

To close the estate of the late

JOHN A. MURPHEY, Importer and Dealer in

HOUSE-FURNISHING GOODS, No. 922 CHESNUT STREET, Between Ninth and Tenth, South Side, Phila.

Between Sints and Tenth, South Side, Phila.

Illis Administrators now effor the whole stock at prices below the ordinary rates charged. This slock embraces every thing wanted in a well-ordered household:—Plain I in Ware. Brushes, Wooden Ware, Baskets, Plated ware. Cutlery, Iron Ware, Japanned Ware, and Cooklap Utensils of every description.

A liteat variety of SHARE & GOODS, BIRD-CAGES, et. otc., can be obtained on the most reasonable terms GENUINE ARCTIC REFHIJER ATORS and WATER O'HERS

A line assortment of PAPIER MACHE GOODS.

This is the largest retail establishment in this line in Philadelphia and citizens and strangers will find it to their advantage to examine our stock before purchasing.

Note—Our triends in the country may order by mall, and prompt attention will be given. (II I thata)

NITED STATES REVENUE STAMPS.—
Frincipal Depot No. 304 CHESNUT Street.
Central Depot No. 163 S. FIFTH Street, one door below
Chesnut. Established 1861.
Revenue Stamps of every description constantly on
hard in any smount.
Urders by highlor Express promptly attended to.

SHIRTS, FURNISHING GOODS, &c W. SCOTT & CO. SHIRT MANUFACTURERS.

IAND DEALERS IN MEN'S FURNISHING GOODS No. 814 CHESNUT Street, FOUR DOORS BELOW THE "CONTINENTAL.

PATENT SHOULDER-SEAM SHIRT MANUFACTORY; AND GENTLEMEN'S FURNISHING STORE

PHILADELPHIA

PERFECT FITTING SHIRTS AND DEAWER made from measurement at very short netice.
All other articles of GENTLEMES 8 DRESS GOODS in full variety. WINCHESTER & CO. No. 706 CHESNUT Stroot

GENTS' FURNISHING GOODS F. HOFFMAN, JR., (Late G. A. Hoffman, successor to W. W. Ruights FINE SHIRTS, AND WRAPPERS,

HOSIERY AND GLOVES, UNDER-CLOTHING.

LUMBER,

1867. SELECT WHITE PINE BOARDS

1867. AND PLANK.

CHOICE PANEL AND 1st COMMON, N feetlone.

44. 6-4. 6-4. 2. 25. 3 and 4 inch.

WHITE PINE, PANEL PATTERN PLANK
LANGE AND SUPERIOR STOCK ON HAND

1867. BUILDING! BUILDING

BUILDING!
LUMBER! LUMBER! LUMBER!

4-4 CAROLINA FLOORING.

5-4 CABOLINA FLOORING.

6-4 DELAWARE FLOORING.

6-4 DELAWARE FLOORING.

WHITE FINE FLOORING.

WHITE FINE FLOORING.

STEP BOARDS.

RAIL PLANK.

PLASTERING LATH.

1867.—CEDAR AND CYPRESS
LONG CEDAR SHINGLES.
SHORT CEDAR SHINGLES.
FINE ASSORTMENT FOR SALE LOW.
No. 1 CEDAR LOGS AND POSTS.
No. 1 CEDAR LOGS AND POSTS.

1867. LUMBER FOR UNDERTAKERS!
RED CEDAR, WALNUT, AND PINE.
RED CEDAR WALNUT, AND FINE.

1867. ALBANY LUMBER OF ALL KINDS
SEASONED WALNUT.
SEASONED WALNUT.
ORF OPLAR, CHERRY, AND ASE.
OAK PLANK AND BOARDS,
MAHOGANY
ROSEWOOD AND WALNUT VENERS. 1867. CIGAR-BOX MANUFACTURERS.

SPANISH CEDAR BOX BOARDS.

1867. SPRUCE JOIST! SPRUCE JOIST!

SPRUCE JOIST.

FROM 14 TO 22 FEET LONG.
SUPERIOR NORWAY SOANTLING.
SUPERIOR NORWAY SOANTLING.

MAULE. BEOTBER & GO.

11 22 6mrp

No. 2500 SOUTH STREET

F. H. WILLIAMS

LUMBER.

PHILADELPHIA. (1129 thatesta C. PERKINS.

LUMBER MERCHANT. Successor to R. Clark, Jr., NO. 324 CHRISTIAN STREET. Constantly on hand, a large and varied assortment of

CUTLERY, ETC. CUTLERY.

A fine assortment of POURET and
TABLE CUTLE MY, RAZORS, RAZOR STROPS, LADIES' SOISSORS
PAPER AND TAILORS SHEARS, ETC., at
L. V. HELMOLD'S
Cutlery Store, No. 125 South TENTH Street,
9 1851 FIRE AND BURGLAR PROOF SAFES EVANS & WATSON

MANUFACTURERS OF FIRE AND BURGLARDEOOF

> SAFES BESTGRED FOR

Bank, Mercantile, or Dwelling - Rouse G Established Over 25 Years Over 24,000 Safes in Uce. The only Bafes with Inside Bours. Never Lose their Fire-Proof Quality Guaranteed free from Dampness

WARERCOMS: No. 811 CHESNUT Street. PHILADELPHIA.

Sold at Prices Lower than other mainty



H. BURDSALL'S

ICE CREAM AND DINING SALOONS, No. 1121 CHESNUT St.,

GIRARD ROW. FRUIT AND POUND CAKES of all sizes, with a large assertment of CONFECTIONERY, etc., for the HOLIDAYS

CONFECTIONERY,

PERSONAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN 2 IN C