

THE NEW YORK PRESS.

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

Peace Prospects in Europe—A Congress of Sovereigns.

Those who are willing to believe in a sign of enduring peace may find some gleam of comfort in the cable telegram published in the Times of Sunday. The sovereigns of all the leading European powers and the Sultan of Turkey are to be in Paris at an early day. For what specific purpose we shall learn anon. The Exhibition must be an attraction, but it is difficult to see how it should bring together such an august company, just at one particular moment—for the date of their appearance in Paris is almost definitely fixed in the despatch. The Emperors of Russia and Austria, the King of Prussia, and the "sick" sovereign of Turkey are advertised at the Tuileries in about two weeks from Saturday last. The Queen of England's presence was pledged for the Exhibition some time ago. She is not, however, named in connection with the present gathering of crowned heads; but the omission may be accidental. Or, if it is not accidental, the meeting may be of none the less political significance.

The part which England seems desirous, hereafter, to play in the coming European Conference, is probably a less ambitious one than might have been supposed, looking to the rôle which Lord Stanley was believed to have played in the Luxembourg drama. The text of the treaty which was the result of the London Conference rather releases the British Government from obligations which have existed since the settlement of Vienna, than imposes upon it any new responsibilities. The guarantee for the final disavowal of the German relationship of the Dutch, by making it permanent appanage of Holland, so far as England is concerned, is not one either of an individual or separate character, but is collective in its nature. If the whole of the intervening powers can agree to act, in the event of future disputes, then England has pledged herself to act. If not, not.

There can be nothing clearer than the terms in which Lord Stanley put the case when questioned in the Commons as to the work of the Conference. Lord Derby's language in the Upper House was also unmistakable. The Queen's Government, in short, holds them selves, under the stipulations of the London treaty, to be absolved from pledges of active intervention, which have long been morally binding upon them. Referring to the text of the treaty as quoted by the Marquis de Moustier, in the French Legislative body, the French Minister very clearly desires it to be understood that, while the formal plea for a Conference on the Luxembourg question was made by the King of Holland, the inspiration of that plea came from the Sovereign of France. In the Minister's speech—whether by design or not we cannot say—the part taken by the British Secretary and his Royal Mistress in the matter of the Conference is entirely ignored. The friendly intervention which led to the Conference is credited, in terms as explicit as diplomatic politeness would permit, to the Grand Duke who proposed to make merchandise of his province, and to the Imperial capitalist who was ready to buy it.

From this development of the situation we gather that it is decidedly agreeable to France that England should be taken at her word, when she disclaims all desire to intervene actively in the future regulation of the political divisions of Europe. And if Lord Stanley and Lord Derby are sincere, as they must be assumed to be, in protesting that the British Government has now its feet cleaved of the smart and trammels of continental politics than before the recent Conference, the presence of the Queen at the promised meeting of sovereigns in Paris would hardly be looked for, even were it in accordance with British constitutional usages to assign ministerial duty to the sovereign in person. The Queen's direct appeal to her royal relative in Prussia, when the war crisis seemed to have been reached, was a timely, but altogether an extra constitutional act. Its influence was more purely personal than political, and was just one of those exceptional acts in the working of responsible government which justify themselves only by results.

The meeting of the four leading sovereigns of the Continent of Europe with the head and representative of the power whose position gives most cause of uneasiness to-day throughout Europe, is a fact to which more than ordinary significance will be attached. It is true, as everybody remembers, that within little more than two years after the first "World's Fair" when the nations seemed to have begun to fraternize in earnest, the war between Russia and the Anglo-French allies broke out. But the policy of Western Europe was then controlled by traditions, and by a class of statesmen that have passed away for good. The dread of Russian aggression has no such hold on the English or the French mind as it had fifteen or twenty years ago. A proposal to discuss the real position of the "sick man" would not, to-day, occasion the shout of alarm that it did when the Emperor Nicholas ventured to open his mind to Sir Hamilton Seymour. Englishmen and Frenchmen, equally with Austrians and Italians, could sit down and calmly contemplate the whole subject, not only in the light of that most fruitless of all conflicts—the Crimean war—but in view, as well, of the recent struggles of the Christian races to release themselves from the rule of the Mussulman. At Paris—if the Sultan should go thither—he is sure to hear what the decided opinion of Europe has come to be on the Cretan insurrection. There, if the Eastern question is not brought to a final and perfect solution, it may, at least, be looked at in its plain, naked aspect, and without unduly exciting jealousies or territorial aggrandizement by any one of the leading powers.

Simple Treason—The Issue Between Greeley and the Republicans.

Greeley justifies the release of Jeff. Davis on straw bail, because he has been lying in jail for two years "undictated for anything but simple treason." This "simple treason," in the eyes of Greeley, is nothing but a venal transgression, for which two years' imprisonment is sufficient atonement. If complicity in the assassination of President Lincoln—only a single victim out of the hundreds of thousands sacrificed to the Rebellion—could have been established against Jeff. Davis, or if he could have been held "in any manner responsible for the murder of our captured soldiers," that would have been altogether a different affair; but as he was "not even indicted" for those offenses, and only stood charged with "simple treason," Greeley considers himself fully justified in doing to him what he has done, and in proclaiming to the world his innocence of any serious crime.

This is precisely the point upon which the great mass of the loyal people of the Union will take issue with Greeley and his straw-bail operation. While very few persons believe that Jeff. Davis had an active share in the assassination of President Lincoln, everybody of common sense, and Greeley among the number, knows that the crime was the natural effect of the Rebellion and its exciting appeals to the prejudices and passions of reckless men. Jeff. Davis may not with his own hands have snatched the food from the starving Union soldiers at Andersonville, Salisburg, and Miller, or shot them down when in their despair they cast themselves beyond the "dead line" of their prison-pens; but as the head of the Rebel armies and the ruler of the Confederacy he had supreme power over his subordinates, and was responsible for the treatment of his prisoners. If the captured Rebels confined in the loyal States had been left to rot and die by the ten thousand in Northern prisons, would the Copperheads who now pat Greeley on the shoulder and pour sixty thousand dollars' worth of Corporation advertising into his lap, have acquitted the Republican President of all responsibility for their murder? The people hold that the Rebellion was a great crime, and not a "simple" and venial offense; and out of it grew the heavy sufferings of the nation; the loss of millions of treasure; the desolation of hundreds of thousands of homes; the horrors of the Confederate prison pens; the assassination of Lincoln, and all. They are not willing to allow the master spirit of the Rebellion to go unpunished, and the arm of the law to be paralyzed by the special pleas and quibbles put forth by Jeff. Davis' straw-bail. An incendiary who sets fire to a dwelling does not directly take the lives of the victims who perish in the flames; but he is nevertheless held responsible for their fate, and suffers the penalty awarded to wilful murder.

The cry of the Republican party, and Greeley among the rest, has been "punish the Rebel leaders and let the misled masses go." The principal count in their indictment against Andrew Johnson is, that he has shown too much leniency and sympathy towards the leading Rebels. But now Greeley turns round and stultifies his party and justifies Johnson by fawning upon the great head of the Rebellion, the arch-traitor of all traitors, the author of the treasonable Confederate Government, and securing his release from jail and his escape from punishment. It is for this offense that the Republicans of the West, and of the whole country, indict Horace Greeley as a black sheep in the flock; and all the "narrow-minded blockheads" of the Union League Club cannot release him from the charge on straw bail.

Treason in Civil War.

Can a Government which, after a long and arduous struggle, has put down an organized and formidable Rebellion, proceed to try and punish its defeated adversaries as traitors? This question is readily answered in the affirmative by ignorance and passion—perhaps also by wisdom and calm judgment. Let us inquire and consider.

Unquestionably, a Government may refuse from the outset to recognize its domestic foes as belligerents, engaged in lawful war. It may say to them, as Maximilian did to his Mexican adversaries—"You are not warriors, but banditti—brigands, robbers—whom, if captured by my armies, I shall treat as arrested felons." But this is a two-edged sword, as Max. is very likely to discover. The Government which treats its enemies as felons must expect to have its adherents so treated by those adherents—to have its soldiers shot or hung, when captured, if it shoots and hangs those whom it captures. Whatever rule it acts upon will surely work both ways.

On the main question, the doctrine generally held by American statesmen and publicists prior to 1860, will be succinctly set forth by Daniel Webster in his address on laying the corner-stone of Bunker Hill Monument (June 17, 1825), wherein he says of the consequences of that memorable combat:—"The battle of Bunker Hill was attended with the most important effects and its immediate result as a military engagement. It created at once a state of open, public war, and thus had no longer a question of treason or rebellion. That fearful crisis was past. The appeal now lay to the sword; and the question was, whether the spirit and the resources of the people would hold out till the object should be accomplished."

Bear in mind that our fathers had not even declared their independence on the 17th of June, 1776, when they fought at Bunker Hill; nay, they had not definitely resolved on separation from the mother country. In the eyes of British law, and of the law of nations, for that matter—they were simply rebels, resisting the authority and the army of their legitimate king. Yet Mr. Webster holds that the naked fact that they resisted in battle array, under the command of their constituted local authorities, precluded any civil proceedings against them as "individuals guilty of treason or rebellion."

Of course, Mr. Webster did not originate this doctrine. He was not the man to do the like of that. He found it in history, and in the eye of British law, and of the law of nations, for that matter—they were simply rebels, resisting the authority and the army of their legitimate king. Yet Mr. Webster holds that the naked fact that they resisted in battle array, under the command of their constituted local authorities, precluded any civil proceedings against them as "individuals guilty of treason or rebellion."

James Otis, the Wyclif or John Huss of our Revolution, Alexander Hamilton (in the *Federalist*), and all our Revolutionary publicists of any authority, refer to and quote from Vattel's "Law of Nations" as setting forth the judgment of the civilized world in accordance with the doctrines of Webster and Washington above cited. Vattel, in his chapter on "Civil War," says:—"But what conduct shall the sovereign observe towards the insurgents? In general, such conduct as shall at the same time be the most consonant to justice, and the most salutary to the State. Subjects who rise against their prince without cause deserve severe punishment; yet, even in this case, on account of the number of the delinquents, clemency becomes a duty in the sovereign. A civil war breaks the bonds of society and government, or, at least, suspends their force and effect. In process of time the nation divides into two independent parties, who consider each other as enemies, and acknowledge no common judge. These two parties, therefore, must necessarily be considered as themselves consulting, at least for a time, separate and distinct societies. Though one of the parties may have been to blame in breaking the unity of the State and resisting the authority, they are not the less divided in fact. Besides, whoever judges them, he is obliged to consider them as two nations who engage in a contest, and being unable to come to an agreement, have recourse to arms. This being the case, it is very evident that the common law and the law of nations are observed by both parties in every civil war. For the same reasons which render the observance of those maxims a matter of obligation between State and State, it becomes equally, and even more necessary in the unhappy circumstances of two increased parties contending their common rights. Thus there exists in the State two separate bodies, who pretend to absolute independence, and between whom there is no judge. They decide their quarrel by arms (not courts of civil law), and as two different nations would do. The obligation to observe the common laws of war towards each other is therefore, absolutely and indispensably binding on both parties, and the law of nations applies to them as to all nations in transactions between State and State."

No Treason—The National Debt a National Swindle.

The voice of the people rises with disappointment and indignation at the conduct of those who favored and have been instrumental in the escape of the arch traitor, Jeff. Davis. We have rarely witnessed a more general and spontaneous expression of public sentiment. The release of Davis on straw bail, which is really the abandonment of the charge of treason on the part of the Government and Judiciary, satisfies no one, except a few uneducated secessionists. It leaves everything unsettled; it makes the war a farce; it shows that half a million of brave men have been slain for naught, and that three thousand millions of national debt, contracted to put down treason and to make it odious, is a swindle. Had Davis been tried and the laws vindicated, had the crime of treason been fixed and defined, and stamped with that odium which the authorities talked so much about, and which would have made men shudder hereafter at the thought of committing it, the people would not have complained. They might have been naggish even, and have consented to Executive clemency to the offenders. But now nothing is settled, and they ask, is there treason or is there not in this conduct? All the parties to this infamous fraud upon the public are conscience-stricken, or, rather, they are stricken with fear of the consequences to themselves; for it is doubtful if they have any conscience in the matter. Having committed the deed, they suddenly wake up to a sense of the evil done, like the assassin Booth, and appeal to the public with all sorts of lame excuses and special pleading. The President pleads want of authority or jurisdiction, and throws the responsibility on Congress and the Judiciary. Congress did nothing, and the Executive. Chief Justice Chase, whose duty it was especially to see that the traitor should be tried, and treason punished, positively refused to act, and now tries to make the District Judge, the pliant Dogberry Underwood, responsible. Underwood, acting under instructions from Mr. Chase and the Administration, undoubtedly made a great fuss about the heinous crime of treason, and then let the traitor go on his own bail. Greeley, who pretends to represent the loyal North, and the Republican party in particular, went all the way to Richmond to influence his radical friend, Underwood, and to volunteer bail for the liberation of the traitor, now makes a pitiful defense of his conduct. "Bots, the bitter enemy of Rebels, and of Davis, the chief one, especially, was another of these volunteers and encouraged by the aid of Greeley, who is pretending to represent the loyal North, and the Republican party in particular, went all the way to Richmond to influence his radical friend, Underwood, and to volunteer bail for the liberation of the traitor, now makes a pitiful defense of his conduct. Bots, the bitter enemy of Rebels, and of Davis, the chief one, especially, was another of these volunteers and encouraged by the aid of Greeley, who is pretending to represent the loyal North, and the Republican party in particular, went all the way to Richmond to influence his radical friend, Underwood, and to volunteer bail for the liberation of the traitor, now makes a pitiful defense of his conduct. Bots, the bitter enemy of Rebels, and of Davis, the chief one, especially, was another of these volunteers and encouraged by the aid of Greeley, who is pretending to represent the loyal North, and the Republican party in particular, went all the way to Richmond to influence his radical friend, Underwood, and to volunteer bail for the liberation of the traitor, now makes a pitiful defense of his conduct."

No Treason—The National Debt a National Swindle.

The interest in the late lamented Mr. Lincoln. To "kick a man upstairs" was long ago pronounced by Sir Robert Walpole a profoundly wise maxim in political rivalry, and what he believed he practised in the case of Pulteney, whom he extinguished as a competitor in the Commons by clapping a coronet on him among the Peers. Possibly Mr. Lincoln had never heard of Sir Robert Walpole's tactics, but he applied them admirably in the case of Mr. Chase; and it has been hinted by persons of a comical turn of mind that Mr. Chase has neither entertained a very lively feeling of gratitude towards the late leader of his party in acknowledgment of the prebend bestowed upon him, nor hesitated to express upon occasion some pretty trenchant opinions as to the general candor and amenability of the President to whose names, as Dr. Butler persistently maintains, a mighty nation thought it necessary to sacrifice the life of an innocent woman.

But it hardly needs any reference to the political relations between Mr. Chase and Mr. Lincoln to explain the crushing contempt with which the former has just "come down" upon another of the latter's judicial appointees. If Mr. Lincoln is thought to have made Mr. Chase a Chief Justice just to get him off the Presidential track, he is believed to have nominated Busted to the Federal bench in Alabama, and Underwood to the same bench in Virginia, simply to relieve the former of a very lively feeling of gratitude towards the late leader of his party in acknowledgment of the prebend bestowed upon him, nor hesitated to express upon occasion some pretty trenchant opinions as to the general candor and amenability of the President to whose names, as Dr. Butler persistently maintains, a mighty nation thought it necessary to sacrifice the life of an innocent woman.

Chase on Underwood.

It is well understood, we believe, that Chief Justice Chase was indebted for his nomination to the Supreme Bench much more to the fears than to the respect of the late lamented Mr. Lincoln. To "kick a man upstairs" was long ago pronounced by Sir Robert Walpole a profoundly wise maxim in political rivalry, and what he believed he practised in the case of Pulteney, whom he extinguished as a competitor in the Commons by clapping a coronet on him among the Peers. Possibly Mr. Lincoln had never heard of Sir Robert Walpole's tactics, but he applied them admirably in the case of Mr. Chase; and it has been hinted by persons of a comical turn of mind that Mr. Chase has neither entertained a very lively feeling of gratitude towards the late leader of his party in acknowledgment of the prebend bestowed upon him, nor hesitated to express upon occasion some pretty trenchant opinions as to the general candor and amenability of the President to whose names, as Dr. Butler persistently maintains, a mighty nation thought it necessary to sacrifice the life of an innocent woman.

But what will be the consequence of letting the Rebel chief go without being tried? How will the people interpret this act? Will they not argue that if there be no treason, the war was in vain and is fruitless? There is no such in the public mind a degree of consternation and doubt. The action of the Government and Judiciary has unsettled it. Is there treason or is there not? is the question every one asks. Soon, if we mistake not, the people will interpret the action of the Government, the Chief Justice, Underwood, Greeley, and of all the rest, as repudiating treason, and as declaring the war a failure in its results. If so, will they not regard the national debt, a national swindle, and repudiate that as readily as the crime of treason has been repudiated? They will say naturally enough that they ought not to be burdened with a debt of three thousand millions and upwards, reckoning the debt of the States as well as of the General Government, for nothing. They will ask why they should be taxed a hundred and fifty to two hundred millions a year, when they have been cheated in the object and results of the war. Is there treason or is there not? This is the question of the time, before which every other must give way. It involves the security of our Government hereafter and the payment or repudiation of the national debt. Understanding the action of the Government and the Judiciary as virtually declaring there is no such crime as treason, we should not be surprised to see, within five years, the debt created by the war repudiated as an imposition and a fraud. That, in fact, would be the logical consequence of letting treason go untried and unpunished. If there be no treason the war was all wrong, and the national debt is a national swindle.

The Opinion of the Attorney-General.

The opinion of the Attorney-General upon the clauses in the Reconstruction acts respecting the rights to vote and to hold office, has in itself evidence of its necessity; for the questions which have arisen needed to be decided by the highest executive authority. Five military commanders might otherwise make five different interpretations of a law which needs to be uniformly enforced in the States in which it is operative. Whether Mr. Stansbury correctly defines the limits of the law is another and important question, not fully to be examined at present. The Attorney-General recites the provisions of the law which affect the right to vote and hold office, and attempts to define those classes who are entitled to registration; the qualifications of residence and age are comparatively unimportant. Of chief interest is the extent to which taking part in the Rebellion is a disqualification from voting. Mr. Stansbury elaborately examines the meaning of the act which excludes officers who have taken part in the Rebellion, and decides that officers of the militia are not included; that the act does not apply to municipal officers, and that with all those who are not strictly State, Judicial, or Executive officers, the uncertain definition, which he contends exists in the law, must be construed in favor of the voter. A vast body of officers, he asserts, are not positively excluded by the law. The disqualification based on the breaking of the oath of office is the next subject of the opinion, which is given to this effect—that the disqualification is intended to comprehend military as well as civil officers, and to be more general in application to United States officers than to those of a State. Of more practical importance is the next question—what acts constitute the guilt of engaging in rebellion, or of giving comfort or aid to the enemies of the United States? As these acts are defined, the number of voters is to be restricted or enlarged. Mr. Stansbury advances the extraordinary opinion that the phrase "enemies of the United States" should be strictly confined to what he asserts to be its legal meaning, viz., foreign nations, and that only such as those who gave aid and comfort to Great Britain in 1812, and to Mexico in 1847, should be disfranchised under the clause. Yet he is "not quite prepared to say that Congress may not have used it as applicable to the Rebellion." It is well that he was not quite prepared to make such a decision, for if there is anything clear and unmistakable in the law, it is that Congress meant absolutely the enemies of the United States who fought at Gettysburg and Atlanta, and not by any means those who were defeated forty years ago on the Lakes, or at Monterey and Buena Vista. This meaning cannot be escaped, and the Attorney-General, therefore, gives it weight. It will be seen that he would not include in the disfranchised classes those who were compelled to aid in Rebellion, conscripts, slaves, and officers who, in obedience to *de facto* governments, were concerned with the administration of law. Purely civil and necessary officers he cannot bring himself to believe were meant by Congress, and upon this point the argument is very full. We cannot say that the Attorney-General has stated his opinion very emphatically, or tersely, though for this he may plead the alleged uncertainty and vagueness of the acts themselves. But the drift of his argument may be summed up to be, in his own words—"The intent (of the acts) as expressed, is to enable the people of each of these States to frame a Constitution for the State by the exercise of the right of suffrage. There are clauses of the act giving the right by general terms of description to the people generally, and especially to those who have never enjoyed the right before. There are other clauses of the act which, by general terms, take away this right of suffrage from those who have always enjoyed it. The rule of construction as to the clauses which give the right must be liberal, and to them the general terms are not to be restricted, but to those clauses which derogate from the existing right the rule of construction must be strict, that none should be excluded who are not clearly within the letter and intent." With this general construction we are satisfied, but not with the special opinions based upon it.

UNION LEAGUE HOUSE. MAY 15, 1867. At a meeting of the Board of Directors of the UNION LEAGUE OF PHILADELPHIA, held March 15, 1867, the following Preamble and Resolutions were adopted:— Whereas, In a republican form of government it is of the highest importance that the delegates to the people, to whom the sovereign power is entrusted, should be so selected as to truly represent the body politic, and there being no provision of law whereby the people may be organized for the purpose of such selection, and all parties having recognized the necessity of such organization by the formation of voluntary associations for this purpose, and Whereas, There are grave defects existing under the present system of voluntary organization, which it is believed may be corrected by suitable provisions of law; now, therefore, be it Resolved, By the Board of Directors of the UNION LEAGUE OF PHILADELPHIA, that the Secretary be and is hereby directed to offer eleven hundred dollars in prizes for essays on the legal organization of the people to select candidates for office, the prizes to be as follows, viz.:— The sum of five hundred dollars for that essay which, in the judgment of the Board, shall be first in the order of merit; Three hundred dollars for the second; Two hundred for the third, and One hundred for the fourth. The conditions upon which these prizes are offered are as follows, viz.:— First, All essays competing for these prizes must be addressed to GEORGE H. BOKER, Secretary of the Union League of Philadelphia, and must be received by him before the FIRST DAY OF JANUARY, 1868, and no communication having the author's name attached, or with any other indication of origin, will be considered. Second, Accompanying every competing essay, the author must enclose his name and address within a sealed envelope, addressed to the Secretary of the Union League. After the awards have been made, the envelopes accompanied by the successful essays shall be opened, and the authors notified of the result. Third, All competing essays shall become the property of the Union League; but no publication of rejected essays, or the names of their authors, shall be made without consent of the authors in writing. By order of the Board of Directors, GEORGE H. BOKER, SECRETARY. 510 1/2m

REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION.

HARBERSBURG, April 16, 1867. — The "Republican State Convention" will meet at the "Herold House," in Williamsburg, Pennsylvania, on the 19th inst. at 10 o'clock A. M. to nominate a candidate for Judge of the Supreme Court, and to initiate proper measures for the coming State canvass. As heretofore, the Convention will be composed of Representatives and Senators from the several counties of the State, and equal in number to the whole of the Senators and Representatives in the General Assembly. By order of the State Central Committee, GEORGE W. HAMERSON, Chairman, J. JORDAN, Chairman, J. ROBBY DUNGLISON, Secretary. 520 2 1/2m

UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, E. D.

OFFICE, NO. 424 WALNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA, MAY 21, 1867. THE INTEREST IN GOLD, ON THE FIRST MORTGAGE BONDS OF THE UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, EASTERN DIVISION, DUE JUNE 1, will be paid on presentation of the Coupons thereon, on and after that date, at the Banking House of

DABNEY, MORGAN & CO., NO. 53 EXCHANGE PLACE, New York.

(Signed) WILLIAM J. PALMER, Treasurer.

THE OFFICE OF THE Liverpool, New York, and Philadelphia Steamship Company, "Inman Line," Has been removed from No. 111 WALNUT Street, to

NO. 411 CHESNUT STREET, JOHN G. DALE, Agent.

OFFICE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY.

PHILADELPHIA, May 4, 1867. The Board of Directors have this day declared a semi-annual dividend of three per cent on the Capital Stock of the Company, clear of National and State Taxes, payable on and after May 15th. They have also declared an EXTRA DIVIDEND OF FIVE PER CENT, based upon profits earned prior to January 1st, 1867, payable in full on or after May 15th, at its full value. Fifty dollars per share—the shares for Stock Dividend will not be entitled to any interest or Dividend, but will be convertible into stock when presented in sums of Fifty Dollars. Powers of attorney for collection of any interest or Dividend, will be received by any Director. The Transfer Books of the Company will be closed on SATURDAY, the 4th day of MAY next, and will be opened on TUESDAY, the 4th day of JUNE—Dated 4th day of MAY, 1867. By order, THOMAS T. FIRTH, Treasurer. 423 1/2m

NOTICE—THE NEW ORLEANS REPUBLICAN CONVENTION.

A public meeting will be held at the residence of J. W. Scott & Co., No. 310 Chestnut Street, on Monday, the 28th day of MAY next, at 10 o'clock, for the purpose of electing a large number of business men to the Board of Directors for the ensuing year, and for the transaction of any other business which may be brought before them. The Transfer Books of the Company will be closed on SATURDAY, the 4th day of MAY next, and will be opened on TUESDAY, the 4th day of JUNE—Dated 4th day of MAY, 1867. By order, H. C. BRYANT, Secy. 5 1/2 1/2m

NATIONAL BANK OF THE REPUBLIC, PHILADELPHIA, May 3, 1867.

Applications for the unalotted shares in the increase of the Capital Stock of this Bank are now being received and the stock delivered. 5 1/2 m JOSEPH P. MUMFORD, Cashier.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SPRING CREEK OIL COMPANY will be held at No. 34 North FRONT Street, on WEDNESDAY, May 29, at 12 o'clock M.

A. S. ROBINSON

No. 910 CHESNUT STREET, Is in receipt to-day of an invoice of

FINE CHROMOS, ENGRAVINGS, ETC., ETC., Which are now open for examination.

"Peace and War" by G. Doros, "Last Rose of Summer," "Crown and Family," "Rome and Juliet," "Star of Bethlehem," are well worthy the attention of the admirers of art. 49

CARPETS, CANTON MATTINGS, OIL CLOTHS, GREAT VARIETY, LOWEST CASH PRICES.

REEVE L. KNIGHT & SON,

NO. 807 CHESNUT STREET, (Bet. w the Girard House).

SPECIAL NOTICES.

UNION LEAGUE HOUSE, MAY 15, 1867.

At a meeting of the Board of Directors of the UNION LEAGUE OF PHILADELPHIA, held March 15, 1867, the following Preamble and Resolutions were adopted:— Whereas, In a republican form of government it is of the highest importance that the delegates to the people, to whom the sovereign power is entrusted, should be so selected as to truly represent the body politic, and there being no provision of law whereby the people may be organized for the purpose of such selection, and all parties having recognized the necessity of such organization by the formation of voluntary associations for this purpose, and Whereas, There are grave defects existing under the present system of voluntary organization, which it is believed may be corrected by suitable provisions of law; now, therefore, be it Resolved, By the Board of Directors of the UNION LEAGUE OF PHILADELPHIA, that the Secretary be and is hereby directed to offer eleven hundred dollars in prizes for essays on the legal organization of the people to select candidates for office, the prizes to be as follows, viz.:— The sum of five hundred dollars for that essay which, in the judgment of the Board, shall be first in the order of merit; Three hundred dollars for the second; Two hundred for the third, and One hundred for the fourth. The conditions upon which these prizes are offered are as follows, viz.:— First, All essays competing for these prizes must be addressed to GEORGE H. BOKER, Secretary of the Union League of Philadelphia, and must be received by him before the FIRST DAY OF JANUARY, 1868, and no communication having the author's name attached, or with any other indication of origin, will be considered. Second, Accompanying every competing essay, the author must enclose his name and address within a sealed envelope, addressed to the Secretary of the Union League. After the awards have been made, the envelopes accompanied by the successful essays shall be opened, and the authors notified of the result. Third, All competing essays shall become the property of the Union League; but no publication of rejected essays, or the names of their authors, shall be made without consent of the authors in writing. By order of the Board of Directors, GEORGE H. BOKER, SECRETARY. 510 1/2m

REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION.

HARBERSBURG, April 16, 1867. — The "Republican State Convention" will meet at the "Herold House," in Williamsburg, Pennsylvania, on the 19th inst. at 10 o'clock A. M. to nominate a candidate for Judge of the Supreme Court, and to initiate proper measures for the coming State canvass. As heretofore, the Convention will be composed of Representatives and Senators from the several counties of the State, and equal in number to the whole of the Senators and Representatives in the General Assembly. By order of the State Central Committee, GEORGE W. HAMERSON, Chairman, J. JORDAN, Chairman, J. ROBBY DUNGLISON, Secretary. 520 2 1/2m

UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, E. D.

OFFICE, NO. 424 WALNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA, MAY 21, 1867. THE INTEREST IN GOLD, ON THE FIRST MORTGAGE BONDS OF THE UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, EASTERN DIVISION, DUE JUNE 1, will be paid on presentation of the Coupons thereon, on and after that date, at the Banking House of

DABNEY, MORGAN & CO., NO. 53 EXCHANGE PLACE, New York.

(Signed) WILLIAM J. PALMER, Treasurer.

THE OFFICE OF THE Liverpool, New York, and Philadelphia Steamship Company, "Inman Line," Has been removed from No. 111 WALNUT Street, to

NO. 411 CHESNUT STREET, JOHN G. DALE, Agent.

OFFICE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY.

PHILADELPHIA, May 4, 1867. The Board of Directors have this day declared a semi-annual dividend of three per cent on the Capital Stock of the Company, clear of National and State Taxes, payable on and after May 15th. They have also declared an EXTRA DIVIDEND OF FIVE PER CENT, based upon profits earned prior to January 1st, 1867, payable in full on or after May 15th, at its full value. Fifty dollars per share—the shares for Stock Dividend will not be entitled to any interest or Dividend, but will be convertible into stock when presented in sums of Fifty Dollars. Powers of attorney for collection of any interest or Dividend, will be received by any Director. The Transfer Books of the Company will be closed on SATURDAY, the 4th day of MAY next, and will be opened on TUESDAY, the 4th day of JUNE—Dated 4th day of MAY, 1867. By order, THOMAS T. FIRTH, Treasurer. 423 1/2m

NOTICE—THE NEW ORLEANS REPUBLICAN CONVENTION.

A public meeting will be held at the residence of J. W. Scott & Co., No. 310 Chestnut Street, on Monday, the 28th day of MAY next, at 10 o'clock, for the purpose of electing a large number of business men to the Board of Directors for the ensuing year, and for the transaction of any other business which may be brought before them. The Transfer Books of the Company will be closed on SATURDAY, the 4th day of MAY next, and will be opened on TUESDAY, the 4th day of JUNE—Dated 4th day of MAY, 1867. By order, H. C. BRYANT, Secy. 5 1/2 1/2m

NATIONAL BANK OF THE REPUBLIC, PHILADELPHIA, May 3, 1867.

Applications for the unalotted shares in the increase of the Capital Stock of this Bank are now being received and the stock delivered. 5 1/2 m JOSEPH P. MUMFORD, Cashier.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SPRING CREEK OIL COMPANY will be held at No. 34 North FRONT Street, on WEDNESDAY, May 29, at 12 o'clock M.

A. S. ROBINSON

No. 910 CHESNUT STREET, Is in receipt to-day of an invoice of

FINE CHROMOS, ENGRAVINGS, ETC., ETC., Which are now open for examination.

"Peace and War" by G. Doros, "Last Rose of Summer," "Crown and Family," "Rome and Juliet," "Star of Bethlehem," are well worthy the attention of the admirers of art. 49

REMOVED.

OUR BEDDING STORE

IN REMOVED FROM THE OLD STAND TO

No. 11 South NINTH Street.

R. L. KNIGHT & SON.

MILLINERY, TRIMMINGS, ETC.

SPRING AND SUMMER

FASHIONS

BONNETS

HATS, FLOWERS,

FEATHERS,

BRIDAL WREATHS, RIBBONS,

LACES, ORNAMENTS,

FRAMES, ETC., ETC., ETC.

NOW OPEN,

THE ABOVE FLETTED STOCK

MILLINERY GOODS,

AT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF

MAD'LE KEOGH,

No. 904 WALNUT ST.,

WHOSE ELEGANT SHOW ROOMS have already been visited by numerous purchasers and she respectfully announces that she is constantly receiving NEW STYLES, and selling always at LOW PRICES.

MOURNING MILLINERY

RECEIVES AT HER ESTABLISHMENT MOST SPECIAL ATTENTION, AND THEREFORE SHE OFFERS THE BEST STOCK OF

MOURNING BONNETS

IN THE CITY.