

JACOBY & KELLER, Publishers. DEMOCRAT AND STAR. PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY IN BLOOMSBURG, PA. BY JACOBY & KELLER. TERMS:—\$2.00 per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, 5 CENTS.

THE SOUTH yet vote for Mr. Jefferson for President. In so doing, they show a preference for one who was a MAN among men; a real white man, the true friend of all men; and the greatest statesman that ever lived.

Counting Now-a-Days. We've always had a great dislike for all the counting ways. The only reason we have for counting now-a-days is that it is so easy to do.

Counting Now-a-Days. We've always had a great dislike for all the counting ways. The only reason we have for counting now-a-days is that it is so easy to do.

Counting Now-a-Days. We've always had a great dislike for all the counting ways. The only reason we have for counting now-a-days is that it is so easy to do.

Counting Now-a-Days. We've always had a great dislike for all the counting ways. The only reason we have for counting now-a-days is that it is so easy to do.

Counting Now-a-Days. We've always had a great dislike for all the counting ways. The only reason we have for counting now-a-days is that it is so easy to do.

Counting Now-a-Days. We've always had a great dislike for all the counting ways. The only reason we have for counting now-a-days is that it is so easy to do.

Counting Now-a-Days. We've always had a great dislike for all the counting ways. The only reason we have for counting now-a-days is that it is so easy to do.

Counting Now-a-Days. We've always had a great dislike for all the counting ways. The only reason we have for counting now-a-days is that it is so easy to do.

Counting Now-a-Days. We've always had a great dislike for all the counting ways. The only reason we have for counting now-a-days is that it is so easy to do.

Counting Now-a-Days. We've always had a great dislike for all the counting ways. The only reason we have for counting now-a-days is that it is so easy to do.

THE DESERTER CASE. OPINION AND JUDGMENT OF THE SUPREME COURT ON THE DISFRANCHISEMENT ACT.

HUBER VS. REILY. Error to the Court of Common Pleas of Franklin County.—Stone, Justice.

The act of Congress under which the defendant below justifies his refusal to receive the vote of the plaintiff is the one approved on the 3d day of March, 1865.

The act of Congress under which the defendant below justifies his refusal to receive the vote of the plaintiff is the one approved on the 3d day of March, 1865.

The act of Congress under which the defendant below justifies his refusal to receive the vote of the plaintiff is the one approved on the 3d day of March, 1865.

The act of Congress under which the defendant below justifies his refusal to receive the vote of the plaintiff is the one approved on the 3d day of March, 1865.

The act of Congress under which the defendant below justifies his refusal to receive the vote of the plaintiff is the one approved on the 3d day of March, 1865.

The act of Congress under which the defendant below justifies his refusal to receive the vote of the plaintiff is the one approved on the 3d day of March, 1865.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

It makes no change in the organic law of the State. It leaves that as before, to confer the right of suffrage as it pleases.

A Clergyman Whips his Child to Death.

We learn from the railroad men who came from Medina this morning that there was a great excitement in that village arising from a report that a Presbyterian clergyman, named Lindsay, residing a mile south of the village, yesterday whipped his son three years old, so severely that he died two hours subsequently, because he would not say his prayers.

We learn from the railroad men who came from Medina this morning that there was a great excitement in that village arising from a report that a Presbyterian clergyman, named Lindsay, residing a mile south of the village, yesterday whipped his son three years old, so severely that he died two hours subsequently, because he would not say his prayers.

We learn from the railroad men who came from Medina this morning that there was a great excitement in that village arising from a report that a Presbyterian clergyman, named Lindsay, residing a mile south of the village, yesterday whipped his son three years old, so severely that he died two hours subsequently, because he would not say his prayers.

We learn from the railroad men who came from Medina this morning that there was a great excitement in that village arising from a report that a Presbyterian clergyman, named Lindsay, residing a mile south of the village, yesterday whipped his son three years old, so severely that he died two hours subsequently, because he would not say his prayers.

We learn from the railroad men who came from Medina this morning that there was a great excitement in that village arising from a report that a Presbyterian clergyman, named Lindsay, residing a mile south of the village, yesterday whipped his son three years old, so severely that he died two hours subsequently, because he would not say his prayers.

We learn from the railroad men who came from Medina this morning that there was a great excitement in that village arising from a report that a Presbyterian clergyman, named Lindsay, residing a mile south of the village, yesterday whipped his son three years old, so severely that he died two hours subsequently, because he would not say his prayers.

We learn from the railroad men who came from Medina this morning that there was a great excitement in that village arising from a report that a Presbyterian clergyman, named Lindsay, residing a mile south of the village, yesterday whipped his son three years old, so severely that he died two hours subsequently, because he would not say his prayers.

Abolitionists and Abolitionism.

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Communications.

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

Msgrs. Edmons.—Some time ago I noticed, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, an account of a Lecture delivered in that city by J. E. Gilmore, in which he spoke of the white people of the South, dividing them into three classes, and says: "The poor white class are lower than the negro."

The Vice Presidents of the United States.

1. John Adams, Mass., 1789—1797. 2. Thomas Jefferson, Va., 1797—1801. 3. Aaron Burr, N. Y., 1801—1805. 4. George Clinton, N. Y., 1805—1813. 5. Elbridge Gerry, Mass., 1813—Died in office.

6. Daniel D. Tompkins, N. Y., 1817—1825. 7. John C. Calhoun, S. C., 1825—1832. 8. Martin Van Buren, N. Y., 1833—37. 9. Richard M. Johnson, Ky., 1837—41. 10. John Tyler, Va., 1841. Became President by the death of President Harrison.

11. George M. Dallas, Pa., 1845—1849. 12. Millard Fillmore, N. Y., 1849. Became President by the death of President Taylor.

13. William B. King, Ala., 1850. Died in office. 14. John C. Breckinridge, Kentucky, 1857—1861. 15. Hannibal Hamlin, Me., 1861—1865. 16. Andrew Johnson, Tenn., 1864. Became President by the death of President Lincoln.

It appears from the organization of the Government we have had sixteen Vice Presidents. Of these three became President by the death of the Chief Magistrate. Two Vice Presidents have died in office: Mr. Gerry and Mr. King. Four of the Vice Presidents were afterward President, viz: Adams, Jefferson, Van Buren and Johnson.

It appears from the organization of the Government we have had sixteen Vice Presidents. Of these three became President by the death of the Chief Magistrate. Two Vice Presidents have died in office: Mr. Gerry and Mr. King. Four of the Vice Presidents were afterward President, viz: Adams, Jefferson, Van Buren and Johnson.

What then is its true meaning?

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

What then is its true meaning?

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

What then is its true meaning?

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

What then is its true meaning?

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.

As already observed, forfeiture of citizenship is prescribed as a penalty for an offense committed before the passage of the act, but for continued desertion and failure to return or report. It is not a new consequence of a penalty, but it is an integral part of the thing itself.