

AN ADDITION TO OUR STEAM FLEET. [SPECIAL TELEGRAM TO THE NEWS.] NEW YORK, November 3. The paddle steamships Tennessee and South Carolina, built respectively at Wilmington, Del., and at Philadelphia, have been bought by industrial persons in this city and in the South, and are to be run regularly between New York and Charleston. These steamships rate \$1 for ten years, are built of iron throughout, and have these dimensions: Length 265 feet, beam 35 feet, depth of hold 20 feet, tonnage capacity 2500 tons. They will have passenger accommodations for seventy-five persons.

The "Tennessee" sails hence in the first week in December, and the "South Carolina" will follow.

THE PROBABLE UPHOLD OF THE YERGER CASE—National Banks Upon a Gold Basis—The President and the Annexation of St. Domingo, &c.

WASHINGTON, November 4. The Attorney-General is not disposed to engage in any further argument of the Yerger case, and it is now believed that the decision in reference to the granting of a writ of habeas corpus will be delayed until Mississippi shall have been fully reconstructed, when Yerger will be turned over by the military authorities to the State courts.

The Comptroller of the Currency will recommend to Congress to permit and encourage the unlimited establishment of national banks upon a gold basis.

Certain parties had an interview with the President to-day, urging him to recommend the annexation of San Domingo in his forthcoming message to Congress. President Grant replied that he had the matter under advisement.

Secretary Robeson has returned. Commissioner Delano insists that pork packers are taxable as manufacturers, as much so as sugar makers.

The ship Golconda, belonging to the American Colonization Society, sailed yesterday for Liberia. She will stop at Savannah to take on board four hundred colored emigrants for Africa.

One hundred and twenty men of the Cuban steamer Lillian arrived at Key West yesterday, from Havana, where the Lillian was seized by the English authorities.

The Herald says editorially: "She boats Barum. Mrs. Stowe is possessed of the genius for advertising in an eminent degree. Her vampire assault on Byron's sister is comprehensible, now that she explains that she has a book in press relating to Byron. She wanted to make a grand preliminary excitement to attract attention to her book, and did not care what woman's good name might stand in the way. What must the world think of a moralist who thus deliberately sacrifices the reputation of another woman, simply to put money in her own purse?"

Cuban Commodore Higgins is here. Mrs. Wagoner, who was the first to see the first of the month.

THE NEW YORK ELECTION. Late returns show the Democratic majority to be from ten to fifteen thousand. The Senatorial returns are not all in. Giving Republicans three doubtful districts, the Senate will be tied. The Assembly is doubtful. The chances favor two Democratic majorities.

THE CREDIT OF LOUISIANA. NEW ORLEANS, November 4. A report having been circulated that Governor Warrick had issued two half million bonds, of which there is no official record, the Governor publishes the statement that all bonds issued have been duly recorded by the treasurer, and concludes: "One thing is certain and that is, that not a single bond of the State has been issued without authority of law during my administration, and the interest has been and will be promptly paid."

A YELLOW FEVER SHIP. NEW YORK, November 4. The steamer Euterpe has arrived from Havana. The first mate died from yellow fever; the second mate, a waiter and one passenger is down. The steamer is detained at quarantine.

LOSS OF THE STEAMSHIP ZOE. SAVANNAH, November 4. The steamship Zoe, which sailed from this port September 14, for Liverpool, foundered in a gale yesterday. The vessel is a total loss. The cargo will probably be saved.

EUROPE. LONDON, November 4. Francis Joseph and Victor Emanuel will meet at Brno. PARIS, November 4. Eugenie has arrived at the terminus of the Suez Canal. MADRID, November 4. Topete insists upon resigning.

SPARKS FROM THE WIRES. There have been heavy rains throughout Oregon. Emigrant travel over the Pacific Railroad is rapidly increasing. Three hundred mechanics and laborers have been discharged from the Charleston, Mass., Navy-Yard.

Agricultural fairs are in progress at Patuxent and Rome, Ga. Ex-President Johnson, who was announced to deliver an address at Home, will not do so at present.

A Havana telegram says: "Do Rodas has departed on an inspection tour. He will be absent ten days. The Spanish bank has reduced the rate of interest to four per cent."

REAL ESTATE MARKET. The following sales of real estate are reported as having taken place on Monday last.

NEWBURY COUNTY. The sheriff sold at the courthouse one tract containing 469 acres, \$2025; 347 acres at \$2575; 781 acres at \$2175; 220 acres at \$2825; 1610 acres at \$1445, and 370 acres at \$4000; in all amounting to \$23,545, averaging over \$5.50 per acre. Two horses were also sold by the sheriff, which brought, one \$185 and the other \$104.

SPARTANBURG COUNTY. The sheriff sold at the courthouse 50 acres belonging to Thomas Hatchett, purchased by Emily P. Rogers, \$255; 220 acres belonging to Eliza Houghton, purchased by James Hamilton, \$3225; 30 acres belonging to same, purchased by E. M. Cooper, \$370; 52 acres belonging to J. M. Brown, purchased by T. A. Rogers, \$500; 90 acres belonging to R. B. Hesse, purchased by S. Morgan, \$310; purchased by M. Sumner, \$300; S. M. Harrison, \$100; A. Floyd, purchased by William Alexander, \$250; 276 acres belonging to Jonas Brown, purchased by S. S. Drummond, \$1165; 186 acres belonging to the same, purchased by P. M. Hrevlon, \$450.

THE CONFEDERATE DOLLAR. It is to be observed that the rights and obligations of a bearer were converted to his in the military character of the war. The policy, by the United States. The whole territory controlled by the United States was the currency of the territory, and the inhabitants of that territory were held in no respect but as subjects of the United States. Without supremacy, however, unparliamentary, in all matters of government with its military lines, the Confederate dollar was not a legal tender. The following important opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday last, is of so much interest that Southern readers will hardly be content with the telegraphic abstract already given in THE NEWS. We therefore publish the decision in full, as pronounced by Justice Chase, and it is stated in the Contract and after the War.

The following important opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday last, is of so much interest that Southern readers will hardly be content with the telegraphic abstract already given in THE NEWS. We therefore publish the decision in full, as pronounced by Justice Chase, and it is stated in the Contract and after the War.

This is a bill in equity for the enforcement of a vendor's lien. The plaintiff purchased the land of the defendant, and he executed to him their promissory note for part of the purchase money. The defendant, however, refused to execute a deed for the land, and the plaintiff brought this bill to enforce the lien.

It was insisted that the land purchased was not the same as that which was sold. It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

THE CONFEDERATE DOLLAR. It is to be observed that the rights and obligations of a bearer were converted to his in the military character of the war. The policy, by the United States. The whole territory controlled by the United States was the currency of the territory, and the inhabitants of that territory were held in no respect but as subjects of the United States. Without supremacy, however, unparliamentary, in all matters of government with its military lines, the Confederate dollar was not a legal tender. The following important opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday last, is of so much interest that Southern readers will hardly be content with the telegraphic abstract already given in THE NEWS. We therefore publish the decision in full, as pronounced by Justice Chase, and it is stated in the Contract and after the War.

The following important opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday last, is of so much interest that Southern readers will hardly be content with the telegraphic abstract already given in THE NEWS. We therefore publish the decision in full, as pronounced by Justice Chase, and it is stated in the Contract and after the War.

This is a bill in equity for the enforcement of a vendor's lien. The plaintiff purchased the land of the defendant, and he executed to him their promissory note for part of the purchase money. The defendant, however, refused to execute a deed for the land, and the plaintiff brought this bill to enforce the lien.

It was insisted that the land purchased was not the same as that which was sold. It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

THE CONFEDERATE DOLLAR. It is to be observed that the rights and obligations of a bearer were converted to his in the military character of the war. The policy, by the United States. The whole territory controlled by the United States was the currency of the territory, and the inhabitants of that territory were held in no respect but as subjects of the United States. Without supremacy, however, unparliamentary, in all matters of government with its military lines, the Confederate dollar was not a legal tender. The following important opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday last, is of so much interest that Southern readers will hardly be content with the telegraphic abstract already given in THE NEWS. We therefore publish the decision in full, as pronounced by Justice Chase, and it is stated in the Contract and after the War.

The following important opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday last, is of so much interest that Southern readers will hardly be content with the telegraphic abstract already given in THE NEWS. We therefore publish the decision in full, as pronounced by Justice Chase, and it is stated in the Contract and after the War.

This is a bill in equity for the enforcement of a vendor's lien. The plaintiff purchased the land of the defendant, and he executed to him their promissory note for part of the purchase money. The defendant, however, refused to execute a deed for the land, and the plaintiff brought this bill to enforce the lien.

It was insisted that the land purchased was not the same as that which was sold. It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

THE CONFEDERATE DOLLAR. It is to be observed that the rights and obligations of a bearer were converted to his in the military character of the war. The policy, by the United States. The whole territory controlled by the United States was the currency of the territory, and the inhabitants of that territory were held in no respect but as subjects of the United States. Without supremacy, however, unparliamentary, in all matters of government with its military lines, the Confederate dollar was not a legal tender. The following important opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday last, is of so much interest that Southern readers will hardly be content with the telegraphic abstract already given in THE NEWS. We therefore publish the decision in full, as pronounced by Justice Chase, and it is stated in the Contract and after the War.

The following important opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday last, is of so much interest that Southern readers will hardly be content with the telegraphic abstract already given in THE NEWS. We therefore publish the decision in full, as pronounced by Justice Chase, and it is stated in the Contract and after the War.

This is a bill in equity for the enforcement of a vendor's lien. The plaintiff purchased the land of the defendant, and he executed to him their promissory note for part of the purchase money. The defendant, however, refused to execute a deed for the land, and the plaintiff brought this bill to enforce the lien.

It was insisted that the land purchased was not the same as that which was sold. It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

THE CONFEDERATE DOLLAR. It is to be observed that the rights and obligations of a bearer were converted to his in the military character of the war. The policy, by the United States. The whole territory controlled by the United States was the currency of the territory, and the inhabitants of that territory were held in no respect but as subjects of the United States. Without supremacy, however, unparliamentary, in all matters of government with its military lines, the Confederate dollar was not a legal tender. The following important opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday last, is of so much interest that Southern readers will hardly be content with the telegraphic abstract already given in THE NEWS. We therefore publish the decision in full, as pronounced by Justice Chase, and it is stated in the Contract and after the War.

The following important opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday last, is of so much interest that Southern readers will hardly be content with the telegraphic abstract already given in THE NEWS. We therefore publish the decision in full, as pronounced by Justice Chase, and it is stated in the Contract and after the War.

This is a bill in equity for the enforcement of a vendor's lien. The plaintiff purchased the land of the defendant, and he executed to him their promissory note for part of the purchase money. The defendant, however, refused to execute a deed for the land, and the plaintiff brought this bill to enforce the lien.

It was insisted that the land purchased was not the same as that which was sold. It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.

It was also insisted that the defendant had not paid the purchase money. The court held that the plaintiff was entitled to the land, and that the defendant was bound to execute a deed for it.