

my lips, and, but for you I never could have spoken out and cased my heart. At length I returned. Then came our marriage morning. We went on strange faces. We went about on foot; because it awakened pleasing recollections. There were some signs in her attire which might have told it was her marriage day, but it was, withal so plain, that we escaped all observation. The sister of M. Gullart served as bridesmaid, and the sexton signed the book.

Afterwards, the old man walked with us and talked to her of other days; until we came again to the gate that opened into the highroad. Then he blessed us again, and looked after us until we were gone. And, hand in hand, alone, we took our way together; but all our Eden lay before us in the days to come.

God bless the other garret! I found my Eden there, and it abides with me.

Dickens' Household Words.

EDUCATION.

For the Republican.

CLEARFIELD, July 19, 1852.

Messrs. Editors:—Let it not be inferred from any remark in my last, that I am disposed to undervalue the thorough examination of a School-teacher. Such an examination lies at the very basis of the Common School system—and which I contend that, it is not in itself a sufficient test of his merits, yet it is essential as a foundation for every good School. In fact, the fundamental error consists in the fact that this examination is either entirely neglected or very imperfectly done. I said in my last, that the "law has done its duty." An examination of the law, since made, would most materially modify the remark.

The law of Pennsylvania, on this subject, if I correctly read it, is an anomaly. I cannot find a single clause in the law providing either what branches of study shall be taught in our Common Schools, or what shall be the qualification of teachers employed in them. The only clause appertaining thereto, which I can find, reads as follows, under the head of duties of School Directors: "They shall, either themselves, or by such persons as they shall appoint for that purpose, examine all persons who may apply for employment as teachers, and who shall give to each teacher found qualified and of good moral character, a certificate, setting forth the branches of learning he or she is capable of teaching, which certificate shall be signed by a majority of the acting board of Directors, and no person shall be employed as teacher without having procured such certificate, which shall be renewed annually." Another section says, "they shall determine and direct what branches of language shall be taught," &c. Thus it will be seen that the Directors are omnipotent as to the branches which shall be taught, and the qualifications of the teachers. If they, in the plenitude of their power, see fit that only reading and spelling shall be taught, they have to examine the candidate only upon those branches. If on the contrary, the director has a son whom he wishes to fit for College, he has a perfect right to insist that his teacher shall be qualified to teach in the classical department. By this law, the chief design of the Common School may be thwarted and rendered wholly nugatory. I ask what security or protection is there in it for the mass of the people? It is as I have said, an anomaly. I am well acquainted with the school laws of several leading States in the Union. In every one of them, the very basis of the system consists in pointing out distinctly and clearly the branches which shall be taught in the Common Schools, and then demanding of the examining board that teachers shall be brought up to the standard of qualification. The board has no discretion whatever—hence there is uniformity throughout the State, and qualification the same every where. No man can teach unless he passes a satisfactory examination in Reading, Writing, Spelling, Grammar, Arithmetic, Geography, History, U. S., and in some instances Nat. Philosophy. Here, then, is a safe, legal guaranty to the poorest man in the State, that these branches shall be taught in the Common School, and teachers examined with direct reference to their ability to teach each and all of them. Here is the basis of a thorough system. The law of Pennsylvania being what I have quoted, I cease to be surprised at the condition of many of her schools, and the entire incompetency and indifference of many employed to teach. I had not before ascertained that the law itself engenders such a state of things—nor do I now wonder why so many offer themselves as teachers, who are perfectly conscious of their incompetency. The law throws no serious obstruction in their way. There may be an occasional board of Directors who do their whole duty thoroughly in this matter, but diligent enquiry has not revealed any such to me. When your law shall specify distinctly and decidedly what branches shall be taught in your public Schools, and appoint a competent and efficient officer or officers to examine applicants in regard to their qualifications to teach these branches, requiring that they come to a certain standard, then, and not till then, will you have the proper basis of a system that will eventually supply you with good teachers, and make your Common Schools what they ought to be, and were designed to be. There will even then be quite opportunity enough for poor teachers to slip in, but compared with the present, their number will be very small, and there will be some satisfaction in knowing that the law gives no encouragement for them to offer themselves. I may, indeed, I have been told, that teachers of very limited abilities only are needed in most of our schools. This is not only a great mistake but an unconscious insult to the intelligence of the people. If it is important that your children be taught at all, it is equally, yes even more important, that they be taught correctly and thoroughly. "No man can teach what he is ignorant of," is an axiom

long since established and it might be added, not one tenth of men have the faculty of teaching one tenth part of what they know. Many a studious boy has wasted months and years in attempting to gain a knowledge of Reading, Arithmetic and Grammar, merely from the inability of his teacher to give him a proper model, or explain the subject to his understanding, and practically apply the theoretical principles of the books.

GEN. PIERCE and HIS VILLIFIERS.

CLEARFIELD, July 20th, 1852.

Messrs. Editors:—The whig papers have commenced and carried on for some time, a crusade against the military reputation of Gen. Pierce. They falsely assert, that he was not, during his whole military career, in a single engagement with the enemy; that he is the fainting General, &c. And, as the *Domb Shell*, the principal propagator and circulator of these mis-statements and misrepresentations is widely circulated, and almost every whig gentleman in this borough, have at all times one or more numbers in their pockets ready at all times to attack every man coming in from the country, and thus give a more extended circulation to misrepresentation. The democrats do not claim for Gen. Pierce a single vote merely on account of his military reputation. God forbid that the time should ever come, that the democratic party should elevate a man to the highest office in the gift of the American people, having no other qualification than that of a successful general.—Gen. Taylor is a warning, too recent to be forgotten. The democratic party seek to elevate Gen. Pierce, on account of his fame as a statesman, a patriot, his upright-ness of conduct, his uniform consistency of principles, and above all his uniform opposition to sectional agitation. As a military man, the democratic party claim for him simply, that he volunteered in the service of his country; that he nobly and gallantly performed his duty; that he fought bravely; that he received the high commendation from the Commander-in-chief and from the Generals of the division—for the truth of which, I respectfully beg leave to refer to the following extracts from Gen. Scott's official despatches, as returned to the war department and published by order of Congress in 1846.

Gen. Scott says in his despatch dated nine miles from Mexico, August 19, 1847. "The battle mostly stationary, continued to rage with great violence until night-fall. Brevet Brigadier General P. F. Smith's, and Brevet Col. Riley's brigade, (Twigg's division,) supported by Brigadier General Pierce's and Cadwalader's brigade, (Pillow's division) were more than three hours under a heavy fire of Artillery and musketry along the almost impassable ravine, in front and to the left of the entrenched camp."

To the above extract some of the whigs object by saying, although Pierce's brigade was there, there is no evidence that he in person commanded it, because his name as being personally present is not mentioned. Now let any candid man look and see the force of this objection. If General Pierce is not mentioned as personally present, neither is Gen. Smith, Col. Riley, Gen. Twigg, Gen. Cadwalader, or Gen. Pillow, the despatch leaves them all in the same category—if one was not present neither were the others. Then who commanded these brigades? According to whig arguments, they were entirely without commanders. Besides, in all General Scott's, as well as all other General's despatches, whenever any regiment or brigade, or part of a regiment or brigade was commanded by any officer not its own legitimate commander, the name of such commander is invariably given. There is not one single instance on record in which it is not so.

Gen. Scott says in his despatch, dated Tecuabua at the gates of Mexico, August 28, 1847: "Accordingly the two advanced divisions, and Shields' brigade marched from Contreras under the immediate orders of Gen. Pillow, who was now joined by the gallant Brigadier General Pierce, of his division, personally, thrown out of activity late the evening before, by a severe hurt received by the fall of his horse." It must be borne in mind that this despatch gives an account of the fighting that occurred on the 24th of August. General Scott says, Pierce was thrown out of activity late the evening before, which would make it the evening of the 19th August, and the same day on which Scott's last despatch says his brigade was under a heavy fire for three hours. Now all the whigs admit that he was at the head of his brigade when he was thrown from his horse, and that occurred late in the evening. Where was he during the three hours fighting that occurred before night? How came he at the head of his brigade just close after the fight? Whigs, for once be candid, and admit that you know well enough he was there all the time, and got hurt at the close of the fight, but was on duty the next day as stated in the above extract and the following one.

Gen. Scott says in the same despatch:—"Next, (but in ten minutes) I sent Pierce, (just able to keep the saddle) with his brigade, (Pillow's division,) conducted by Capt. Lee, engineer, by a third road, a little farther to our left, to attack the enemy's right and rear, in order to favor the movement upon the convent, and cut off the retreat towards the capital. And finally Shields, senior Brigadier to Pierce, with the New York and South Carolina Volunteers, (Quitman's division) was ordered to follow Pierce closely, and to take the command of our left wing. All these movements were made with the utmost alacrity by our gallant troops and Commanders.

The above extracts are correctly taken from the official despatches of Gen. Scott. These official despatches are now before me, and may be seen and examined at length, at my office, by either whig or

democrat, at any time, and I would be happy to have them examined by every man wishing to know the truth. My object, in thus appearing before the people, is not to render myself conspicuous or notorious, but to do justice to a distinguished man—and as the despatches are entirely too voluminous to be published at length, I have taken the only method, I could think of to inform the public where the despatches can be had. Further extracts from Gen. Scott's despatches, will, in due time be published, and extracts from Division General's despatches, in which Gen. Pierce is highly complimented.

J. S. FRANCE.

Registration of Births, deaths, and Marriages.

The Act of the Legislature, passed January 1852, providing for the registration of births, deaths, and marriages in the several counties in the State, went into operation on Thursday the 1st day of July.—The following synopsis of the provisions of the Act, and their several facts to be embraced in the certificate of returns to the Register of Wills office, will enable those interested to know fully what the requisitions of the law are, until they shall have an opportunity of reading the entire copy of the Act:

The 1st section declares that the law shall go into effect on the 1st day of July, 1852.

The 2d, 3d and 4th sections, direct that marriages, births and deaths respectively, shall be returned to the Register of Wills in the form of a certificate, which certificate shall be signed by the person who certifies to the facts contained in it. The 2d section provides also, that under certain circumstances, the parent may make the return of the birth to the office. Parties are not subject to a penalty for neglecting to make a return, except, as to deaths occurring in the city and county of Philadelphia. Physicians, &c., required to furnish persons having charge of burying grounds, previous to interment with a certificate, in the form as provided for in the 4th section, and the persons having charge of the grounds are required to procure such certificate; and a physician or surgeon neglecting to furnish, or a sexton neglecting to procure, or having procured the same, neglecting, within thirty days to return to the Register such certificate, are subject for every offence to a fine of five dollars.

The form of the return of a death must be signed by the sexton; but the act does not, however, require that the name of the sexton shall be entered on the register. The 5th section embraces marriages, births, or deaths happening previously to the passage of the Act. The proof in these cases must be upon oath or affirmation. The 6th section provides for the return of deaths preliminary to letters testamentary, &c., are not required to be under oath. The returns made under this section must contain the items set forth in the 4th section, as far as it may be in the power of the party to return them. It does not say who shall make the return, but refers to the 4th section, in which it is made the duty of the physician or surgeon to make the return within 30 days after the decease. The return must be made before the granting of letters, &c.

If application is made for letters on the estate of a person who died previously to the passage of the Act, it must be made under oath, as required by the 5th section, and the registry entered among the uncurrent registrations. The 7th section refers to the action of the Orphans' Court, and makes a previous registration of the birth in the Registers office necessary to the appointment of Guardians, &c., the proof to be made under oath, when the Register will furnish a certificate, which the party applying for the minor will file in the office of the Clerk of the Orphans' Court.

Every return is to be considered as an application to register, and a failure to register accordingly within fourteen days after such application subjects the Register to a penalty of \$10. False swearing, or returning false certificates and false entries, are provided against in the 10th section.

For registering births or deaths which took place, or of marriages contracted previous to the year 1851, 25 cents are to be paid by the party making the return, but no charge is made for administering an oath or examining a witness, unless the testimony is reduced to writing. For making current registrations since the passage of the Act, six cents to be paid by the County Treasurer.

In the case of deaths, the return is to embrace the full name of deceased; color, sex, age, name of father, name of mother, occupation, place of birth, name of wife, name of husband, date of birth and death, cause of death, name of place, town, township and county in which the person died, place of interment, with the name of person making return, place of residence, and date.

In the case of marriages—full name of husband, name of father of husband, name of mother, occupation of husband, residence of husband, birth-place of husband; full name of wife previous to her marriage, name of the mother, time when marriage was contracted, town, township and county where contracted, color, by what ceremony, name of person pronouncing marriage, residence of person last named, date of certificate.

In case of birth—full name of child, sex, color, name of other issue living, full name of father, occupation of father, name of mother previous to marriage; hour, day, week, of month and year of birth; town or township, name of physician or other person certifying or on whose application registry is made; residence of such person, date of certificate.

Secularism, when carried to extremes, is a miserable short-sighted prejudice. It makes you hate your neighbor because he eats his oysters roasted when you prefer them in the shell.

THE REPUBLICAN.

CLEARFIELD Pa., July 30, 1852.

FOR PRESIDENT.
Gen. FRANKLIN PIERCE,
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT.
WILLIAM R. KING,
OF ALABAMA.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.
For the State at large—Senatorial.
George W. WOODWARD, of Luzerne.
WILSON M'CANDESS, of Allegheny.
ROBERT PATTERSON, of Philadelphia.

DISTRICT ELECTORS.
1. Peter Logan, 13. H. C. Eyer,
2. G. H. Martin, 14. John Clayton,
3. John Miller, 15. Isaac Robinson,
4. F. W. Boeckus, 16. Henry Peter,
5. R. McKay, Jr., 17. Jas. Burnside,
6. A. Apple, 18. M. McCaslin,
7. N. Strickland, 19. Jas. McDonald,
8. A. Peters, 20. W. S. Colahan,
9. David Fister, 21. Andrew Burk,
10. R. E. James, 22. Wm. Dunn,
11. J. McKeonolds, 23. J. S. McCalmont,
12. P. Damon, 24. G. R. Barrett.

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER.
WILLIAM SEARIGHT,
OF FAYETTE COUNTY.

Democratic Primary Election.

The Democrats of Lawrence township are hereby notified, that the primary election for electing delegates and instructing them, &c., will be held at the Court House, in Clearfield, on Saturday the 31st day of July, 1852, at 4 o'clock, p. m.

By order of Com. of Vigilance.

The 24th of August.

And Brookville, will suit the Democracy of this county, as the time and place for holding the Congressional Conference.

SCHOOL TEACHER.—A good situation for a School teacher is offered at Curwensville. See advertisement.

Our fair correspondent, *The Turtle Dove*, is a welcome contributor to our columns.

The communication of "a whig of '40, '44 and '48, giving reasons why no whig should vote for Scott, is too long for this week. We shall take pleasure in giving it in our next, and ask for it an attentive perusal, as it is a veritable document—a sound egg.

SETTING TYPE.—The first page of this paper was put up in one day between sun and sun, by one set of fingers, all except the last two paragraphs in the last column. Now, types, beat this if you can, and if you can't, let us know, and we will do it for you.

DEATH FROM THE BITE OF A SNAKE.

On Tuesday last a little girl, aged some 9 or 9 years, named LIVINGSTON, living with her Brother, in Bradford township, died very suddenly from the bite of a snake, as is conjectured. The men were cutting grain, and the little girl was heard to cry in a distant part of the field. No further attention was paid to her for some ten minutes; but when found she was in convulsions, and the blood oozing from her nose, mouth, &c. After being carried to the house she revived enough to tell that she had been bitten by a snake, but could give no description of it, and ceased to breathe in about two hours after she was supposed to have received the wound.—The bite was on the top of the foot, and supposed to have been inflicted by a hoop, or horn snake.

WHO SAYS GEN. SCOTT IS A COWARD?

In 1817 Gen. Scott declined to meet Gen. JACKSON under the code of honor, on the ground of "religious" and "patriotic" aversion to the practice of duelling. In 1818 he had a misunderstanding with Dr. WITT CLINTON, of New York, growing out of some of the circumstances which had caused the difficulty between he and Gen. JACKSON. In 1819, De Witt Clinton was inaugurated as Governor of New York, and took an oath against duelling. Very shortly after this, Gen. Scott challenged Gov. Clinton to meet him in mortal combat. The Governor was obliged to decline, and in doing so, intimated to the General that he could not be answerable to him under the code of honor until he (Gen. Scott) settled an unjust difficulty with "one A. JACKSON."

The correspondence growing out of these difficulties, and embodying the above facts, have been presented to the country, and forthwith the whig press sent forth a torrent of indignation at what they construe into a charge of cowardice on Gen. Scott, and parade all the battles of his life, from Lundy's Lane down to the Court-martial of Gen. Pillow—(at least one engagement in which Gen. Scott's friends cannot parade a victory)—to prove his bravery.—Such a volcanic outburst of high-sounding indignation is almost enough to disturb a man's nerves, and to make him believe there is really something criminal in the publication of this history.

But who says that Gen. Scott is a coward? The democratic press almost invariably

give him credit for bravery, and a degree of military skill that is denied by high authority. But are we to be responsible for the whig construction upon these peculiar facts, or for the impression they may make upon the public mind? We (that is, the Democracy,) say, Gen. Scott is a brave man, notwithstanding this correspondence shows that he preferred to challenge a man whom he knew could not fight him, to accepting the challenge of one who was ready and willing and his equal in every particular. Some may say, by way of explanation, that he did not like Gen. JACKSON, and therefore would not fight him; others, that he was not in a fighting humor at that time. Some will say one thing and some another, but we think the fair and most charitable conclusion to come to in this affair is, that between the time that Gen. JACKSON challenged him, and the time that he challenged De Witt Clinton—a period of about two years—he had changed his "religious" and "patriotic" scruples, and began to think that duelling was not such a bad thing as some people thought. And why not? Gen. Scott has often changed, and why not in this as well as in other respects? As all this occurred before the days of the "hasty soup," we can find no other version of the affair that is at all favorable to the General. Many men change their religious notions; and it is right that they should do so, providing the change is not from bad to worse; and who will say that Gen. Scott hasn't as much right to change as other people? We say he has; and we say that Gen. Scott is a great General, and that the whig party—that is, the Seward-Johnston whig party, is a great party.

MOBE HELP!

We have the authority of the Philadelphia Daily News for saying that that numerous and highly respectable class of voters in Pennsylvania—the Friends, alias Quakers—will vote for Gen. FRANKLIN PIERCE. This will add tremendously to the democratic majority in November next, and we cordially welcome them—though it be at the eleventh hour—into the support of correct and liberal principles; and as it is from good Whig authority, of course we will not doubt it.

But does the Daily News know, that as often as they intinate (they dare not make the charge direct) cowardice, or want of gallantry as a soldier, on the part of Gen. Pierce, they as often charge their own candidate, Gen. Scott, with cool and deliberate falsehood? We don't believe either. None but fools, or mad-men, would make such a charge.

General Scott's proposed System of Naturalization.—Most Outrageous Doctrine.

In 1844, a communication was addressed to Congress, through the columns of the National Intelligencer, signed "Americus," suggesting a radical change in our naturalization laws, and presenting a draft of a law for the purpose, and enforcing its adoption in a long, labored and studied argument. This law we present to our readers below, and are only prevented from giving the argument accompanying by reason of its great length.

This production was recently brought to light by the editor of the New York Herald, whose Argus eyes never lets any thing escape, or pass into forgetfulness.—The editor charges Gen. Scott, with the authorship, declaring his readiness to prove it clear as day; and Col. Oles, a member of Congress, in his seat the other day also made the same charge, and defied any friend of Gen. Scott to contradict or gain say it. This they did not do. Nor has either of the whig organs at Washington, in one of which the article originally appeared, and of course they know all about it, dared to say a single word either in denial or defence of it. The authorship of this monstrous proposition is, therefore, fixed upon the whig candidate for President as firmly as if he would avow it in every shape and form.

That such a law as was thus proposed would be anti-republican, and of dangerous tendency to our well-being as a nation, is to speak of it in terms of meek submission. The old Alien and Sedition law, as hard as it was, was the perfection of justice, and wise political economy, compared to this. Look at this law—tripped of its legal and technical terms, and done up in plain English. Here it is:—

1. To reduce the time of naturalization from five to three years.
2. To exclude all aliens forever from the right to vote in any public election whatever, except
3. Such aliens as shall have served two years in the army or navy, who shall thereby be entitled to the rights of citizenship, including the right of suffrage.
4. Aliens shall be exempted from involuntary service in the militia, the army, or navy, (as free negroes and Indians are.)
5. The law to go into operation in six months after its passage.

Virginia Whigs Repudiating Scott.

The Jeffersonian published at Charlottesville Virginia, contains the proceedings of a meeting of the Albemarle Central Democratic Association, where Mr. N. H. Masie, a whig, who is represented to be a good speaker and a logical debator; was introduced, and announced his intention to support Pierce and King. The Jeffersonian adds that there are "numerous other persons in the county who have for many years voted with the whigs, and now openly declare that they cannot support Scott."

Going to Work.

Clearfield Democratic Club, No. 1 will meet in the court house to-morrow evening for the purpose of organizing.

This is a fair digest of Gen. Scott's naturalization law. Look at it, ye foreign-born American voter! Could any thing be more unjust, or more illiberal. To be sure the foreigner would have rights. Yes, the right to be taxed, and to pay his taxes, the right to improve and enrich our country, and the right to aid us in all things tending to make us a great and happy nation; but no right to a voice in the government; they are to have no right to vote!—except upon one condition, and that is, Two years' service in the U. S. army or navy! No other service, no other duty, no other qualification can procure them this intemperate right. If a foreign-born citizen should desire to obtain and enjoy the right of suffrage, he must forsake his calling, and devote two years of his life to military duty. There is no other means provided for him. This is his only alternative.

And what would be the effects of such a law? On the one hand, our army, now, in time of peace, numbering some ten or twelve thousand men, would then, probably, be composed almost exclusively of foreigners, there is not much doubt but that a large number of emigrants would be willing to undergo them in order to be admitted to the full immunities of citizenship.—And on the other hand, we would always have some million or more able bodied citizens in our midst whom our laws discarded and proscribed, and who could not and would not feel as if they were American citizens. In such case, what would be our situation in case of invasion, or civil strife? Think of it Americans, both native and foreign born. Your interests are identical. Let your acts be in unison.

The following is the law recommended by Gen. Scott, referred to above:—*An act supplementary to the acts now in force on the subject of a uniform rule of naturalization.*

Sec. 1. Be it enacted &c., That any alien, being a free white person, and who shall come into the United States 6 months or later after the passage of this act, may be admitted to become a citizen thereof after a residence therein of at least three (1) years, and one year (2) at least after declaring his bona fide intention of becoming a citizen, in the manner and form, and upon the other conditions not herein altered, as prescribed by the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and to repeal the acts heretofore passed on that subject," which was approved April 14, 1802: Provided, that no alien arriving in the United States after six months from the passage of this act shall ever acquire the right to vote, except in the manner hereinafter prescribed, for any elector of President or Vice President of the United States; for any member of the House of Representatives of the same; for any governor, lieutenant governor, member of the legislature, judge of any court of record, or sheriff, in any State or Territory of the United States or for any mayor, intendant, president, alderman, assistant alderman, or common councilman of any city, borough, or incorporated town or village, in any of the said States or their Territories, or within the District of Columbia; but all aliens admitted in naturalization under the foregoing provisions and limitations shall enjoy every other right and privilege of native-born citizens which is not expressly limited or withheld by the constitution of the United States.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That every naturalized citizen, as aforesaid, shall be wholly exempted or excused from involuntary service in the militia, army, or navy of the United States.

Sec. 3. And be it further enacted, That every free white alien, being an able-bodied male of at least seventeen years of age, who shall, in time of war, engage to serve the United States against their enemies, for at least two years, or during the war, or who, in time of actual war, shall serve the said States faithfully for two years, or to the end of the war, in any company or vessel of war, in the army or navy of said States, shall, on obtaining the certificate or certificates of faithful service, signed by the commanding officer or officers of such company or companies, vessel or vessels of war, and countersigned by the next higher officer in the army or navy under whom, if any, such alien has served, shall be admitted, on presenting such evidence to any court designated in the act heretofore recited, to all the rights and privileges of citizenship at any time conferred by the act, on simply taking the oath of allegiance to the United States, and making the renunciation enjoined in the said act.

Sec. 4. And be it further enacted, That this act shall take effect on and after six months from its passage, when all provisions of former acts, inconsistent with this act, shall be taken and held to be repealed, in respect only to all aliens arriving in the United States after that date.

Virginia Whigs Repudiating Scott. The Jeffersonian published at Charlottesville Virginia, contains the proceedings of a meeting of the Albemarle Central Democratic Association, where Mr. N. H. Masie, a whig, who is represented to be a good speaker and a logical debator; was introduced, and announced his intention to support Pierce and King. The Jeffersonian adds that there are "numerous other persons in the county who have for many years voted with the whigs, and now openly declare that they cannot support Scott."

Going to Work.

Clearfield Democratic Club, No. 1 will meet in the court house to-morrow evening for the purpose of organizing.