

FOR SUPREME JUDGE, GEORGE SHARSWOOD, OF PHILADELPHIA.

DEMOCRATIC COUNTY CONVENTION.

At a meeting of the Democratic Standing Committee, held at the Carlisle room, on Saturday, June 22nd, it was unanimously resolved...

DECEASED AND THE PRESIDENT.

After enacting a new measure of despotism, more tyrannical than any which preceded it, the Rump Congress has again dispersed.

With their usual unfairness, the Radical journals decline to publish this opinion in full, but confine their attacks to innuendos.

It is not true that the soundness of that decision would be endorsed by every intelligent man of his party. In fact, a prominent member of the party...

Such a demand, resolutely backed up by the negro will be sure to succeed, as the Republican party do not do without that vote.

THE Radicals of Pennsylvania desire to make this an issue in the coming judicial contest in this State, the friends of Judge Sharswood are not to be deceived.

THE Radicals denounce this decision as a party to the credit of the nation. It is this, so the Radical leaders are responsible for the first attack themselves.

THE Boston Post pointedly remarks, "how much quicker than by impeachment would it be to get rid of the President to put the City of Washington under martial law, appoint a military commander of the District, and 'he could remove Mr. Johnson'."

OUR WASHINGTON LETTER. The Conspiracy Agreement, which is the "Grand Old Party" of the South...

THE Radical candidate for Governor of California is a Connecticut Yankee. This is all proper enough. The Radical party everywhere gets its rules and regulations from New England, and why not?

It is about time the people of this country would begin to inquire into the legality of the acts of the Rump Congress. On Friday last, the Senate passed the despotism bill over the veto by a vote of 36—seven less than half a lawful Senate.

A WRITER for Forney's Press says Juarez "resembles the man who led Lincoln in for many points, and like Lincoln, he is fond of a joke."

THE following judges were "in harmony with the political sentiments" of their times: Pontius Pilate, Judge Jeffrey, Lord Ellenborough, and Judge Tiville, and these are the kind of judges the Radicals want in their day.

JUDGE SHARSWOOD AND LEGAL TENDER.

Some of "the little creatures" whom Greeley says "an insupportable Providence permits to edit some of the minor Republican journals" have undertaken to make a little capital for their bankrupt organization out of a decision one rendered by Judge Sharswood, which they attempt to torture into a declaration that greenbacks are unconstitutional and not a legal tender for debts.

The facts of the case are simply and briefly these: A man held a ground rent mortgage, given in 1782, in which it was stipulated that the annual rent should be paid in Spanish milled dollars, by weight.

After the passage of the law making greenbacks a legal tender for debt, the holder of the ground rent mortgage agreed to extinguish the mortgage for a consideration, and the purchaser, (the owner of the ground) entered both the principal and interest in greenbacks. The holder agreed to accept greenbacks for the principal, but insisted that the contract demanded the payment of Spanish milled dollars for the interest.

With their usual unfairness, the Radical journals decline to publish this opinion in full, but confine their attacks to innuendos.

It is not true that the soundness of that decision would be endorsed by every intelligent man of his party. In fact, a prominent member of the party...

Such a demand, resolutely backed up by the negro will be sure to succeed, as the Republican party do not do without that vote.

THE Radicals of Pennsylvania desire to make this an issue in the coming judicial contest in this State, the friends of Judge Sharswood are not to be deceived.

THE Radicals denounce this decision as a party to the credit of the nation. It is this, so the Radical leaders are responsible for the first attack themselves.

THE Boston Post pointedly remarks, "how much quicker than by impeachment would it be to get rid of the President to put the City of Washington under martial law, appoint a military commander of the District, and 'he could remove Mr. Johnson'."

OUR WASHINGTON LETTER. The Conspiracy Agreement, which is the "Grand Old Party" of the South...

THE Radical candidate for Governor of California is a Connecticut Yankee. This is all proper enough. The Radical party everywhere gets its rules and regulations from New England, and why not?

It is about time the people of this country would begin to inquire into the legality of the acts of the Rump Congress. On Friday last, the Senate passed the despotism bill over the veto by a vote of 36—seven less than half a lawful Senate.

A WRITER for Forney's Press says Juarez "resembles the man who led Lincoln in for many points, and like Lincoln, he is fond of a joke."

THE following judges were "in harmony with the political sentiments" of their times: Pontius Pilate, Judge Jeffrey, Lord Ellenborough, and Judge Tiville, and these are the kind of judges the Radicals want in their day.

A Negro for Vice-President.

The New York Tribune tries to throw cold water on the demand of the South for a negro as a candidate for Vice-President. The demand is a man of their own color. But the demand is pressed in a manner which the Tribune people will find it difficult to withstand.

Speaking of the Vice-Presidency, certain distinguished Senators and Representatives of Congress who have been counting the negro vote, in the expectation of getting that position, will make some fine morning and find themselves wonderfully mistaken.

The intelligent African-Americans, and the white men who are in sympathy with them, are not to be deceived by the promises of the Republican party.

It is not true that the soundness of that decision would be endorsed by every intelligent man of his party. In fact, a prominent member of the party...

Such a demand, resolutely backed up by the negro will be sure to succeed, as the Republican party do not do without that vote.

THE Radicals of Pennsylvania desire to make this an issue in the coming judicial contest in this State, the friends of Judge Sharswood are not to be deceived.

THE Radicals denounce this decision as a party to the credit of the nation. It is this, so the Radical leaders are responsible for the first attack themselves.

THE Boston Post pointedly remarks, "how much quicker than by impeachment would it be to get rid of the President to put the City of Washington under martial law, appoint a military commander of the District, and 'he could remove Mr. Johnson'."

OUR WASHINGTON LETTER. The Conspiracy Agreement, which is the "Grand Old Party" of the South...

THE Radical candidate for Governor of California is a Connecticut Yankee. This is all proper enough. The Radical party everywhere gets its rules and regulations from New England, and why not?

It is about time the people of this country would begin to inquire into the legality of the acts of the Rump Congress. On Friday last, the Senate passed the despotism bill over the veto by a vote of 36—seven less than half a lawful Senate.

A WRITER for Forney's Press says Juarez "resembles the man who led Lincoln in for many points, and like Lincoln, he is fond of a joke."

THE following judges were "in harmony with the political sentiments" of their times: Pontius Pilate, Judge Jeffrey, Lord Ellenborough, and Judge Tiville, and these are the kind of judges the Radicals want in their day.

THE following judges were "in harmony with the political sentiments" of their times: Pontius Pilate, Judge Jeffrey, Lord Ellenborough, and Judge Tiville, and these are the kind of judges the Radicals want in their day.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A pretty servant girl has eloped with a negro servant in Cincinnati. Official statistics say there are 70,000 papers in the State of Georgia. At a picnic in Bordentown, Wm. Wood, a colored man, cut his wife's throat.

The royal family of England spent or took two and a half millions yearly. It is stated that one of the editors of a Yankee newspaper, returning the other day, was severely wounded, one died of yellow fever, and one had a pained experience.

What brought you to prison, my colored friend? "I was in the jail," "Yes, but I mean had I any money to do with it?" "Yes, sir, I was in the jail," "Yes, but I mean had I any money to do with it?"

An editor of West has married a girl by the name of Church. He says he has experienced more happiness in his married life than he did in his single life.

A Phil's Penk note, written to a Milwaukee paper, says the miners are much discouraged in that region: "they have to dig through a solid vein of sulfur four feet before they reach the coal."

A caricature has been published at Matamoros, which represents Uncle Sam lying flat on his back, with a Russian peasant, taking an ice drink, his legs cramped up by a rickety fence around him.

It is asserted that the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who is a member of the original cabinet of the present government, was made "in all respects" subject to the military authority of the United States.

At Franklin, Tennessee, before the recent riot, a man was killed by a mob. The man was taken to a hospital, but he died there.

A young man named Joseph Kirby, was killed by a falling slab from him, at Williamsport, on Thursday last.

On one of the train cars, on the Pennsylvania Railroad, on Monday morning last, by the breaking of one of the wheels. Nine cars were derailed.

At present there are one hundred and fifty-eight miles of railroad in the State of Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania Railroad is the longest.

On Friday morning last, about seven o'clock, a man named Patrick Moore, who was being conveyed from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh by officer Abraham, was shot by a man named Brown.

A man named Thomas, who was being conveyed from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh by officer Abraham, was shot by a man named Brown.

A man named Thomas, who was being conveyed from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh by officer Abraham, was shot by a man named Brown.

THE VETO OF THE RECONSTRUCTION BILL.

WASHINGTON, July 18, 1867. To the House of Representatives of the United States. I return herewith the bill entitled "An act supplementary to an act entitled 'An act to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States,' passed on the 24th day of March, 1867, and the act supplementary thereto, passed on the 25th day of March, 1867, and will state, as far as possible, some of the reasons which prevent me from giving it my approval.

The first objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The second objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The third objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The fourth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The fifth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The sixth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The seventh objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The eighth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The ninth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The tenth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The eleventh objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The twelfth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The thirteenth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

THE VETO OF THE RECONSTRUCTION BILL.

WASHINGTON, July 18, 1867. To the House of Representatives of the United States. I return herewith the bill entitled "An act supplementary to an act entitled 'An act to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States,' passed on the 24th day of March, 1867, and the act supplementary thereto, passed on the 25th day of March, 1867, and will state, as far as possible, some of the reasons which prevent me from giving it my approval.

The first objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The second objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The third objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The fourth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The fifth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The sixth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The seventh objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The eighth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The ninth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The tenth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The eleventh objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The twelfth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The thirteenth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

THE VETO OF THE RECONSTRUCTION BILL.

WASHINGTON, July 18, 1867. To the House of Representatives of the United States. I return herewith the bill entitled "An act supplementary to an act entitled 'An act to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States,' passed on the 24th day of March, 1867, and the act supplementary thereto, passed on the 25th day of March, 1867, and will state, as far as possible, some of the reasons which prevent me from giving it my approval.

The first objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The second objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The third objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The fourth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The fifth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The sixth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The seventh objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The eighth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The ninth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The tenth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The eleventh objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The twelfth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The thirteenth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

THE VETO OF THE RECONSTRUCTION BILL.

WASHINGTON, July 18, 1867. To the House of Representatives of the United States. I return herewith the bill entitled "An act supplementary to an act entitled 'An act to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States,' passed on the 24th day of March, 1867, and the act supplementary thereto, passed on the 25th day of March, 1867, and will state, as far as possible, some of the reasons which prevent me from giving it my approval.

The first objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The second objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The third objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The fourth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The fifth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The sixth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The seventh objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The eighth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The ninth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The tenth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The eleventh objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The twelfth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

The thirteenth objection to the bill is that it is a violation of the Constitution. The bill is a violation of the Constitution in that it gives the President the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.