



CLEARFIELD, Aug. 20, 1860.

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS FOR PRESIDENT.

STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, JNO C. BRECKINRIDGE.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT.

HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON, GEN. JOSEPH LANE.

GOVERNOR.

HENRY D. FOSTER.

OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY.

FOR CONGRESS.

HON. JAMES K. KERR.

FOR ASSEMBLY.

A. M. BENTON, ESQ., MAJ. E. R. BRADY.

COMMISSIONER.

S. C. THOMPSON.

AUDITOR.

P. C. BOWMAN.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.

- Richard Yaux, Geo. M. Keim, Fred A. Sorver, 14-Isaac Reckhow, 2-W. L. Patterson, 15-Gen. D. Jackson, 3-Jos. Crockett, Jr., 16-John A.H., 4-Jno. G. Brenner, 17-Joe B. Dunner, 5-G. W. Jacoby, 18-J. R. Crawford, 6-Chas. Kelley, 19-H. N. Lee, 7-Oliver P. James, 20-Josh. B. Howell, 8-David Schall, 21-N. B. Potterman, 9-Joe Lighter, 22-Saml. Marshall, 10-S. S. Barbour, 23-Wm. Hook, 11-T. H. Walker, 24-B. D. Hanlin, 12-S. Winches er, 25-Gaylord Church, 13-Jos. Laubach.

RESOLUTION OF THE DEMOCRATIC STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Resolved, That the Democratic Electoral Ticket be headed with the name of Stephen A. Douglas or John C. Breckinridge, as an Elector at Large, and in the event of the success of said ticket, if the greater number of votes shall have been cast for Stephen A. Douglas, then the vote of the Electoral College of the State shall be cast for Stephen A. Douglas and Herschel V. Johnson for President and Vice President, but if for John C. Breckinridge, John C. Breckinridge and Jos. Lane for the same offices. If the vote of Pennsylvania cannot elect the candidates for whom the majority of votes are cast, and if an elect any man running for the office of President of the United States, claiming to be a Democrat, then the vote of the Electoral College shall be cast for that candidate. If it will not elect either of the Democrats for whom it is cast, or any of the Democrats who are voted for in the States, then the votes shall be cast for the candidate who has the majority of the votes of the State; and that the Chairman of this Committee be intrusted to obtain from the gentlemen on the Democratic Electoral ticket of this State their several and distinct pledges of acquiescence in the foregoing resolution, and to report the result of his action in the premises at the next meeting of the Committee.

The following resolution was passed at the last meeting of the Douglas Club in this place.

Resolved, That all Democrats favorable to sustaining the regular nomination be requested to meet in Mass Meeting in Clearfield Borough, on Tuesday night, September 25th 1860. For the purpose of organizing the party for the future.

It is a poor rule that went work both ways—yet the advocates of a straight-out Douglas electoral ticket in Pennsylvania denounce the Croson arrangement as a "fusion"—a "compromise of principles," and that their love for regular nominations prevents them from having anything to do with "Senslers," &c., &c.

But why won't this rule work as well in Pennsylvania as it does in New York?—There, it seems, the Douglas men were quite willing to "fuse," not only with their fellow Democrats who professed Breckinridge, but with the Know Nothings, actually putting to rest and Everett men on electoral ticket and agreeing to vote for them. Now if the Douglas men of New York can thus "fuse" with their former enemies, it seems to us very strange that the straight-outers in this State refuse to form a partnership here. It smacks too visibly of Forney-Lincolinism—and so will the people understand it.

How to test the temper of a Young lady.—If you wish to ascertain the temper of a young lady, look at her nails and the tips of her gloves. If they are jagged and much bitten, you may be sure she is peevish, irritable, quarrelsome and too ready to show her tooth at the smallest provocation. This is an infallible test that every ill-tempered young lady carries at her fingers ends.

The Duty of Democrats.

The State Executive Committee—to whose safe-keeping was committed the Democratic party of Pennsylvania for the time being, by the Reading Convention (of which that Committee was elected) met at Crosson on the 9th Aug. last, and arranged that there should be no quarrel between the friends of Douglas and the friends of Breckinridge, so far as to prevent any democrat expressing his opposition to the pernicious doctrines of Black-Republicanism. It is in perfect harmony with that arrangement for a democrat to support either Breckinridge or Douglas. The plan and manifest object was, to secure the whole vote of the Democratic party of the State for the same set of electors, in order that the State might be carried against Lincoln, and thus the worst calamity that could befall the country, averted. It was adjudged by that Committee, that to prevent the election of Lincoln was the paramount object of every Democrat. It was, therefore, emphatically a union or the formation of a partnership, between the two wings of the Democratic party—the friends of Breckinridge and the friends of Douglas—in order that either the one or the other of them might be elected, and thus Lincoln be defeated.

This being the case, we respectfully submit to the Democratic editors who acquiesce in the Croson arrangement, whether they are advocating the claims of the one or the other, that they cease their bitterness. Under this arrangement there is no call for Douglas men abusing Breckinridge or those who support him. Nor is there any call for the friends of Breckinridge or those who support him to abuse Douglas or his friends. There is quite an abundance to say in favor of both these distinguished Statesmen, to fill all our columns from now until the election. If not, then let us employ our time and labor in the exposition of the dangerous and destructive doctrines of Black-Republicanism. This is a beautiful field, and much good may be the result. If either Douglas or Breckinridge is elected, it will be a full Democratic triumph. But if Lincoln is defeated it will be at least half a victory to every Democrat no matter who is elected.

"Popular Sovereignty."

This is a subject on which a difference of opinion exists, being construed to suit different localities. The sticklers for Popular Sovereignty, claim for themselves the same rights in the Territories that they enjoy in the State—this view is partially correct—if a man is a Sovereign in Pennsylvania; he is not however the same sovereign when he emigrates in to a Territory—that is, he is not entitled to the same sovereign rights there that he has in Pennsylvania.

The sovereign in Pennsylvania, has a right to assist by his vote to choose a Governor, Judges, and a Legislature, which has power to elect United States Senators, here he has a voice in directing and shaping the Executive, Judicial, and Legislative branches of his government; if he emigrates to Kansas or any other territory of the United States, he has none of those rights—except incidentally in the Legislative branch—having the right to vote for members of a Territorial Legislature. In a Territory he is furnished with his Governor and Judges, and has no right to vote for a Legislature that can elect two United States Senators, until this territory has population enough to entitle them to be admitted as a State. Here we find this would be sovereign; furnished with a Governor, and Judges by a foreign power—the General Government; in the same way that a Father is bound to furnish food and clothing for his minor children, as long as he is able to do it. Our Government is composed of a Trinity; it takes three different and distinct attributes to carry it along—the Executive, Judicial and Legislative, and in the organized States we all have a right to assist in making them; which right constitutes us Popular Sovereigns—in short we are 21 years of age and must provide our own food and clothing.

It will thus be seen that the General Government furnishes the people of a territory with the whole working machinery of their Government, all of which it must see faithfully executed and carried out, if it should take the President the Supreme Court, and Congress—all these branches of the General Government must be brought into requisition—if nothing less will do, to see that equal rights are guaranteed to all the several States in this Union, and the citizens thereof.

Therefore, believing as we do, that the Territory of the United States, belongs to all the several States alike, it then necessarily follows that whatever is recognized as property in any of the States—can legally be claimed and held as such, in any territory of the United States—and the General Government must see that those rights are preserved inviolate; to all the citizens of the several States if it should take the whole three branches to do it.

We also hold that neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature has a right to legislate upon the subject of slavery in a Territory, but that the people thereof; when they wish to be admitted into the Union as a State, may form and adopt a constitution Republican in form, and in it either adopt or exclude Slavery therefrom. The fallacious doctrine—that the citizens of a State carry with them into a Territory of the same Sovereign rights that they enjoy in

the State is all gammon. If popular sovereignty means that the people of a Territory have sovereign power in themselves by virtue of their manhood, or any other attribute or source, independent of, and separate from, the General Government of the United States, they certainly can remain, and continue in a Territorial condition; and not come into the Union at all? Thus presenting the novel spectacle of an independent—"Popular Sovereign," people within our Union; but not of our Union.

Surely no sound Democrat will contend for a doctrine like this. We appeal to our Democratic fellow citizens everywhere to become united, and assist in carrying our old banner on to victory—assist in raising it higher; for if our old adversaries get hold of it; they will haul it over to John proemium.

Gen. Foster Found?

The opposition Press is trying to create capital, by ridiculing the silence of our candidate for Governor Henry D. Foster; and the little man down street has recently caught the same fever, and desires to get up a sensation, by innocently asking in two successive issues of his paper, whether "Foster has been found?"

For the purpose of satisfying the curious, and allaying the anxiety of our neighbor, we would say, that Gen. Foster, has never been; nor is he lost. He is a man that never hides himself, nor does he vauntingly strut like a gay Peacock before the people of our State, saying; fellow citizens, this is I. Your next Governor.

We know he is unlike his competitor, with that native modesty accompanying true greatness; Henry D. Foster rests on his past record, not on his present happy speeches, on his principles; not on his appearance; on his fame as a great conservative Statesman, not on straddling two platforms, and publishing his own eminent qualification for office.

When the gallant Col., six feet four; was sneaking around with a Bible in his Hat, secretly swearing men to proscribe their fellow citizens; Gen. Foster was publicly advocating the rights of man, whether native or foreign born.

When the heroic Col., was hunting Catholics with a broad sword and a dark lantern; Gen. Foster was pleading with the people of Pennsylvania not, to make religion a qualification or test for office.—When eloquent Andy was abusing men on account of their birthplace and religion, and talking of the criminals and paupers, shipped upon us by Ireland and France; Gen. Foster was manfully repudiating this miserable slander, by pointing to the many prominent names in American history; and calling on his countrymen, to look around them at the thrifty, hardy, honest, emigrant; and then forever banish the heresy, that "birth" had higher claims on government than "worth. No Democrats? our gallant standard bearer is not lost, nor is he in danger; and though the Opposition may not see him through a "glass dimly," the time is coming when they shall see him as he is, and shall like him.

His record is before the people; and so is Andy's—the former as a lightened honorable man—a consistent and conservative Statesman, the latter, as a weak man willing one year to despise and abuse men, for their birth and religion; and the next year to cajole and embrace them for their votes to make him Governor—willing to advocate any principle, or endure any platform to further his personal vanity and ambition—willing to betray his former political friends, and sell himself to the Ishmaelites; because he believes they can give him office.

Between such men the people of Pennsylvania can have little difficulty in choosing a Governor in October next—after which time Andrew G. Curtin will continue the practice of law in Bellefonte, where all his old clients may find him. And Henry D. Foster will be found at Harrisburg discharging the duties of Governor of this good old Commonwealth.

Who is correct.

We publish in another column a long letter from Mr. Crans, explaining his course, and referring to the action of the Baltimore Conventions, a subject upon which there seems to be a diversity of opinion.

Below we publish an extract from a speech made in Philadelphia by Hon. Isaac I. Stevens.

Mr. Stephens is the Delegate to Congress from Washington Territory, has been Governor of it; and was a delegate to the Charleston and Baltimore Conventions—an eye witness to the whole proceeding, bear what he has to say upon the same subject.

[Mr. Stevens then referred in detail to the action of the Baltimore Convention, effectively refuting the position that Mr. Douglas was regularly nominated. He showed that when, after Mr. Douglas had obtained 181 votes, a resolution was offered declaring him the unanimous choice of the Convention, no opportunity was allowed for dissent on the part of those opponents of Mr. Douglas who remained in the Convention. He showed that, deducting from those 181 the bogus votes and the forced votes, the actual strength of Mr. Douglas in the Convention was 129! The line of argument on this subject was substantially the same as that exhibited in the address of the National Executive Committee, published in Saturday's Pennsylvaniaian, Mr. Stevens being the Chairman of that Committee.]

Mr. Crans says Mr. Douglas had 212 votes in the Convention. Mr. Stevens says he had but 181 and that the true strength

of Mr. Doug as was only 129 votes. We give the opinion of these 424 gentlemen upon this subject, and leave our readers to form their own conclusion from them.

United Action.

The only papers in Pennsylvania, making any pretensions to Democracy, that persistently oppose the action of the State Executive Committee at Crosson, are the State Sentinel at Harrisburg, and the Republican at West Chester. The former is but an adjunct of Forney's Press, and the latter was this organ an apologist of John Hickman in all his acts of treason to the Democratic party.

We are aware that the Lycoming Gazette, Perry Democrat, Warren Ledger, Butler Herald, and one or two other papers, have not endorsed that arrangement. But most of them have frankly admitted its unfairness, but neither of them so far as we have seen, have openly denounced it.—This is only done by those who prefer Lincoln to Breckinridge.

We are quite sure that nine-tenths of the Democrats of the State endorse the action at Crosson, and this unanimity of expression on behalf of the Press of the State, fully demonstrates it.

Oil and Water.

At the North Mr. Breckinridge is denounced as a "secessionist" and "disunionist," while at the South some of his enemies hold him up as far too northern in his opinions. At the North Mr. Douglas is presented as the champion of "popular sovereignty," while at the South his supporters are compelled to disavow his interpretation of that doctrine. Mr. Douglas and his northern supporters are usurping in their denunciations of those they call "interventionists," advocates of the "slave code," &c., while at the South Gov. Johnson, who is running on the same ticket with Mr. Douglas, has said—"I believe that it is the right of the South to demand, and duty of Congress to extend, protection to persons and property of every kind (including slavery) in the Territories during their territorial state." Mr. Johnson has never retracted this opinion. On the contrary, he has reiterated it, in a speech made by him in Missouri since his nomination for Vice President. In that speech he quoted the following extract from a speech made by Mr. Toombs at Lexington in September last:

"It may be that the power of the Executive may be inadequate to that purpose (the protection of slavery in the Territories); but if all these safeguards fail, I shall then be prepared to protect all the rights of all the people in the Territories, as well as elsewhere, by all the powers of the Government."

After quoting this extract from the speech of Mr. Toombs, Mr. Johnson said:—"I subscribe to these sentiments." Mark the fact, that this endorsement of the position of Senator Toombs was made since the nomination of Mr. Johnson for Vice President on the Douglas ticket. It comes up fully to the Breckinridge platform.—We wonder that the perpendicular Douglas men do not repudiate their candidate for Vice President under such circumstances. What! Union between an interventionist and a non-interventionist! You might as well attempt to mingle oil and water. How can Mr. Douglas consent to fuse with Johnson?

There is not now a prominent man at the South who advocates Douglas upon the Douglas platform as declared in his Freeport speech. Those who have espoused his cause are careful to repudiate his doctrines.—Patriotic Union.

Straight-out Dictionary.

The Forney-Douglasites attach a peculiar interpretation to language, which differs so entirely from the commonly received and obvious meaning of the terms they use, that some explanation is necessary for the information of the uninitiated. Take for instance a few illustrations: Popular Sovereignty.—This means the right of a self-constituted Convention, composed of 200 disappointed politicians, to appoint a committee of 67 persons to assemble in a close room and form an electoral ticket for the Democracy of Pennsylvania, notwithstanding the regular State Convention, representing all parts of the Commonwealth, had already performed that duty to the satisfaction of a large majority of the party. The term "popular sovereignty," in the vocabulary of this select party, also signifies the running of a straight-out ticket in opposition to the wishes of eight-tenths of the Douglas men in the State.

Regular Organization.—The definition of this term is principally comprised in the foregoing. It consists in getting up a spurious organization in opposition to the Reading Convention. It also means the right of certain members of the State Executive Committee to play fast and loose, by appearing at the meetings of the Committee, voting in favor of the resolutions adopted, and then taking part in the secret convolve at the Buehler House.

Non-intervention.—A very flexible expression. Ordinarily it means the right of the people to govern themselves; but among the Forney-Douglasites it means that the Democracy of Pennsylvania have no right to settle their own affairs in their own way, and that Miles Taylor's Federal Committee may exercise the controlling and supervisory power. Under this reading of the much misunderstood expression "non-intervention," nine-tenths of the Democracy of a State may resolve to pursue one course, but if Miles Taylor commands another, they are bound to obey.

Party Division.—Running a straight-out ticket to elect Lincoln.

Voice of the people.—The minority of a small committee in Buehler's parlor.

Submission of the Popular Will.—Refusing to agree to an arrangement by means of which Mr. Douglas claims to the vote of Pennsylvania is made dependent upon his receiving a majority of the Democratic vote fairly ascertained at the polls.

Consistency.—Refusing to co-operate with Democrats in Pennsylvania, on the ground that they favor "intervention," and closing a bargain with the Bell "interventionists" of the South.

Denunciation.—All Democrats who don't support Douglas.

The dictionary is incomplete, but it will answer for the present to inform those persons who hear the straight-out Douglas men using these terms, and are at a loss to know the meaning they attach to them.

We advise those in search of correct information to preserve this for future reference, as it is calculated to throw some light upon a dark subject.

Communication.

For the Clearfield "Republican."

Having been brought to hold in contempt any creature weak enough to insult an anonymous letter, I had concluded to pass in silence a communication which appeared in your paper, and in which the writer charges me with making an abolition speech. But since one of you was present when I had the privilege of addressing that meeting, called as a Democratic Mass Convention, and heard the sentiments I then expressed, and as your paper has styled the meeting a Republican meeting, and stigmatized those who participated therein as Lincoln men, I feel it my duty to reply. If to declare my firm adherence to the Cincinnati platform, my belief that the Constitution recognizes slavery and confers on slaveholders the right to take that species of property into our common territories where the relation of master and servant cannot be constitutionally abrogated either by Congress or a territorial legislature, my determination to abide by the decisions of the Supreme Court now made or which may hereafter be made touching this and all other subjects, and my utter abhorrence of the doctrine of congressional intervention either for or against slavery, constitute me an Abolitionist—then I am one and on that occasion I made an abolition speech.

You are well aware that before the meeting of the national Convention I was opposed to the nomination of Judge Douglas. You, then, doubted if all his adherents would cordially support the nominee of the Charleston Convention, should he fail to be selected, and you endeavored to pledge them. It was for this purpose you gave your unequalled pledge in your paper of April 18th, when you said—"we are for the nominees of the Charleston Convention, be they who they may." We all looked to that convention with anxiety and hope. We experienced bitter disappointments. Your editorial of May 16th condemned the course of the seceders; and its language—"the secession of delegates from those States was caused by the refusal of the Convention to adopt a set of resolutions in accordance with what they claimed to be a recognition of southern rights on the question of slavery in the territories—although the resolutions adopted by the Convention embodied what has been heretofore regarded as the doctrine on that subject—which if carried out in letter and spirit in the administration of the government must secure to all sections of the country, north as well as south of the rights guaranteed to them by the Federal compact" was approved. We trusted that better counsels would prevail when the Convention should reconvene at Baltimore. "It was with sincere regret" you recorded the action of that Convention when on the 27th of June you could not divine "what object they (the seceders) desire to accomplish, unless it be the entire overthrow of the Democratic party, the trampling of its principles in the dust, and the dissolution of our national union." We admired your independent language when on the 6th day of July, casting off the fetters of placemen and office seekers who sought to deprive us of "our right of thought—our last and only refuge." You used those words—"It cannot fail to appear doubly important to us that a candidate should be selected who could command the entire strength of the party and enable us to present to the country that unity of action and of sentiment in our councils which insures success by inspiring respect. Whether so desirable a result can be accomplished with either of the gentlemen now in the field, representing different views of the Democratic principles, we will not undertake to say; but if it cannot be done with either, we have no hesitation in saying that the safety of our organization, upon which hangs the hopes of this union, demands that the Democratic party of the country—the whole country—should at once take this matter in their own hands and declare for themselves who shall be their candidate for the presidency." At that time you were willing to refer this matter to the source of power—the people. You then marked out a course—took the initiative, and advocated calling a new convention from the body of the party. Your position presented a tangible mode for heading all differences—it was reasonable. Such a compromise might have been effected. But you were not aware at that time that a committee appointed by one man could release electors chosen by a State Convention from obedience to the unanimous resolution of the Convention which pledged them to the support of the national Convention and could authorize them in case "the vote of Pennsylvania cannot elect the Candidate for whom a majority of the votes are cast and it can elect any man running for the office of President of the United States claiming to be a Democrat, then the vote of the electoral college shall be cast for that candidate."

Thinking that your remarks conferred on us freedom of action, and believing after the manifesto issued from the Whitehouse that "every Democrat is at perfect liberty to vote as he thinks proper," some Democrats, I among the number, reviewed the past expecting it might yield a glimmer of light to conduct them in the future. We found that at a national Convention, convened according to the usages of the Democratic party, having full delegation from every State in this Union adopted an orthodox platform which "embodied what has been heretofore regarded as the constitutional doctrines." That after certain men entertaining "different views of Democratic principles" from those entertained by the majority of the Convention had seceded, the Convention, still containing 424 regularly accredited delegates entitled to cast 212 votes (more than two thirds of a full Convention) had unanimously nominated Stephen A. Douglas—that a party of those who had seceded held an informal Convention at Baltimore, and another fragment of them at Richmond, and each had selected as their standard bearers Breckinridge and Lane, and inscribed on their banners principles antagonistic to the heretofore recognized views of the national Democracy. The old battle cry—"principles not men" still rang in our ears and we determined to support the regular nominee and defend the Democratic creed, recognized of yore, spurning all coalition which would cause an abandonment of principles. We thought we were pursuing the line of du-

ty and that any other course would be morally and distasteful to the party and merit the contempt of reasonable and thinking men. Within a fortnight a change came over the spirit of your dream. You then censured us for listening to your teachings and obeying your instructions to the letter and stigmatized us as Breckinridge, Lincoln men Abolitionists.

Four years ago, when you and we knew no north, no south, no east no west, but determined to maintain the Constitution and rights of all sections of the confederacy, you remember how galling it was to northern freedom to be called slavery propagandists. Yet we have it because we were right. Think you now, when in your parades abolitionism implies a crusade against the constitutional rights of the Southern States and an adherence to the treasonable dogma that our glorious Constitution is a compact with the devil and a league with hell that the right, abolitionist falls, like the cadence of sweet music on our ears? If so, you are deceived. It has been supposed that salt and water cannot mix, but skillful chemists, by pounding, crushing, and grinding the former in contact with other substances, soon to render it minutely divided, have succeeded in making a homogeneous mixture of the two. Think you, then, also using us, you can destroy our organization, or ride us into atoms, and prevent us for admixture with those southern so-called democrats whose course has led you to them as "unstable as water." Our future conduct will answer. If we are wrong and you are right, would not the best words, rather than those full of hostility serve your purpose better, in telling us in to what you now call the true north? Let your course answer.

Remembering that we differ in opinion on so vital a question as congressional intervention, and recognizing the authority of no body, but a Convention assembled in conformity to party usage, to settle such doubtful issues as should receive the sanction of the party, I am truly yours,

L. J. CRANS.

Philipsburg & Waterford Railroad.

At a meeting of the Stockholders of the "Philipsburg & Waterford Railroad and Company" held at the Borough of Waterford on Thursday Aug. 23d 1860, the following officers were unanimously elected for said company.

President—Hon. G. R. Barrett, President of the Board of Directors—Hon. James T. Leonard, Gen. John Patton, Col. J. D. Lamberton, James B. Graham, Esq., McPhail, L. J. Crans, S. B. Ransom, Messrs. Christopher Krutzer, Charles Moore, Isaac G. Gordon and John J. K. Anagnostis.

The board of directors having arranged the following appointments were then made for said company.

Vice President—Gen. John Patton. Treasurer—Hon. James T. Leonard. Secretary—L. J. Crans.

New Advertisements.

PHILADELPHIA MARKETS.

Table with 2 columns: Item and Price. Includes Flour, Superfine, Western, Southern, and other grades.

Clearfield Markets.

Table with 2 columns: Item and Price. Includes Flour, Wheat, and other market goods.

COAL! COAL! !

The public are hereby informed that we keep on hand at the Coal Bank of Judge Miller in the Borough of Clearfield, a constant supply of the best article of Peacock Coal. The quality of the coal needs no recommendation, as the public know it as far superior to all other kinds of many other brands. Orders for coal will be obtained at the store of Messrs. A. K. B. & Co. in Philadelphia, or at the store of Messrs. B. & Co. in Clearfield, and upwards of 1000 bushels at the bank, or 6 delivered.

Aug. 29, 60.—MICHAEL CONEY.

LOOK OUT FOR A BARGAIN!

There will be exposed to public sale in Lewisburg, on Saturday the 23d inst., at 2 o'clock P. M. a certain piece or tract of land situated in Brady township, bounded as follows: on the north and west by Thomas Montgomery; on the north and east by Robert Dale. Containing TWENTY-SIX ACRES MORE OR LESS, with a two story plank house and a log stable, with a good garden, and a number of fruit trees thereon, late the property of Christian Downey deceased.

TERMS OF SALE, one third in hand, and the balance in two equal annual payments, to be secured by Bond and Mortgage on the premises.

LOSWELL LUTHER, Auctioneer.

COURT PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS, Hon. SAMUEL LINN, Esq., President Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of the twenty-fifth Judicial District, composed of the counties of Clearfield, Centre and Clinton—and the Hon. Wm. L. Moore and John Jamieson, Associate Judges of Clearfield county; have issued their precept, to me directed for the holding of a Court of Common Pleas of the County of Clearfield, at Court of Quarter Sessions, on the 28th day of May in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and sixty.

F. G. MILLER, Sheriff.