

THE DAILY NEWS.

Large Circulation.—THE DAILY NEWS BEING THE NEWSPAPER OFFICIALLY RECOGNIZED AS HAVING THE LARGEST CIRCULATION IN THE CITY OF CHARLESTON, PUBLISHES THE LIST OF LETTERS REMAINING IN THE POSTOFFICE AT THE END OF EACH WEEK, ACCORDING TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE NEW POSTOFFICE LAW.

LOCAL MATTERS.

AUCTION SALES THIS DAY. JOHN G. MILLNER & CO. will sell at 11 o'clock, at their saleroom, meeting-street, white lead, silver-plated ware, &c.

LAURET & ALDENMAN will sell at 11 o'clock, before their court at 11 o'clock, at their saleroom, East Bay, damaged auto.

T. M. CATER will sell at three-quarters past 9 o'clock, at his store, Brown's wharf, butter, lard, &c.

MEETINGS THIS DAY. South Carolina Society, at 2 P. M. Delta Lodge, at 7 P. M. Carolina Chapter, at 8 P. M. M. E. Lodge of Perfection, at 8 P. M. M. E. Lodge of Perfection, at 8 P. M. Vigilant Fire Company, at 8 P. M.

JOB PRINTING AT THE NEWS OFFICE.—For the accommodation of our friends and the public, we have just established, in connection with our business, a Job Printing Office, where we are now prepared to execute all kinds of job printing with cheapness, accuracy and dispatch.

DEPARTURE OF TROOPERS.—Company B, 8th Regiment, under command of Major Worth, left yesterday for Goldsboro', to receive the colored troops at that point.

THE STATE COURT.—HON. R. B. CARPENTER PRESIDING.—The special session of the Court of Common Pleas began yesterday morning. The list of the jurors was called and the court adjourned until this morning. The court was engaged all day in hearing the argument in the quo warranto case.

SAVANNAH AND CHARLESTON RAILROAD.—The directors of the Savannah and Charleston Railroad Company, at a meeting held at the office of the company, elected Bentley D. Howell President and Treasurer. Mr. J. B. Boylston will act as President pro tem.

STOCK BOARD.—There was an informal meeting of the brokers, at the Planters and Merchants Bank hall, yesterday morning, for the purpose of considering the formation of a stock board.

HOTEL ARRIVALS, March 29.—Parthenon Hotel, S. H. Jones, Georgia; James Mott, city; John Pearce, H. C. Jones, New York; George Thompson, G. F. Proctor, James Taylor and wife, James Fisher and wife, W. Armstrong, J. Blair, Charles Proda, New York; B. Bourdieu, South Carolina; E. H. Cramer, Richmond; P. S. Wortham, Cooper River; L. M. Ayer, A. P. Brannelle, Barnwell; G. L. Caldwell, W. A. Colquhoun, Georgia.

CHARLESTON HOTEL.—Thomas H. Blackwell, Eugene Ward, New York; James O. Putnam, Buffalo; George Ward, New York; J. Van Horn, United States Army; John F. Howell, New York; J. H. Williams, D. B. Rose, Philadelphia; H. M. Drume, Wilmington; Jacob Tracy, George D. Bedell, Philadelphia; L. D. Waddell, Dr. E. Olcott and mother, W. J. Turner and wife, Wm. Turner, New York; W. J. Goold, Mrs. S. Mullin, South Carolina; E. Bates, City; G. T. Berry, Columbia; J. W. McCarty, Camden; N. Fox, Miss F. Jenkins, D. O. Perrotto, Columbia; J. Hayden, M. and O. Railroad; H. A. Stratton, Southern Agent Coast India; J. N. Lawrence and wife, J. O. Atwater, New York.

CLUBS AND STARS.—The Mayor's docket for Sunday was rather full than usual.

John Francis, colored, a migrant, was sent to the House of Correction for ten days.

M. McBride, colored, drunk and disorderly in Coming-street. Fined \$10. Couldn't pay and went up.

Peter Campbell, colored, sleeping in the street. Sent to Mount Pleasant.

J. S. Sullivan, for keeping open his fruit store on Sunday. Fined \$5.

John Zangas, same offense. Fined \$5.

H. Spinkon, for keeping his store open on Sunday. Fined \$10.

P. H. Ludden, same offense. Fined \$10.

Peter Higginson, colored, while assisting at the guardhouse yesterday, made his escape. This is the second time Peter has escaped from the custody of the law.

FASHION CHIT-CHAT.—According to the latest Parisian fashion news, "false hair is augmenting in volume."

Flaming color—or, as some call it, caprice—or nautical color—is very popular this season. It is a deep brilliant shade of orange.

Formal wedding receptions are going out of fashion, the favorite taking the form of a dinner, or English dinner, for relatives and friends.

The "Almaviva" bonnet is a novelty, and is quite in the Spanish style. It is made of black lace, and has a wide wreath of shaded geraniums to replace the American comb; two geraniums are fastened at the side over the crown. It is tied in front with two long black lace lappets, joined with a jeweled brooch.

This year's parasols will be made to match the suits with which they are carried, will be trimmed with fringe, as of old; and, instead of being lined with white or black, will be lined with silk gaiter brocade with flowers, so that if the sun is in no way to be feared, it will be in the hands of one's parasol and not in the hands of the sun.

It is gratifying, now that so many feet are ruined by the heel that has been in vogue for the past year or two, to see a return to something as the heels to the newest shoes are. They are only about half as high, are straight and broad, and are placed at the very back of the foot, instead of being placed in the center of the foot, as they have been, to the detriment of the foot and the injury of the whole physique.

The latest importation of shoes offers us square toes and lower and broader heels, with less height in the ankle. Bows of kid-stitched, with white silk, are in favor, and the shoes are finished at the top in scapole, also stitched with white. Some French shoes lately brought over have a row of buttons and simulated button-holes opposite to the ordinary fastening of the shoe, the buttons being very small.

Mr. Porter showed that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

THE CHARLESTON ELECTION.

Process—Warranto Under the Writ of Quo Warranto.

SECOND DAY.

The hearing of the arguments in the matter of the writ of quo warranto, directed to the Acting Mayor and Aldermen, was continued yesterday in the Circuit Court before Judge Carpenter.

Mr. C. R. Miles, for the Acting Mayor and Aldermen, continued his argument, repeating the statement made on Thursday last that the whole question divided itself into two parts: 1. As to the legality of the whole election; and 2. as to the legality of the particular votes cast, which second part of the question had never been decided, and was now pending.

Mr. Miles reviewed the circumstances attending the writ of mandamus issued by the Supreme Court, and the return of the Mayor and Aldermen and their declaration of the election, arguing that all that the Supreme Court did was to give the claimants grounds upon which to found their claims to the office, but it did not declare that its decision did not touch the validity of the election.

To touch it would have been for the court to give a question of fact. All that the Mayor and Aldermen had to do was to declare who had the largest number of votes—all other questions being left in election. The court said that the declaration of the election might be of no value to the claimants, but that they were entitled to the office, and that it was on the basis of the Validating act. The Supreme Court granted the declaration so that the claimants might be able to make a case and try their title, and the claimants, having obtained the declaration for that purpose, had no right to go before the Legislature and use it for another purpose. Having obtained that purpose, it was void and no law.

The act did not repeal the act of 1845, and it came in the middle of the term and ordered an election in November, 1868. It did not amend the charter, and the Acting Mayor and Aldermen were not divested by it of their right to remain in office. It is a right of the corporations or citizens to be governed by Mayor and Aldermen duly elected by qualified voters, and it is not proper to give three different offices to persons not duly elected. The Mayor and Aldermen have the right to hold office until their successors are elected; their offices are property of which they cannot be divested but by judgment of their peers or the law of the land. In these ways the act infringed the rights of the citizens and the Acting Mayor and Aldermen.

Mr. Miles claimed that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

THE W. L. L. MONUMENT.

List of the Dead—The May Fair.

The movement, by the Washington Light Infantry Association, to hold a large and splendid fair, for the double purpose of creating a monument to their dead and adding their charity fund, is now well under way. A partial list of the names of the fair, which will be commencing on Monday, the 30th inst., and will be continued until the 10th of May. There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable.

He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

He also pointed out that the act was unconstitutional, because it was not a proper exercise of the judicial power, but a judgment and sentence, a function that could only be exercised by the courts.

He pointed out the unconstitutionality of the act as relating to more than one subject, and the subject expressed in the title. And if any right or privilege was to be taken from the citizens it must be done by an express act, of which this declaration was void.

There is also an appropriate legal remedy for the claimants, and where this is the case any interference by the Legislature is improper and unwarrantable. He showed the discriminating character of the act, and that by Mr. Clark and his Aldermen were cut out from the benefit of the law of the land.

THE UNITED STATES COURT, MARCH 29.

HON. GEORGE S. BRYAN, PRESIDING.—LOUIS M. RILEY, CLERK.

THE UNITED STATES COURT, MARCH 29.—HON. GEORGE S. BRYAN, PRESIDING.—LOUIS M. RILEY, CLERK. In the case of Sallie J. Edwards, in the matter of N. Haywood, was received and the assigned order to execute the order made previous to the 2d of March, 1869, which also refers to L. Lopez & Sons. Louis McLain, assignee of D. Riker, bankrupt, was entered as a party defendant in the case of Anderson vs. Riker, claimant, H. W. Rice and Thos. J. Lamotte defendants. The petition of the assignee was approved and assigned, and ordered that the bill for plantation be conveyed to Geo. A. Trenholm, upon payment of costs by T. D. Wagner. The application of L. Drucker to refer to a jury the grounds of opposition to his discharge, filed by his creditors, was granted, and the trial set down for the 7