The Nittsburgh Gazette.

President Johnson's Answer to Articles of Impeachment.

Following is President Johnson's answer, read in the Senate on Monday, to Articles of Impeachment presented by the House of Representatives:

To the Senate of the United States;of the President to the Senate of the United States, sitting as a Court of Impeachment for the trial of Andrew Johnson, President of the United Stales.

ANSWER TO ARTICLE FIRST. answer to the first article he says that Edwin M. Stanton was appointed Secretary for the Department of War on the fifteenth day of January, A. D., 1862, by Abrahum Lincoln, then President of the United States, during the first term of his presiding, and was commissioned, according to the Constitution and the laws of the United States, to hold the said office during the pleasure of the President. That the office of Secretary, for the Department of War was created by an act of the First Congress in its first session, passed on the seventh day of August, A. D. 1789, and in and by that act it was provided and enacted that the said Secretary for the Department of War shall per-form and execute such duties as shall from time to time be enjoined on and entrusted to him by the President of the United States, agreeably to the Constitution, relative to the subjects within the scope of said Department; and, furthermore, that the said Secretary shall conduct the business of said Department in such a manner as the President of the United States shall from time to time order and instruct. And this respondent, further answering, says that by force of the act, and by reason of his appointment aforesaid, the said Stanton became the principal officer in one of the Executive Departments of the Government, being the true intent of the second section of the second article of the Constitution of the United States, according to the true intent and meaning of that provision of the Constitution of the United States, and in accordance with the settled and uniform practice of each and every President of the United States, the said Stanton then became, and so long as he should continue to hold the office of Secshould continue to noin the onice of secretary of the Department of War, must continue to be one of the advisors of the President of the United States, as well as the person entrusted to act for and reparation. upon him or entrusted him by the President touching the Department aforesaid, and for whose respondent, further answering, says he succeeded to the office of President of the United States on and by reason of the death of Abraham Lincoln, then President of the United States, on the 15th day of April, 1865, and said Edwin M. Stanton was then holding said office of Secretary for the Department of War, under and by reason of the appointment. retary for the Department of War, under and by reason of the appointmen, and commission aforesaid, and not having been removed from said office by this respondent, the said Edwin M. Stanton continued to held the commission nued to hold the same under the appointment and commission aforesaid, at the pleasure of the President, until the time hereafter particularly mentioned,

and at no other time received any appointment or commission as above de-tailed. And this respondent, further answering, says that on and prior to the 5th day of August, A. D., 1867, this respondent, the President of the United States, responsible for the conduct of the Secretary for the Department of War, and having the Constitutional right to resort and rely upon the person holding that office for advice concerning the great public duties enjoined on the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, because setting the terms. ing, says that on and prior to the 5th day of the United States, became satisfied tha he could not allow the said Stanton to hold office as Secretary of the Department of War, without hazard of the public interest; that the relations between said Stanton and President to be set ween said Stanton and President no longer permitted the President to resort to him for advice, or in the judgment of the President, be safe-ly responsible for the conduct of the Department of War, as by law required, in accordance with orders and instructions of the President thereupon, by the force of the Constitution and laws of the United States, which devolve on the President the power and duty to control the conduct of the business of the Executive De-partment of the Government and by reason of the constitutional duty of the President to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, this respondent did necessarily consider and determine the said

· 🖫 .

At.

of the United States, by the Constitution and laws of the United States, to give effect to such his decision and determination, did, on the 5th day of August, A. D. 1867, address to the said Stanton a note, of which the following is a true copy:
"Sir: Public considerations of a high character constrain me to say that your resigna-tion as Secretary of War will be accepted." To which note the said Stanton made the

Stanton ought no longer to hold said office of Secretary for the Department of War,

and this respondent, by virtue of the pow er and authority vested in him as Presiden

To which hot following reply:

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, Aug. 5th, 1867. (Sir: Your note of this day has been received, stating that "public considerations of a high character" constrain you to say that my resignation as Secretary of War will be accepted. In reply I have the honor to say that public considerations of a high charucter, which alone induce me to continue at the head of this Department, constrain me not to resign the office of Secretary of War before the next meeting of

Very respectfully, yours, Edwin M. Stanton. This respondent, as President of the Unithis respondent, as Fresident of the United States, was thereon of opinion that having regard to the necessary official relations and duties of the Secretary for the Department of War to the Fresident of the United States according to the Confession. the United States, according to the Consti-tution and laws of the United States, and President for the conduct of said Secretary and having regard to the paramount executive authority of the office which the respondent holds under the Constitution and laws of the United States, it was impossi-ble, censistent with public interest, to allow said Stanton to continue to hold the said office of Secretary for the Department of War, and it then became the official duty of the respondent, as President of the United States, to consider and decide what act or acts should and might lawfully be done by him, as President of the United States, to cause the said Stanton to surren der the said office. This respondent was in der the said office. This respondent was informed and verily believes that it was practically settled by the First Congress of the United States, and had been so considered and uniformly and in a great number of instances acted upon by Congress and the Presidents of the United States in succession, from President Washington to and including President Lincoln, and from the first Congress to the Thier winth Congress to t conferred on the President, as part of the Executive power, and as one of the necessary means and instruments of performing of War, and will cease to exercise any and by the Constitution, of taking care that the laws of the same, and all times of removing from office all Executive officers for cause, to be of War ad interim all and one of the necessary means and instruments of performing the same was so issued by the Constitution, of taking care that the same was so issued and all times of removing from office all Executive officers for cause, to be of War ad interim all and one of the necessary in the same was so issued by the Constitution, of taking care that the same was so issued without the advice and consent of the Seinate of the United States and all executive officers for cause, to be of War ad interim all executive officers for cause, to be of War ad interimation. the first Congress to the Thirty-ninth Congress, the Constitution of the United States conferred on the President, as part of the Executive power, and as one of the neces-

power was lodged by the Constitution in the President of the United States, and consequently could be lawfully exercised by him, and Congress could not deprive him thereof; and this respondent in his capacity as President of the United States, and because in that capacity he was both enabled and bound to use his best judgment upon that question, did, in good faith, and with honest desire to city he was both enabled and bound to use his best judgment upon that question, did, in good faith, and with honest desire to arrive at the truth, come to the conclusion and did make the same known to the arrive at the truth, come to the conclusion and did make the same known to the honorable the Senate of the United States, by a message dated on the 2d day of March, 1867, a true copy whereof is hereunto annexed, and marked "A," that the power last mentioned was conferred, and the duty of exercising it in cases was imposed on the President by the Constitution of the United States, and that the President could not be deprived of this power or relieved of this duty. nor could the same be vested by law deprived of this power or relieved of this duty, nor could the same be vested by law in the President and the Senate jointly, either in part or in whole, and this has ever since remained and was the opinion of this respondent at the time when he was forced, as aforesaid, to consider and decide what act or acts should and might be lawfully done by this

situtional majority of both Houses of Congress, it was enacted as follows:

"That every person holding any civil office to which he has been appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, "That every person holding any civil office to which he has been appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and every person who shall hereafter be appointed to such office, and shall become duly qualified to act therein, is and shall be entitled to hold such office until a specific. entitled to hold such office until a successor entitled to hold such office until a successor shall have been in like manner appointed and duly qualified, except, as herein otherwise provided, that the Secretaries of State, of the Treasury, of War, of the Navy, and of the Interior, the Postmaster General and the Attorney General, shall hold office for and during the term of the President by whom they may have been appointed, and for one month thereafter, subject to removal by and with the advice and consent of val by and with the advice and consent of

passed that the power to remove an Execuhim and the Senate jointly, and although this respondent had arrived at and still and is wholly inoperative and void, submit the question to a judicial determinably reason of its conflict with the Constitution of the United States, yet inasmuch as the same had his purpose to obtain a judicial deciberen enacted by the constitutional massion of the said questions, or such of them congress, this respondent considered it to be proper to examine and decide whether the particular case of the said Stanton, on which it was respondent's duty to act, was within or without the terms of that first section of the act, or within it, whether the President had not power according to the terms to remove said Stanton from the office of Secretary for the Department of War, and having, in his capacity of President of the United States, examined and considered, did: form the opinion that the case of said Stanton form the interest section of the behavior of the Department of the power of removal from executive office confided to the President by the Constitution of the United States, examined and considered, did: form the opinion that the case of said Stanton form the office of Secretary for the Department of the power of removal from executive office confided to the President by the Constitution of the United States, and any question respecting the construction and effect of the first section of the list section of said act regulating the tenure of certain civil offices, while he should not by any act of his abandon and considered, it is might be necessary.

And this respondent, further answering, says that in further pursuance of his intention and there count was guilty of a high crime in office. Our contrary, the respondent, protesting said Stanton was not then and there count was guilty of a high crime in office. Our contrary, the respondent, protesting said Stanton was not then and there count was guilty of a high crime in office. Our contrary, the respondent, protesting said Stanton was not then and there count was guilty of a high crime in office. Our contrary, the respondent, protesting said Stanton was not then and there count was guilty of a high crime in office. Our contrary, the respondent, protesting said Stanton was not then and there count was guilty of a high crime in office. Our contrary, the respondent, protesting said Stanton was guilty of a high crime in office. Our contrary, the respon jority in each of the two Houses of that as might be necessary. conduct in such capacity, subordinate to the President, the President is, according to the Constitution and laws of the United States, made responsible. And this

> and although each of the said opinions had been formed by this respondent upon an actual case requiring him in his capacity of.
> President of the United States to come to the
> same judgment and determination thereon, yet this respondent, President of the United States, desired and determined to avoid, if possible, any question of the construction and effect of said first section of the last named act, and also the broader question of the executive power conferred on the President of the United States by the Constitu-ution of the United States, to remove one of the principal officers of one of the Executive Departments for cause, seeming to him suf-ficent, and this respondent also desired it to be determined that, if from causes over which he could exert no control it should become absolutely necessary to raise and have settled in some way either or both of the last named questions, it was in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, and requres the President thereby, that questions of so much gravity and importance on which the Legislative and Executive De-

partments of the government had disagreed, nich involved powers considered by all branches of the government during its entire history, down to the year 1867, to have been confided, by the Con-stitution of the United States to the President, and to be necessary for the com-plete and proper execution of his duties, and should be in some proper way submit-ted to that Department of the government entrusted by the Constitution with the power and subjected by it to the duty, not only of determining finally the construction and effect of all acts of Congress, but of com-paring them with the Constitution of the United States and pronouncing them inop-erative when found in conflict with the fundamental law which the people have enacted for the government of all ther servants. ed for the government of all ther servants. And to these ends, first, that through the action of the Senate of the United States the absolute duty of the President to substitute some fit person in place of Mr. Santon as one of his advisers, and as as a principal subordinate officer, whose official conduct he was responsible for, and had a lawful right to control, might be accomplished without the necessity of raising any one of the questions aforesaid: and ing any one of the questions aforesaid; and second, if this duty could not be so performed, then that these questions, or such of them as might necessarily arise, should be judicially determined in the manner aforesaid. And for no other end or purpose this respondent, as President of the United States, on the 12th day of August, 1867, seven days after the reception of the letter of said Stanton hereinbefore stated, did issue to said Stanton the order

this day been authorized and empowered to act as Secretary of War ad interim, all records, books, papers and other public property now in your charge." The Hon. Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of tution of the United States War, to whom said order was addressed, ANSWER TO ARTICLE. made the following reply:

War Department, Washington, War Department, Washington, August 12th, 1867.—Sir: Your note of this date has been received, informing me that by virtue of powers vested in you as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States,

to superior force. To the President.

United States, was advised, he verily be-lieved, and still believes, that the executive power of removal from office confided to him by the Constitution aforesaid includes the power of suspension from office at the pleasure of the President; and this respondsnould and might be lawfully done by this respondent, as President of the United States, to cause the said Stanton to surrender said office. This respondent was also then aware that by the first section of an act regulating the tenure of certain civil offices; passed March 22 of certain civil offices, passed March 23 of certain civil offices, passed March 24 of certain civil offices, passed March 25 of certain civil offices, passed March 26 of certain civil offices, passed March 27 of certain civil offices, passed March 27 of certain civil of c States, to cause the said Stanton to surrender said office. This respondent was also then aware that by the first section of an act regulating the tenure of certain civil offices, passed March 2d, 1867, by a Constitutional majority of both Houses of Congress, it was enacted as follows:

"This respondent was also force of the power and authority vested in him by the Constitution and laws of the United States, indefinitely, and at the pleasure of the President, and the order in form aforesaid was made known to the Senate of the United States on the 12th of December,

office of Secretary for the Department of War, it shall be lawful for the President, in such Secretary for the Department of War ad interim, in the form which similar authe Senate."

This the respondent understood as intended to be an expression of the opinion of the Congress by which that act was the case, but at the pleasure of the President was the case, but at the president was the president was the case, but at the case, but at the cas dent, subject only to the limitation of six tive officer for cause might by law be months in the last mentioned act, and a taken from the President and vested in copy of the last named order was made copy of the last named order was made known to the Senate of the United States this respondent had arrived at and still retained the opinion above expressed, and verily believed, as he still believes, that the first section of the last mentioned act was and is wholly inoperative and void, by reason of its conflict with the Constitution of the United States, the last mentioned order, did make known by the same had been constitution of the United States, the last mentioned order, did make known by the marmore to obtain a judicial determination, this respondent, at or near the date of the United States, and the same had a present the senate of the United States, and the senate of the s

ton and his tennre of office were not affected by the first section of the last named act. And this responden', further answering, says that although a case thus existing, which in his judgment, as President of the United States, called for the exercise of the executive power to remove said Stanton from office as Secretary for the Department of War, and although this respondent was of opinion, as above shown, that the power to remove said Stanton from said office was vested in the President of the United States, and although this respondent the Constitution of the United States a message, a copy of which is hereunto annexed, and marked B, wherein he made known the United States, and although this respondent the constitution of the opinion, as above shown, that the case of said Stanton was not affected by the first section of said act. regulating the tenure of certain civil offices, while he should not by any act of his abandon and relinquish either a power he believed the should had conferred upon the President of the United States to enable him to perform his duty, a power designedly left to him by the first section of the 2 constitution had conferred upon the President of the United States to enable him to perform his duty, a power designedly left to him by the first section of the 2 constitution had conferred upon the President of the United States to enable him to perform his duty, a power designedly left to him by the first section of the act of Congress lat aforesaid, this respondent did, on the 12th day of December, 1837, transmit to the Senate of the United States a message, a copy of which is hereunto annexed, and marked B, wherein he made known the orders aforesaid, and the reasons which had induced the same, so far as the respondent the considered it material and necessary that the same should be set forth, and reit-cated his views concerning the constitutional power of removal vested in the President of the same should be set forth, and reit-cated his views concerning the constitutional power of rem tional power of removal vested in the President, and also expressed his views con-cerning the construction of the said first section of the last mentioned act as respect-ing the power of the President to remove the said Stanton from the said office of Sec-retary for the Department of War, well hoping that this respondent could the part hoping that this respondent could thus r form what he then believed and still be-lieves to be his imperative duty in reference to said Stanton, without derogating from the powers which this respondent believes were confided to the President by the Constitution and laws, and without the neces-sity of raising judicially any question re-

And this respondent, further answering, says that this hope not having been realized, the President was compelled either to allow the said Stanton to resume said office and remain therein contents to the said stanton to resume to the said service. remain therein, contrary to the settled con-victions of the President, formed as aforesaid, respecting the powers confided to him and the duties required of him by the Constitution of the United States, and contrary to the opinion formed, as aforesaid, that the first section of the last mentioned act did not affect the case of Stanton, contrary to the fixed belief of the President that he could no longer advise, trust or be responsible for said Stanton, or the said office of Secretary of War, or else he was com-pelled to take such steps as might in the judgment of the President be lawful and necessary to raise for a judicial decision the questions affecting the lawful right of the said Stanton to persist in refusing to quit the said office, if he should persist in refusing to quit the said office, if he should persist in remaining actually, the respondent did, on the 21st day of February, 1868, issue the order for the removal of said Stanton, in the said first sticle mentioned and set forth, and the order authorizing the said Lorenzo F. Thomas to act as Secretary of World interior is the said second action of War ad interim in the said second article se forth; and this respondent, proceeding to answer specifically each substantial allegation in the said first article, says that he denies that the said Stanton on the 21st day of February, 1868, was lawfully in possessien of the said office of Secretary for the Department of War; he denies that the said Stanton on the day last mentioned was lawfully entitled to hold said office against the will of the President of the United States; he denies that said order for the re-moval of the said Stanton was unlawfully issued; he denies that said order was issued with intent to violate the act entitled "an act to regulate the tenure of certain civil offices;" he denies that the said order was a violation of the last mentioned act; he dethe letter of said Stanton hereinbefore stated, did issue to said Stanton the order following: "Executive Mansion, Washing-ton, August 12, 1857.—Sir: By virtue of the power and authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and substantial matters in the said order was a violation of the constitution of the United States, or any the constitution of the United States, or any the power and authority vested in me as the power and author nles that the said order was a violation of same are therein stated and set forth, do by law constitute a high misdemeanor in of-

ANSWER TO ARTICLE SECOND. And for answer to the second article, this respondent says he admits he did issue and deliver to said Lorenzo Thomas the said writing set forth in the second article, bearby the Constitution, of taking care that the laws be faithfully executed, the power at any and all times of removing from office all Executive officers for cause, to be judged of by the President alone. This respondent had the assurance of the Constitution, required the opinion of each principal officer of the Executive Departments upon the question of Executive Departments upon the question of Executive Department of the United States, without the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States then in session; but he of the United States the constitution of the United States, or any law thereof; or that he did thereby intend to violate the Constitution of the United States, or any law thereof; or that he did thereby intend to violate the Constitution of the United States or the provisions of any act of Congress; and this respondent refers to his answer to first article for a full statement of the purpose and intentions with which said order was issued, and adopts the same as part of his answer to this article; and he further the Constitution of the United States or the provisions of any act of Congress; and this respondent refers to his answer to first article for a full statement of the United States or the provisions of any act of the United States or the Constitution of the United States article for a full statement of the United States or the provisions of any act of Congress; and this respondent refers to denies the thereby violate the Constitution of the United States the constitution of the United States or the United States or the United States the constitution of the United States the

fice within the true meaning of the Consti-

sion, it was lawful, and according to long and well established usage, to empower and authorize the said Thomas to act as Secretary of War ad inlerim: third, that if the said act regulating the tenure of civil offices be held to be a valid law, no provision of the same was violated by issuing said order, or by the designation of said Thomas to act as Secretary of War ad in

ANSWER TO ARTICLE THIRD. And for answer to said third article, this respondent says he admits by his answer to the first and second article, in so far as the same are responsive to the allegations con-tained in the said third article, and without here again repeating the same answers, prays the same be taken as an answer to this third article, as fully as if here lagain set out at length. And as to the new allegation contained in said third article, that this respondent did appoint said Thomas for be Secretary of War ad interim, this rebe Secretary of War ad interim, this respondent denies he gave any other authority to said Thomas than such as appears in said written authority, set out in the said article, by which he authorized and empowered said Thomas to act as Secretary for the Department of War ad interim, and he denies the same amounts to an appointment and insists it is sale. to an appointment, and insists it is only the designation of an officer of that Department to act temporarily as Secretary for the Department of War ad interim until an appointment should be made; but whether the said written authority amounts to an appointment, or a temporary authority or designation, this respondent denies that in any sense he did thereby intend to vio-late the Constitution of the United States, or that he thereby intended to give said order the character or effect of an appointment in the constitutional or legal sense of the term; he further denies that there was no vacancy in said office of Secretary for the Department of War existing at the date of said written authority. ANSWER TO ARTICLE FOURTH

And for answer to said fourth article, this

And for answer to said fourth article, this respondent denies that on the twenty-first day of February, 1868, at Washington, aforesaid, or any other time or place, he did unlawfully conspire with said Lorenzo Thomas, or with said Thomas or any other rhomas, or with said Thomas or any other person or persons, with intent by intimida-tion and threats unlawfully to hinder and prevent the said Stanton from holding said office of Secretary for the Department of War, in violation of the Constitution of the United States, or of the provisions of the said act of Congress in said article mentioned, or that he did then and there commit or was guilty of a high crime in office. On the contrary, the respondent, protesting that said Stanton was not then and there lawfully the Secretary for the Department of War, this respondent states that his sole as Secretary for the Department of War ad interim, as is fully stated in his answer to the first article, to bring the question of the right of said Stanton to hold office, notwithstanding his said suspension and the said order of removal, and notwithstanding the said authority of said Thomas to act as Secretary of War ad interim, to the test of a final decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in the earliest practicable time at which the question could be brought before that tribunal. This respondent did not agree with the said Thomas or any other persons to use intimidation or threats to persons to use intimidation or threats to hinder or prevent said Stanton from holding the said office of Secretary for the Department of War, nor did this respondent at any time command or advise said Thomas, or any other person or persons, to resort to or to use threats or intimidations for that purpose. The only means in the contem-plation or purpose of the respondent to be used are set forth fully in said orders of February 21st. the first addressed to Mr. Stanton and the second to said Thomas. By the first order the respondent notified Mr. Stanton he was removed from said office and that his functions as Secretary for the Department of War were to terminate upon the receipt of that order, and he also notified said Stanton the said Thon ned said Stanton the said Thomas had been authorized to act as Secretary for the Department of War ad interim, and ordered said Stanton to transfer to him all records, books, papers and other public property in his custody and charge; and by the second order this respondent notified said Thomas of the removal of said Stanton and authorized him to get ay Secretary of War ad in ized him to act as Secretary of War ad in terim, and directed him to immediately enter upon the discharge of duties pertain ing to that office, and to receive the transfer of all records, books, papers and other pub-lic property from Mr. Stanton, then in his custody and charge. Respondent gave no instructions to said Thomas to force obedience to these orders; he gave him no authority to call in the aid of the military or

any other force to enable him to obtain possession of the office, books, papers, records or property thereof. ANSWER TO ARTICLE FIFTH. . And for answer to the said fifth article this respondent denies that on the 21st day of February, 1868, or any other time or times in the same year before the said 2d day of March, 1868, or at any prior or subsequent time, at Washington aforesaid, or at any other place, this respondent did un-lawfully conspire with said Thomas, or with any other person or persons to prevent or hinder the execution of the said act entitled hinder the execution of the said act entitled "an act regulating the tenure of certain civil offices," or that in pursuance of said alleged conspiracy, he did unlawfully attempt to prevent the said Edwin M. Stanton from holding said office of Secretary for the Department of War, or that he did thereby commit or that he was thereby guilty of a high misdemeanor in office. This respondent, protesting that said Stanton was not then and there Secretary of War, begs leave to refer to his answer given to the fourth article, and to his answer given to the first article, and to his answer given to the first article, as to his intent and purpose in issu-ing the orders for the removal of Mr. Stanm, and the authority given to the said homas, and prays equal benefit therefrom as if the same were here again repeated and fully set forth. And this respondent excepts to the sufficiency of the said fifth article, and states his ground for such exception that it is not alleged by what means or by what agreement said alleged conspiracy was formed or agreed to be carried out, or in what way the same was attempted to be carried out, or what were the acts done in pur-suance thereof. ANSWER TO ARTICLE SIXTH.

ANSWER TO ARTICLE SIXTH.

And for answer to the said sixth article, the respondent denies that on the 21st day of February, 1808, at Washington aforesaid, or at any other time or place, he did unlawfully conspire with the said Thomas by force to spize, take and possess the property of the United States in the Department of War, contrary to the provisions of the said acts referred to in the said articles, or either of them. This respondent, protesting that said Stanton was not then and there Secreof them. This respondent, protesting that said Stanton was not then and there Secretary for the Department of War, not only denies the said conspiracy as charged, but also denies any unlawful intent in reference to the custody and charge of the property of the United States in the said Department of War, and again refers to his former answers for a full statement of his intent and nurross in the premises. and purpose in the premises.

ANSWER TO ARTICLE SEVENTIL. And for answer to the said seventh article this respondent denies that on the said 21st day of February, 1963, at Washington ntoresaid, or at any other time and place, he did unlawfully conspire with the said Thomas, with intent unlawfully to selve. take or possess the property of the United States in the Department of War, with in tent to violate or disregard the said act in the seventh article referred to or that he did then and there commit a high misde that the said Stanton was not there and then

(Continued on Seventh Page.)

DENTISTRY A FULL SET OF ARTIFICIAL TEETH
FOR EIGHT DULLARS.
FULL UPFER AND LOWER SET FOR 113.
TEETH EXTRACTED WITHOUT PAIN.
NO CHARGE FOR EXTRACTING WHEN ARTIFICIAL TEETH ARE ORDERED.
ALL WORK WARRANTED FOR FIVE YEARS.
LAUGHING GAS FREE OF CHARGE, AT QUINCY A. SCOTT'S

Steam Dental Establishment. 278 PENN STREET, 3D DOOR ABOVE HAND N. B.—As DR. SCOTT is a licensee under the Goodyear Patents, he will not make any "new toogus) ruber" sets, but will continue to manufacture the genuine article—VULCANITE. mh2::d&T

GAS FIXTURES GAS FIXTURES

Chandeliers,

FOR GAS AND OIL.

Just received, the finest and largest assortment

WELDON & KELLY, 147 WOOD STREET, COR. VIRGIN ALLEY. TRIMMINGS AND NOTIONS.

GRAND OPENING!

SPRING GOODS.

Barred Organdies. Barred and Striped Nainsook; Victoria Lawns Soft Finish Cambric.

ALSO, A LARGE LOT OF SOILED WHITE GOODS. Which we are selling at a great sacrifice

GOOD IRISH LINENS at 37 cents. SOILED KID GLOVES at 50 cents. SYSTEME ALEXAN-DRE KIDS for 41. GENUINE ALEX-ANDRE KIDS for \$1.95. Our

assortment of HOSIERY cannot be beat. HOOP SKIRTS

CORSETS. Also, a line of MISSES' CORSETS. RISTORI FRINGES, all colors. BULLION FRIN-GES. all colors. BUGLE TRIMMINGS, a fine as ment. A fine lot of BUTTONS.

MACRUM, GLYDE & CO., 78 and 80 Market Street. AT JOSEPH HORNE & CO.'S,

The Largest Assortment of

STRAW AND MILLINERY GOODS.

To be Found in the City.

FLOWERS. RIBBONS. MALINES, FRAMES,
FROSTED ILLUSIONS,
STRAW TRIMMINGS, ornamented ALSO, A WELL ASSORTED STOCK OF ALMORAL SKIRTS, IANDKERCHIEFS,

GLOVES, EMBROIDERIES, FRINGES, TRIMMINGS, And a Full Line of Notions. FURNISHING GOODS, NECK TIES, BOWS, SUSPENDERS MORRISON'S STAR SHIRTS.

Agents for BISMARCK, DICKENS, VICTOR and her popular makes of PAPER COLLARS. Prices as low as Eastern Jobbers.

Wholesale Rooms up Stairs. Nos. 77 and 79 Market Street.

PERFECT FITTING GLOVE. MACRUM & CARLISLE,

19 Fifth Street, INVITE ATTENTION TO THEIR

KID GLOVE DEPARTMENT Which is now complete with every colol and shade They have just opened 100 DOZEN of the

Celebrated A. C. C. (Jouvin) KIDS.

Imported especially to our order. Hundreds of our customers can testify to their perfect cut and fault-less quality. The colors were got up from shades of dress material, selected and furnished by us, and

Elegant and Desirable. The assortment includes BLACK, WHITE DARK COLERS, MEDIUM COLORS, and OPER. or PARTY COLORS.

MACRUM & CARLISLE, 19 FIFTH STREET.

SIZES-5 3-4 TO 8.

FRINGES. GIMP HEADINGS,

IN AL COLORS, JUST OPENED, AT

F. H. EATON'S, No. 17 Fifth Street. CARPENTERS & BUILDERS

XVILLIAM J. DICK, CARPENTER AND BUILDER, No. 39 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, opposite High street, Pittsburgh, Pa. Residençe, No. 143 ign street, responses, rent street, rant street, all relations with heatness and dispatch. All rides promptly attended to, and satisfaction warranted.

PAINTERS. LIUTCHINSON & HEPLURN, HOUSE. BIGH AND ORNAMENTAL PAINTERS.

GRAINERS AND GLAZIERS. No. 88 Penna. Avenue, Pittsburgh. All orders by mail promptly attended to

REAL ESTATE AGENTS. D.P. HATCH,

REAL ESTATE OFFICE,

No. 98 Grant Street, Pittsburgh.

REAL ESTATE

AND PERSONAL PROPERTY BOUGHT AND SOLD.

WILL GIVE PROMPT ATTENTION TO

Negotiation of Loans, Attend to the Renting of Property, Collection of Claims, &c., &c.

TOHN D. BAILEY & BRO., STOCK AND REAL ESTATE BROKERS

AND AUCTIONEERS.

Are prepared to sell at Auction STOCKS, BONDS, and all kinds of SECURITIES, REAL ESTATE, HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE, &c., either on the premises or at the Board of Trade Rooms.

Particular attention paid, as heretofore, to the sale of Real Estate at private sale.

Sales af Real Estate in the country attended Office, No. 66 SMITHFIELD STREET. HEAR FARMS FOR SALE.

I have now for sale several of the finest FARMS is estmoreland and Indiana countles. on remarks G. M. PETTY, No. 80 Smithfield street.

BUSINESS CHANGES.

DISSOLUTION.—THE FIRM OF WHITE, BERGER & CO. was dissolved on he 10th inst., by mutual consent.

The undersigned will contin The undersigned will continue the manufacture of Wooden Ware and Packing Boxes, under the name and style of FREEMAN & BERGER. Office and Factory between Morton and Clymer streets, Ninth Ward.

W. FREEMAN.
W. H. BERGER.
Pittsburgh, March 17, 1865.

DISSOLUTION.—The firm of ROBINSON, McKENNA & CO.,

Of Allegheny City, has this day been dissolved by mutual consent. J. S. ROBINSON will continue the Grocery Business at his new store, No. 185 Federal Street,

And assumes all liabilities of the old firm. ROBINSON, MCKENNA & CO., J. S. ROBINSON.

DISSOLUTION.—THE FIRM OF ATWELL, LEE & CO. was dissolved on the lat of February, 1868, by mutual consent. Either partner may sign the name of the firm in settlement. JOHN ATWELL. CHARLES ATWELL. A. J. LEE.

The undersigned will continue the WHOLESALE GROGERY BUSINESS, under the name and style of ATWELL & LEE. at the old place, No. 131 Second street. A continuance of the patronage of their friends and the public is respectfully solicited.

A. J. LEE.
PITTSBURGH, March 5th, 1868.

HOTELS. THE MANSION HOUSE.

The undersigned beg to announce to their friends and the public that they have purchased this OLD ESTABLISHED and POPULAR HOUSE, No. 344 Liberty Street, And will continue to keep it in the best style. The MANSION HOUSE has over one hundred rooms, all newly furnished in the best style, and only two min-

utes watk from the Raifroad Depot. Trayelers will find this house an excellent one to stop at, and will be accommodated any hour, day or night. Connected with the House is a splendid Hall for concerts.

Families or single persons taken to board by the lay, week or month, with or without rooms. mhi7:m37

CONDUCTED ON THE EUROPE-

ST. JAMES HOTEL, Nos. 405 and 407 Liberty St., Opposite Union Depot, PITTSBURGH.

JAMES K. LANAHAN, Proprietor, This house is newly built and splendidly furnished, and convenient to all the Italiroads coming into the city. Strangers visiting the city will find this a very convenient and economical plan. You secure your room and pay for your meals as you get them. The Restaurant connected with this hotel is open at all hours of the day and night. Balls and parties supplied with Suppers at the shortest notice and reasonable rates.

RES:g88

ST. LAWRENCE HOTEL,

(ON THE EUROPEAN PLAN,) No E. Corner Penn and Canal Streets, PITTSBURGH, PA.

JAMES JOHNSON, Proprietor. This house has been thoroughly refitted and new-y furnished throughout, and is now open to the

HATS AND CAPS. NEW SPRING GOODS.

ALL THE NEW STYLES OF

Hats and Caps.

ARRIVING DAILY, AT

M'CORD & CO.'S, 131 WOOD STREET. MARTIN LIEBLER,

DEALER IN HATS, CAPS AND FURS,
Also, Manufacturer, Wholesale and Retail Dealer
in TRUNKL, VALISES, &c., No. 133 SMITHFIELD STREET, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Orders promptly filled and satisfaction guaranteed.

ARCHITECTS.

BARR & MOSER, ARCHITECTS,

FRUIT HOUSE ASSOCIATION BUILDINGS, Nos. 2 and 4 St. Clair Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. Special attention given to the designing and building of COURT HOUSES and PUBLIC BUILDINGS. ARTOS.

MECHANICAL AND ENGINEERING

DRAFTSMAN. Office, Philo Hall, 75 Third Street, With Mesers Holland & Co., PITTSBURGH. O. LIVINGSTON. W. H. BURT. W. A. ROBINSON, JR.

LIVINGSTON & CO., IRON FOUNDERS.

MANUFACTURERS OF FINE LIGHT CASTINGS, ll descriptions, for Plumbers and Gas Fisters; Ag-cultural Implements, Cotton and Wooled Mill Ma-

ainery, &c. All JobWork promptly attended to. TRON CITY BELT WORKS.

GEO. O. CLARR & CO. Manufacturers of every description lof Patent, Stretched, Cemented and Riveted Oak-Tanned LEATHER BELTING. No. 409 LIBERTY STREET, (2d floor,) opposite Inion Depot, Pistebusgh.