

SPiRiT OF THE PRESS.

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

Partisan Expenditures.

We have to shoot so many lies on the wing around home that we can only afford to spend our powder on distant game when it is very large. A Mr. Eden, who is running against General Palmer for Governor of Illinois, somewhat as a bull would run against a locomotive, has discovered that the revenues of the Government for three years have been \$500,000,000 a year, and he calls on the Republican party to explain what they have done with the \$1,500,000,000 of the people's money.

The question displays the same charming modesty which Judas Iscariot might have shown had he demanded of the eleven in what manner of dissipation and devilry they had been squandering the apostolic treasury, when Judas himself carried the bag. But the minority apostle did not venture to put a question which would have placed him eternally on a par with the modern Democracy.

However, as Mr. Eden probably does not know what the money was paid for, and as the Chicago Times asserts that it was "squandered for partisan objects," it is well to see what objects the Democratic party regard as being of interest only to the Republicans. During the three years beginning July 1, 1865, there were paid out of these revenues for interest on the public debt an average of \$140,000,000 a year, or for the three years exactly \$418,484,865.

Therefrom we infer that to pay the interest on the public debt is a Republican partisan object, in which Democrats have no lot nor sympathy. They loaned no money to feed, clothe, and pay out soldiers; they own no bonds, and would pay no interest.

In the first six months after the close of the war, there were paid \$233,491,778 as back pay and transportation to send our soldiers to their homes. This, too, according to Governor Eden and the Democratic journals, was a Republican "squandering of money on partisan objects."

In order to make it Democratic or non-partisan, our soldiers should have been sent home beggars and penniless, or the money should have been equally divided between the armies of Grant and those of Lee. Still more Democratic would it have been to lump the Union and Rebel debts into one, and then repudiate the whole.

Out of the same sum \$49,382,850 were paid in bounties to Union soldiers only. Clearly a Republican "squandering of money on partisan objects," as no bounties were paid to Rebels.

Eleven million dollars more were paid to Union men for property lost and destroyed during the war. As none of this was intentionally paid to Rebels for property destroyed by the Union armies, this also was "money squandered on partisan objects."

Should the Democrats come into power they would rectify this injustice by paying Rebels for the devastations committed by the Union armies on the property of Rebels. This is what the Albany Argus means by saying that the "unascertained" debt of the United States amounts to about two and a half times the ascertained debt, or \$1,000,000,000.

The balance of the debt will never be "ascertained" until the Democrats come into power. Ten million three hundred and thirty thousand dollars were reimbursed to Northern States for sums advanced by them to aid in suppressing the Rebellion. This is clearly partisan and Republican, as not a dollar was reimbursed to the Rebel States, nor to the New York rioters, nor the Sons of Liberty, nor the St. Albans raiders, nor the Confederate bondholders, nor the English pirates and blockade-runners, for the losses incurred by them in sustaining the Democratic Rebellion.

Sixty million dollars were paid to the navy, the brave sailors of Farragut, Porter, and Foote, for back pay and contracts made during the war. As nothing was paid to Semmes, Lynch, and the Rebel pirates, this is evidently "money squandered on partisan objects."

So are the \$185,426,127 paid in army expenses, including those of our Indian war, and the \$50,000,000 paid in pensions, and \$73,000,000 paid in the expenses of the navy, and the \$247,000,000 paid toward reducing the principal of the debt.

It is rather more difficult to explain how the \$147,373,969 paid during the three years as the ordinary expenses of the Government or civil list, almost wholly to Johnson's forty-one thousand Democratic office-holders, who are now contributing to pay the expenses of buying votes for Seymour and Blair, can be regarded as "money squandered for partisan objects," though doubtless some of it may inadvertently find its way into political channels.

Then the expenses of reconstruction, \$2,344,700, were so equally divided between the Democratic "policy" governments set up by President Johnson, and the final State Governments authorized by Congress, as to render the pickings moderate, when it is considered that the officers of both Governments have stood nearly as much change of being murdered by the Rebels and Ku-Klux as of being paid.

die. Indeed, they would have it that he was only a remorseless butcher and blunderer in the war and only a cunning trickster in the Cabinet. Holding up the Rebel General Lee as the model of military leaders, they have still contended that the conqueror of Lee blundered along from the Wilderness to Appomattox Court House. Of course this sort of party warfare rapidly rallied "the Boys in Blue" and the loyal people of the war standing behind them around the banner of Grant, as the same campaigning against General Jackson rallied the honest masses of the people around him forty years ago.

In the next place, the constellation of the political and military leaders of the Rebellion who figured so largely in the Tammany Convention were permitted from the outset to proclaim that in the election of Seymour "their lost cause would be regained; and accepting this appeal from Appomattox Court House to the Tammany Convention the Union party of the war are all in line again, and are resolved to reaffirm, under Grant, the settlement of Lee's surrender. And yet, again, in the outset of the canvass the independent press was favorably inclined towards the Democratic party in view of the excesses and wasteful extravagances of the dominant radicals. But certain self-sufficient and basely envious Democratic organs undertook the absurd experiment of a moral crusade against every independent journal which would not fling up its cap and hurrah for Seymour according to instructions from the Manhattan ring.

This absurd experiment, like that of the scandalous abuse of General Grant as citizen, civilian, and soldier, has only operated to plague the inventors. The independent press still flourishes as the representative of an independent public opinion, while the self-sufficient Democratic organs aforesaid are evidently falling into the sere and yellow leaf before the first frost. It is a passing strange that in this campaign our Democratic managers, leaders, and organs appear to have forgotten, not only the lessons of the war as given in the general run of the elections since 1860, but the instructions of all our great elections of the last forty years. Their budget of blunders embraces the blunders of the Adams party of 1826, the blunders of the Van Buren party of 1840, of the Cass party of 1848, the blunders of poor Pierce and Buchanan, the blunders of the Southern oligarchy at Charleston in 1860 and the blunders of the Democracy at Chicago in 1864, all rolled together. With such a load upon his back what hope is there for Seymour, nominated to fight over again the last and most disastrous campaign of McClellan? Echo answers, none.

The Radicals and the War.

Considering that the radicals claim to have been the "war-party" of the North, it is rather remarkable that they should be profoundly in the dark as to the history of the war. They celebrated on Thursday night the anniversary of the battle of Antietam, with a loud national victory. But we have always understood from the Tribune that General McClellan, who certainly commanded the army which triumphed at Antietam, was a "Rebel" and from the Times that he was incapable of victory. Clearly, therefore, Antietam either was no victory at all, or it was a "Rebel" victory, or—dreadful alternative—the radicals are a crew of noodies!

At this same meeting, too, General Sickles, a colonel of the regular army, who disgraces his uniform daily by taking money for partisan speeches while drawing his pay as an officer of the United States, was hailed by the audience as the "hero of Gettysburg." It has been commonly supposed that the battle of Gettysburg was fought by General Meade, and that it was won in spite of the monstrous blunders committed by this same "General" Sickles. Now that General Meade has done his best to earn the favor of the radicals by shutting up negroes in sweating boxes to make them bear false witness against Southern white men, it is rather hard upon him that a stumping stipendiary of the "Loyal Leaguers" should get from them the credit of his military achievements!

Patriotism, Democratic and Radical.

The Tribune, which not only in "October, 1861," but for months afterwards, maintained the right of the South to secede from the Union, and then turned its back on the American colonists in 1776 to throw off the yoke of the usurping British Parliament, now abuses Horatio Seymour for declaring in October, 1861, that the Southern people were entitled to that protection for their slave property "which the Government guaranteed to them by its terms." It is perfectly natural, we suppose, that the terms of a solemn constitutional compact should be regarded as of little account by a journal which openly derided during the impeachment the notion that Senators ought to be bound by their oaths.

Then the Tribune— "There were large slaveholders who said, 'If we must lose either slavery or the Union, take our negroes and leave us our country!'" Horatio Seymour felt differently. "Large slaveholders," of course, had a right to give up their property for their country; but it is rather in the vein of Artemus Ward proposing to shed the last drop of the blood of his wife's last relation for his country's sake, to assert that Horatio Seymour ought to have been willing to sacrifice other people's slaves. The Democratic notion of patriotism is that a man should respect other people's rights and his own obligations. The radical notion is that a man should make handsome sacrifices of other people's property, and interpret contracts for himself exclusively.

Rebel Leaders and the Republican Press.

The Boston Post, in its desire to vindicate Wade Hampton and the Southern extremists, suppresses one or two slightly important facts. It says:— "Three years ago the radical papers were speaking in admiration of Wade Hampton's frank and manly course in advising the people of South Carolina, white and black, to begin and profit by the costly lessons of the war, and to place themselves in harmonious relations with the Union without delay. Now the same papers, in a tone of violent hostility, have denounced the Rebel who was in the South. Yet they do not show that he has changed at all in his sentiments for the Union. It is rather curious to find the mischief of his growing usurpations, for which it has over and over again been condemned, and just as how long ago was it that these journals were proclaiming in the very rosiest terms that the men of the South who openly fought us in the field, were the ones to become the firmest friends in a state of peace? Yet we have meagrely in a National Democratic Convention, the 'lost cause' of 1864 over again against the champion of the Union war party and the conqueror of the Rebellion.

From this departure of the Tammany Convention the popular reactionary movement of 1867 against the radicals was instantly stopped, and a new reaction commenced in favor of the Republican party and General Grant on the great issues of the war. To make the matter worse for Seymour, the managers, leaders, and organs of the Democracy undertook to strengthen their desperate cause by personal abuse of General Grant, and by the most silly and preposterous attempts to prove Grant an ignorant, destitute alike of any of the qualities of a statesman and of any merit as a sol-

Among others who comprehended the situation, and evinced a disposition to adapt themselves to its requirements, was Wade Hampton. He talked fairly. He professed to recognize the significance of the changes wrought by the war, and the obligations which the result imposed upon all who had resisted the national authority. He declared himself anxious to assist in the work of reconciliation, and, acknowledging the altered status of the negro, expressed a willingness to support qualified enfranchisement. At that period—unless our memory be greatly at fault—while opposing universal suffrage, he took ground in favor of giving votes to those of the colored people whose intelligence and thrift should prove their fitness for the privilege. These were the circumstances in which Wade Hampton's frank and manly course. The Republican party had then scarcely passed the threshold of reconstruction, and a considerable proportion of its members regarded qualified and impartial suffrage, without reference to color, as the best basis for determining the political rights of the freedmen.

Soon, however, the class of whom Wade Hampton is a representative began to misinterpret the temper and purposes of the ruling party. They failed to appreciate the magnitude of the work that had been given them, and hailed the course of the President adverse to Congress as evidence of weakness on the part of the latter by which they might profit. Their tactics underwent a change. From an attitude of submission they jumped to one of defiance. They were no longer willing to submit to terms. They forgot that they were conquered. And, rejecting very liberal conditions of reconciliation, they claimed a right to restoration, free from all terms and restrictions. They insisted, in short, that conquered rebellion should initiate a victorious loyalty, and that those who had been given freedom should be made civilly and politically subject to the class who formerly owned them. From that moment the Wade Hamptons changed their tune. They talked no more of impartial suffrage. They contended only for the overthrow of reconstruction, and the disfranchisement and permanent subjection of all whom God made black.

In this spirit their leaders attended the New York Convention. They were not, however, assailed for presuming to be present." The excited noisiness of the Democracy, their presence excited no surprise. If they were found themselves objects of unpleasant remark, they have only themselves to blame. Forrest threw down the gauntlet by nominating General Blair, with the Broadhead letter as his only recommendation. Wade Hampton followed suit by declaring that white votes alone shall be counted, and that a majority acquired with the help of black votes shall be overborne. He of all men first resorted to bluster about bayonets. Yet later, he expatiated upon the triumph of the Rebel element in the construction of the Democratic platform, taking to himself credit for having the phrase committing the party to the revolutionary doctrine of the Blair letter. The Southern extremists, then, have no just cause of complaint against the Republican press. If its language concerning them differs from that which it employed soon after Lee's surrender, it is because their tone and conduct have entirely changed. They were then, professedly, willing to comply with requirements laid down by the Government; they are now, avowedly, resolved to resist its authority and to overthrow its work. The change is in them, not in the leaders, or the journals of the Republican party.

The War Party.

The Democratic party has become the war party; and that, too, in the time of peace. Its platform declares "the Reconstruction acts (so called) of Congress" to be "usurpations, and unconstitutional, revolutionary, and void." This declaration, if carried into effect, means that Congressional reconstruction is to be swept away from top to bottom. Will it be carried into effect if the Democrats triumph in the coming election? So Wade Hampton understands the purpose of the party. So the whole tribe of Rebels and the Democratic sympathizers both demand.

Of course, the reconstructed State governments are now in actual operation and represented in both Houses of Congress, and are to be treated as null and void—as really having no legal existence or rightful authority. This is the necessary result of the Democratic proposition, when put into practice. Is, then, any man so foolish as to suppose that this will or can occur without a second war, involving anarchy and bloodshed at the South, and quite likely sweeping over the whole country? These State governments are already in existence. They have their officers of law, invested not only in the courts of the State but also in those of the nation. They also have their earnest supporters, both North and South. And these, let it be remembered, are solid facts, not to be disposed of or brushed away by a mere resolution. Nothing can dispense with them but revolutionary violence. Such violence means war. It can mean nothing else. The Democratic programme, if reduced to practical effect, will and must bring on a collision of arms.

We are aware that the Democrats claim that these reconstructed Governments are illegal, and that for this reason they may and should be displaced; yet they exist as facts under Congressional legislation. Moreover, Southern loyalists, supported by the Republican party, claim that these Governments are duly constituted, and that they must be maintained. Here are elements of immense danger to the peace of the country the moment the Democratic doctrine assumes a practical form. Rebels of the Wade Hampton school are ready for the strife; but are the American people ready? No graver question has ever been placed before the public mind.

What does the Democratic party propose to substitute in place of these governments, declared to be "unconstitutional, revolutionary, and void?" Of course, they mean to have State governments at the South of some kind. What shall they be, and in what respect shall they differ from those already in existence? There is no difficulty in answering this question. The Democrats mean—the proof thereof is as clear as the light of day—to disfranchise the negro, and restore the Rebels to power. They mean to make these States Democratic States; and, by this means, place the party once more in power in the National Government. They want the votes of their Southern Democratic friends, nine-tenths of whom are unrepentant Rebels. The political reason is the great secret of their hostility to the reconstruction measures of Congress. Southern Rebels affiliate themselves with Northern Democrats, because this is their only hope for saving the "lost cause;" and Northern Democrats affiliate themselves with Southern Rebels, and make a platform to their liking, because by so doing they hope at last to achieve a political success. Combine the two, and give them the control of the Government, and then the old Democratic régime would be again in full blast. The rights of the negro would be crushed to the earth. Slavery would be re-established in effect, if not in form. The national debt would be re-

published. The very men who were the chief changes of the Rebellion would rule the party and rule the Government. The victories on the battle-field would all be lost by the strategies of the politician. Rebellion would be the winner, and loyalty the loser. Such are the natural and almost certain consequences to ensue from the success of the Democratic party in the pending election. Will the American people invite these results? Will it be best in this stage of the question to reverse the whole action of Congress, and start out upon a new and revolutionary track, for the sake of placing the Democrats in power? Is it not best for the peace of the country to let the Republican party—the party that carried the nation safely through the war—finish what would long since have been consumed but for the treachery and perversity of Andrew Johnson? We appeal to the friends of liberty and lovers of peace to vote down the Seymour and Blair ticket. General Grant says, "Let us have peace." The way—and, happily speaking, the only way—to have this peace is thoroughly to defeat the war party at the ballot-box.

CLOTHING.

THE OLDEST ESTABLISHED BOYS' CLOTHING STORE IN THE UNION.

We have now on hand a large assortment of very fine Ready-Made Clothing for Boys, which will be sold as cheap as the same style and quality can be purchased elsewhere.

F. A. HOYT & BRO., ASSEMBLY BUILDINGS, TENTH AND CHESTNUT STREETS.

RELIEF ASSOCIATION.

NOTICE.

OFFICE OF THE MANHATTAN CO-OPERATIVE RELIEF ASSOCIATION.

No. 423 WALNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA. OBJECT.—The object of this Association is to secure a cash payment within forty days after the death of a member of as many dollars as there are members in the class to which he belongs to the heirs. ILLUSTRATION: Class "A" has 500 male members. A member dies. The Association pays over within 40 days \$500 to his heirs, and the remaining members forward within thirty days one dollar and ten cents each to the Association to reimburse it. Failing to send this sum, they forfeit to the Association all moneys paid, and the Association supplies a new member to fill the place of the retiring one.

CLASSES.—In Class A all persons between the ages of 20 and 25 years; in Class B, all persons between the ages of 25 and 30 years; in Class C, all persons between the ages of 30 and 35 years; in Class D, all persons between the ages of 35 and 40 years; in Class E, all persons between the ages of 40 and 45 years; in Class F, all persons between the ages of 45 and 50 years; in Class G, all persons between the ages of 50 and 55 years; in Class H, all persons between the ages of 55 and 60 years; in Class I, all persons between the ages of 60 and 65 years. The classes for women are the same as for men, but the minimum age is 18 years. Each person pays a dollar and ten cents each time a member and one dollar and ten cents each time a member dies. One dollar and ten cents each time a member dies. One dollar and ten cents each time a member dies. One dollar and ten cents each time a member dies.

WATCHES, JEWELRY, ETC.

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

WEDDING RINGS. We have for a long time made a specialty of Solid 18-Karat Fine Gold Wedding and Engagement Rings.

FARR & BROTHER, MAKERS. 11 1/2 North 2d St., below Fourth.

FRENCH CLOCKS. G. W. RUSSELL, No. 22 NORTH SIXTH STREET.

BOARDING. No. 1121 GRAND STREET, CENTRALLY located, within two squares of the Continental and Grand House—An unfurnished SECOND-STORY FRONT ROOM, with first-class board.

GEORGE FLOWMAN, CARPENTER AND BUILDER. REMOVED. To No. 184 DOCK STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

HENRY S. HANNAIS & CO. 218 & 220 S. FRONT ST. OFFER TO THE TRADE, IN LOTS, FINE RYE AND BOURBON WHISKIES, IN BOND OF 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868. ALSO, FREE FINE RYE AND BOURBON WHISKIES, OF GREAT AGE, ranging from 1864 to 1845. Liberal contracts will be entered into for lots, in bond at Distillery, of this year's manufacture.

EDUCATIONAL.

EDMON SEMINARY (LATE LINWOOD HALL), opposite the York Road Station, North Pennsylvania Railroad, seven miles from Philadelphia. Fifteenth Session of Miss CARR'S Select Boarding School for Young Ladies will commence at the above beautiful and healthful situation, September 13, 1868.

ST. FRANCIS' COLLEGE, IN CARE OF St. Francis Brothers, LORETO, California County, 187 four miles from Crosson, California. Increased accommodations having been obtained by change of residence, there are few vacancies which may be filled by early application to the Principal, Shoemakerstown, P. O., Montgomery County, Pa.

HAMILTON INSTITUTE FOR BOYS AND GIRLS. School for Young Ladies, No. 330 CHESTNUT Street, Philadelphia, will open on MONDAY, September 7, 1868. For terms, etc., apply to Miss PHILIP A. OREGAR, A. M., Principal.

JANE M. HARPER WILL REOPEN HER School for Boys and Girls, No. 423 CHESTNUT Street, September (ninth month) 21st.

CHESTNUT STREET FEMALE SEMINARY, PHILADELPHIA. Misses BURNETT and Miss DILLAYE will reopen their Boarding and Day School (thirty-seven students) September 16, at No. 161 Chestnut Street. Particulars from circulars.

ACADEMY OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, LOCUST and JUNIOR Streets. The autumnal Session opened on SEPTEMBER 7. JAMES W. ROBINS, A. M., Head Master.

Mrs ELIZA W. SMITH'S FRENCH AND ENGLISH BOARDING AND DAY SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES, No. 124 SPRUCE Street, will open on MONDAY, September 14, 8 1/2 A. M.

CLASSICAL INSTITUTE, DEAN STREET, above SPRUCE. The duties of the Classical Institute will be resumed September 7. J. W. FAIRBEN, D. D., Principal.

THE MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA. A term will commence on THURSDAY, October 1, Introductory by Professor K. SPENCER MILLER, at 9 o'clock P. M. 919 N. 5th St.

MUSICAL INSTRUCTION. MISS JENNIE T. BECK, TEACHER OF PIANO-FORTE, No. 716 FLOIDA Street, between Eleventh and Twelfth, below Filadelfia.

PROFESSOR E. BARILLI WILL COMMENCE his Singing Lessons on the 1st of September. Address No. 1162 CHESTNUT St., Oct. 1, 9 o'clock P. M. Circulars can be obtained in all Music stores. 97 Walnut St.

SIG. P. RONDINELLA, TEACHER OF SINGING. Private lessons and classes. Residence, No. 208 S. THIRTIETH Street, Philadelphia.

PIANO.—MR. V. VON AMSEBERG HAS RECOMMENCED his LESSONS, No. 224 SOUTH 4th St., between Market and Arch Streets.

T. BOWERS, TEACHER OF PIANO AND SINGING, No. 66 S. TENTH Street, 9 1/2 M.

FLAGS, BANNERS, ETC. 1868. PRESIDENTIAL CONTEST. FLAGS, BANNERS, TRANSPARENCIES, AND LANTERNS.

W. F. SCHEIBLE. No. 49 SOUTH THIRD STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

ENGINES, MACHINERY, ETC. PENN STEAM ENGINE AND BOILER WORKS.—NEAPLE & LEVY

OFFICE OF COLLECTOR INTERNAL REVENUE, SECOND DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA, No. 229 DOCK Street.

DR. KINKELIN, AFTER A RESIDENCE of nearly thirty years at the Northwest corner of Third and Union Streets, has lately removed to South EIGHTH Street, between MARKET and CHESTNUT.

JOHN CRUMP, CARPENTER AND BUILDER. SHOP, No. 318 LODGE STREET, AN 1/2 M. No. 1738 CHESTNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

WILLIAM S. GRANT, COMMISSIONER. No. 8 S. DELAWARE Avenue, Philadelphia.

WINES, ETC.

JAMES CARSTAIRS, JR., Nos. 126 WALNUT and 21 GRANITE Sts., IMPORTER OF Brandies, Wines, Gin, Olive Oil, Etc. Etc., AND COMMISSION MERCHANT FOR THE SALE OF PURE OLD RYE, WHEAT, AND BOURBON WHISKIES.

LUMBER. F. H. WILLIAMS, SEVENTEENTH and SPRING GARDEN.

OFFERS FOR SALE. PATTERN LUMBER OF ALL KINDS. EXTRA SEASONED PANEL PLANK. BUILDING LUMBER OF EVERY DESCRIPTION.

CAROLINA 44 and 54 FLOORING. HEMLOCK JOISTS, ALL SIZES. CEDAR SHINGLES, CYPRESS BUNCH SHINGLES, PLASTERING LATH, POSTS, & C.

A FULL LINE OF WALNUT AND OTHER HARD WOODS. LUMBER WORKED TO ORDER AT SHORT NOTICE. 77 1/2 Walnut St.

1868. SEASONED CLEAR PINE. SEASONED CLEAR PINE. CHOICE PATTERN PINE. SPANISH CEDAR, FOR PATTERNS, RED CEDAR.

1868. FLORIDA FLOORING. FLORIDA FLOORING. VIRGINIA FLOORING. DELAWARE FLOORING. WALNUT FLOORING. FLORIDA STEEP BOARDS.

1868. WALNUT RIS. AND PLANK. WALNUT RIS. AND PLANK. WALNUT RIS. AND PLANK.

1868. UNDERPAVERS LUMBER. UNDERPAVERS LUMBER. UNDERPAVERS LUMBER.

1868. SEASONED POPLAR. SEASONED CHERRY. WHITE OAK PLANK AND BOARDS. BICKORY.

1868. OVAR BOX MAKERS. OVAR BOX MAKERS. SPANISH CEDAR BOX BOARDS.

1868. CAROLINA SCANTLING. CAROLINA SCANTLING. CAROLINA SCANTLING.

1868. CEDAR SHINGLES. CEDAR SHINGLES. CEDAR SHINGLES.

"UNITED STATES BUILDERS' MILL," Nos. 24, 26, and 28 S. FIFTEENTH St., PHILADELPHIA.

ESLER & BROTHER, MANUFACTURERS OF WOOD MOULDINGS, BRACKETS, STAIR BALUSTERS, NEWELL POSTS, GENERAL TURNING AND SCROLL WORK, ETC.

GAS FIXTURES. G. A. S. FIXTURES. G. A. S. FIXTURES.

QUEEN OF ENGLAND SOAP. QUEEN OF ENGLAND SOAP. QUEEN OF ENGLAND SOAP.

OFFICE OF COLLECTOR INTERNAL REVENUE, SECOND DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA, No. 229 DOCK Street.

DR. KINKELIN, AFTER A RESIDENCE of nearly thirty years at the Northwest corner of Third and Union Streets, has lately removed to South EIGHTH Street, between MARKET and CHESTNUT.

JOHN CRUMP, CARPENTER AND BUILDER. SHOP, No. 318 LODGE STREET, AN 1/2 M. No. 1738 CHESTNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

WILLIAM S. GRANT, COMMISSIONER. No. 8 S. DELAWARE Avenue, Philadelphia.

Depot's Opposite of the City, No. 1738 CHESTNUT Street, W. Baker & Co.'s Chocolate, Cocoa, and Brooms, Crocker Bros. & Co.'s Yellow Metal, Sheet-iron, Bells and Nails.