

# STAR OF THE NORTH

Wm. H. Jacoby, Editor.

BLOOMSBURG, WEDNESDAY, AUG. 3, 1859.

## Democratic Nominations.

FOR AUDITOR-GENERAL,  
**RICHARDSON L. WRIGHT,**  
OF PHILADELPHIA.

FOR SURVEYOR-GENERAL,  
**JOHN ROWE,**  
OF PHILADELPHIA.

## DEMOCRATIC COUNTY CONVENTION.

NOTICE is hereby given, that the Democratic Electors in and for the several Townships and Election Districts of Columbia County, will meet at the respective places of holding the general election, on Saturday, the 27th day of August, between the hours of 3 and 7 o'clock, in the afternoon of said day for the purpose of choosing two Delegates from each Election District, to meet in County Convention, at the Court House, in Bloomsburg, on Monday, the 29th day of August.

At one o'clock, P. M., for the purpose of making the usual annual nominations of the Democratic party of Columbia County.

At one o'clock, P. M., for the purpose of making the usual annual nominations of the Democratic party of Columbia County. At one o'clock, P. M., for the purpose of making the usual annual nominations of the Democratic party of Columbia County. At one o'clock, P. M., for the purpose of making the usual annual nominations of the Democratic party of Columbia County.

We publish below one of the standing Rules of the Democratic party, passed September 6th, 1851, in a Democratic County Convention, which reads as follows:—

IX. THE STANDING COMMITTEE SHALL BE FIVE IN NUMBER, ONE OF WHOM SHALL RESIDE AT THE COUNTY SEAT, AND SHALL BE CHOSEN ANNUALLY IN CONVENTION. IN CASE OF VACANCY THE COMMITTEE MAY FILL OF THEIR NUMBER.

This Rule never was altered in Convention, and has been regarded as one of the standing Rules till last fall, when the present acting Committee, six in number, was packed by the Democrat man and their appointment strongly urged. This is a direct violation of the Rule above quoted, by the would-be-leader of the Democratic party, as the Rule only claims five members. We suppose in arranging this Committee the Democrat man had five members picked, forgetting to choose one from the County Seat, until he was reminded of the Rule, where it set out that one of the Committee must reside at the County Seat, when quickly his name was put down at the head of the Committee, as he would make an excellent Chairman, and make six in number, thereby giving the whole thing strength, and nobody would find any fault. Now if this Committee shall consist of no particular number of men hereafter, why not have it composed of some dozen or more—say the whole county.

THE DEMOCRATIC STANDING COMMITTEE give notice in our paper of to-day that the Democratic voters of this County will meet at their usual places of holding the general elections on Saturday, the 27th day of August next, for the purpose of selecting two delegates from each township to meet in our County Convention in Bloomsburg on Monday, the 29th of August, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of nominating men for the County offices which are to be filled this fall, and appointing Representative Conferees to meet in Conference at Tunkhannock with similar Conferees of the District to make the legislative nominations for the coming fall election. The delegate election is a matter of considerable importance, and of late years not as much attention has been paid to it as should have been done to insure sound nominations and true Democrats placed in office. No bogus Democrats should be chosen as delegates to the Convention. When such appear in a Democratic Convention they should be immediately read out—they have no business in such Conventions.

We have been requested to announce through the columns of the Star, that the Rev. S. M. Osborn, of Philadelphia, will preach in the New Baptist Church of Bloomsburg on next Saturday evening at early candle light. We bespeak a good turn out. This church building is a good one. It is spacious, airy, and everything comfortably arranged.

JOHN LEACOCK has lately been making sundry repairs in and about his house, which have added greatly to its appearance and convenience. In the bar-room a pretty thorough renovating has been made, changing things almost amazingly.

## President Buchanan and the Succession.

A recent article in the Pittsburgh Post, bringing forward the name of the President for re-nomination and election as the only mode for quieting distractions in the Democratic party, is the subject of much comment by the Press of all parties. We refer to the subject with a view, if possible, of putting at rest all such speculation. There is no point upon which Mr. Buchanan has expressed his determination more freely and unreservedly than his fixed purpose under no circumstances to be a candidate for re-election to the Presidency; and we are satisfied that there is none upon which his mind is more unalterably made up. In accepting the nomination of the Democratic party in 1856 he took occasion to say:—

"Under these circumstances, I most cheerfully pledge myself, should the nomination of the Convention be ratified by the people, that all the power and influence constitutionally possessed by the Executive shall be exerted in a firm but conciliatory spirit, during the single term I shall remain in office, to restore the same harmony among the sister States which prevailed before this apple of discord, in the town of slavery agitation, had been cast into their midst." Again, in his inaugural at the time of entering upon the duties of his office, he said: "Having determined not to become a candidate for re-election, I shall have no motive to influence my conduct in administering the Government, except the desire ably and faithfully to serve my country, and to live in the grateful memory of my countrymen." During the President's recent visit to North Carolina, he availed himself of the opportunity to repeat, in the most emphatic manner, this determination which he had so early formed and so firmly declared, and to which he has so firmly adhered. He announced in one of his speeches in North Carolina, when addressing the immediate neighbors of the late Nathaniel Macon, that like their own venerated Macon, and influenced in a considerable degree by his example, he had long since determined to retire from public life at or before the age of three-score and ten; when he thought every wise man ought to desire to pass the last years of his life—should a kind Providence prolong his days—in tranquility and retirement, and in preparing for his last account; that at the end of his term he would have completed his seventieth year, and that he would return at that time to his quiet home with far greater pleasure than he had enjoyed in coming to Washington to enter on the administration of the Government. Thus has Mr. Buchanan availed himself of every opportunity—both public and private—to announce and reiterate to the country his fixed and irrevocable purpose to retire from public life at the end of his present presidential term; and we feel fully authorized to declare that under no circumstances will he consent to be a candidate for re-election. Whatever course the "Opposition" press may see proper to pursue hereafter on this subject, we trust that our Democratic cotemporaries will, in justice to the known wishes and repeated announcements of the President, unite with us in discouraging for the future, all speculations on the subject. And why should not Mr. Buchanan desire to retire at the end of his present term? He will have devoted the best years of a long and useful life in the service of his country. He has been called to many positions of trust and responsibility. In all of them he has done well. He will leave behind him a record of which any statesman and patriot might feel proud. He will have accomplished the great desire of his heart, so earnestly expressed in the extract we have quoted from his letter of acceptance. He will, indeed, have "restored the same harmony among the sister States which prevailed before this apple of discord, in the form of slavery agitation, had been cast into their midst." He entered on the Presidency in the midst of bitter sectional controversies. The storm had reached its height, threatening the peace of the country and the integrity of the Union. He brought to the helm the strong arm of a statesman and stout heart of a patriot. True and faithful, firm and steadfast, he has spoken quiet to a distracted people; and has before him now the bright prospect of retiring to private life at a time of universal peace, harmony and prosperity. Not only the domestic but the foreign policy of his administration will have been attended with eminent success, and it will only require the harmonious action of the Democracy to insure to the country the election of a successor pledged to the support of its principles—Washington Constitution.

Two Prisoners, confined in the jail of this county—Franklin Haas, committed for stealing, and Patrick Curry, committed for threatening the life of his better half,—made an ineffectual attempt, some time last week, to escape from the prison by means of breaking a large hole in the wall of the room in which the late Mr. Twigg was confined. They had broken the padlock at the room door, and replaced it in such a way that it was not observed by the Sheriff, until when he discovered the hole in the wall, and thereby prevented their further operations. They have since been hopped, and put upon English diet to cool them down in this hot and sultry weather.—Danville Democrat.

A sixty-four pound army gun burst at the Washington Navy-yard, while the gunner's crew were engaged in battery practice, and two men, named James H. Wilson and William Nokes, were killed, their heads being blown off, and their bodies being thrown to a considerable distance. Eight other persons were severely wounded.

Col. Jefferson Davis is said to be engineering the Presidential prospects of Gen. Pierce, who is reported to be in the race for Charleston.

Dr. W. E. M'Laure, formerly an editor in Pittsburg and Cleveland, is preparing to depart for Japan, where he will hereafter devote himself to missionary labors.

## EXTRACT: Mr. Webster to Ignacio Tolen, N. Y.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
WASHINGTON, June 25, 1852.

The respect paid to any passport granted by this Department to a naturalized citizen, formerly a subject of Spain, will depend upon the laws of that nation in relation to the allegiance due its authority by its native-born subjects. If that Government recognizes the right of its subjects to denationalize themselves, and assimilate with the citizens of other countries, the usual passport will be a sufficient safeguard to you; but if allegiance to the Crown of Spain may not legally be renounced by its subjects, you must expect to be liable to the obligations of a Spanish subject, if you voluntarily place yourself within the jurisdiction of that Government.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
WASHINGTON, June 1, 1852.

Sir: There to acknowledge the receipt of your letter to Mr. Redhall of the 27th ultimo, inquiring whether Mr. Victor B. Depierre, a native of France, but a naturalized citizen of the United States, can expect the protection of this Government in that country when proceeding thither with a passport from this Department. In reply, I have to inform you that if, as is understood to be the fact, the Government of France does not acknowledge the right of natives of that country to renounce their allegiance, it may lawfully claim their services when found within French jurisdiction.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,  
DANIEL WEBSTER,  
To J. B. Nones, Esq., New York.

The letter from Mr. Everett, was addressed to our Minister at Berlin, under date of 14th January, 1853, in reference to several cases which had been presented by his Ministers.

"The question raised," Mr. Everett writes, "has received the particular attention of the President." The following extracts sufficiently state this doctrine:—

If, then, a Prussian subject, born and living under this state of law, chooses to emigrate to a foreign country without obtaining the certificate which alone can discharge him from the obligation of military services, he takes that step at his own risk. He elects to go abroad under the burden of a duty which he owes to his Government.—His departure is of the nature of an escape from her laws, and if, at any subsequent period he is indiscreet enough to return to his native country, he cannot complain if those laws are executed to his disadvantage. His case resembles that of a soldier or sailor enlisted by conscription or other compulsory process in the army or navy. If he should desert the service of his country, and thereby render himself amenable to military law, no one would expect that he could return to his native land and bid defiance to its laws, because, in the meantime, he might have become a naturalized citizen of a foreign State.

For these reasons, and without entering into the discussion of the question of perpetual allegiance, the President is of opinion that, if a subject of Prussia, lying under a certain amount of military duty, leaves his native land, and without performing that duty or obtaining the prescribed "certificate of emigration," comes to the United States and is naturalized, and afterwards, for any purpose whatever, goes back to Prussia, it is not competent for the United States to protect him from the operation of the Prussian law. The case may be one of great hardship, especially if the omission to procure the certificate arose from inadvertence or ignorance; but this fact alters a just ground of sympathy, does not alter the case as one of international law.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
WASHINGTON, May 17th, 1859.

To Mr. Felix LeClerc, Memphis Tenn.,

Sir—Your letter of the 13th instant, has been received. In reply, I have to state, that it is understood, that the French Government claims military service from all natives of France who may be found within its jurisdiction. Your naturalization in this country will not exempt you from that claim if you should voluntarily repair thither.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
LEWIS CASS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
WASHINGTON, June 14, 1859.

Sir—In answer to your letter of the 6th inst., I have to inform you that the brief letter from this Department to which you referred dated the 17th day of May last, and addressed to Mr. Felix LeClerc, was in reply to an application for information, and was principally intended to recommend caution to our naturalized citizens, natives of France, in returning to that country, as the operations of the French conscription law were not precisely known here, and might bear injuriously upon that class of American citizens. Most of the Continental European nations have a system of military organization by which their citizens are compelled to serve in the army by conscription, as in France, where the duty is designated by lot or by draft, as in Prussia, where every young man is required to take his turn as a soldier.

The condition of American naturalized citizens returning to their native country where the system of compulsory service prevails, and who had left before performing such service, has frequently been the subject of discussion with some of the European powers. Quite recently it has arisen between the United States and Prussia, and the representative of that country at the Court of Berlin has brought the matter to the attention of the Prussian Government. In the instructions which were sent to him, dated May 12, 1859, it was explicitly stated that this government is opposed to the doctrine of perpetual allegiance, and maintains the right of expatriation and the right to form new political ties elsewhere. Upon this subject it is observed, that in this age of the world the idea of controlling the citizen in the choice of a home, and binding him by a mere political theory to inhabit for a lifetime a country which he constantly desires to leave, can hardly be entertained by any government whatever.

The position of the United States, as communicated to the Minister at Berlin for the information of the Prussian government, is that native born Prussians naturalized in the United States and returning to the country of their birth, are not liable to any duties or penalties, except such as were existing at the period of their emigration. If at that time they were in the army or actually called into it, such emigration and naturalization do not exempt them from the penalty which they incurred by their desertion, but this penalty may be enforced against them whenever they shall voluntarily place themselves within the local jurisdiction of their native country and shall be proceeded against according to law. But when no present liabilities exist against them at the period of their emigration, the law of nations, in the opinion of this government gives no right to any country to interfere with naturalized American citizens, and the attempt to do so would be considered an act unjust in itself and unfriendly towards the United States.—It is only when he voluntarily returns to his native country that its local laws can be enforced against him.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
LEWIS CASS.

Extract of a dispatch from the Department of State to the Minister of the United States at Berlin, dated July 8, 1859.

The right of expatriation cannot at this day be doubted or denied in the United States. The idea has been repudiated ever since the origin of our Government, that a man is bound to remain forever in the country of his birth, and that he has no right to exercise his free will and consult his own happiness by selecting a new home. The most eminent writers on public law recognize the right of expatriation. This can only be contested by those who in the nineteenth century are still devoted to the ancient feudal law with all its oppression. The doctrine of perpetual allegiance is a relic of barbarism which has been gradually disappearing from Christendom during the last century.

The Constitution of the United States recognizes the natural right of expatriation, by conferring upon Congress the power "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization." Indeed, it was one of the grievances alleged against the British King in the Declaration of Independence, that he had "endeavored to prevent the population of these States—for that purpose obstructing the laws of naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither," &c., &c. The Constitution thus clearly recognizes the principle of expatriation in the strongest manner. It would have been inconsistent in itself, and unworthy of the character of the authors of that instrument, to hold out inducements to foreigners to abandon their native land, to announce their allegiance to their native Government, and to become citizens of the United States, if they had not been convinced of the absolute and unconditional right of expatriation. Congress have uniformly acted upon this principle ever since the Federal Government. They established "a uniform rule of naturalization" nearly seventy years ago. There has since been no period in our history when laws for this purpose did not exist, though their provisions have undergone excessive changes.—The alien, in order to become a citizen, must declare on oath or affirmation that he will support the Constitution of the United States; and, at the same time, he is required to absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, State or Sovereignty whatever, and particularly, by name, the prince, potentate, State or sovereignty whereof he was before a citizen.

The exercise of the right of naturalization, and the consequent recognition of the principle of expatriation, are not confined to the Government of the United States.—There is not a country in Europe, I believe, at the present moment, where the law does not authorize the naturalization of foreigners in one form or other. Indeed, in some of these countries this law is more liberal than our own to foreigners.

The question, then, arises, what rights do our laws confer upon a foreigner by granting him naturalization? I answer, all the rights, privileges, and immunities which belong to a native born citizen, in their full extent, with the single qualification that, along with the Constitution, "no person except a natural born citizen is eligible to the office of President." With this exception—the naturalized citizen, from and after the date of his naturalization, both at home and abroad, is placed upon the very same footing with the native citizen. He is neither in a better nor a worse condition. If a native citizen chooses to take up his residence in a foreign country for the purpose of advancing his fortune or promoting his happiness, he is, whilst there, bound to obey its municipal laws equally with those who have lived in it all their lives. He goes abroad with his eyes open; and if these laws be arbitrary and unjust, he has chosen to abide by the consequences. If they are administered in an equal spirit towards himself and towards native subjects, this Government has no right to interfere authoritatively in his behalf. To do this would be to violate the right of an independent nation to legislate within its own Territory. If this Government were to undertake such a task, we might soon be involved in trouble with nearly the whole world. To protect our citizens against the application of this principle of universal law, in its full extent, we have treaties with several nations securing exemption to American citizens when residing abroad from some of the onerous duties required from their own subjects. Where no such treaty exists and an American citizen has committed a crime or incurred a penalty for violating any municipal law whatever of the country of his temporary residence, he is just as liable to be tried and punished for his offense, as though he had resided in it from the day of his birth. If this has not been done before his departure and he should voluntarily return under the same jurisdiction, he may be tried and punished for the offense upon principles of universal law. Under such circumstances no person would think

of contending that an intermediate residence in his own country for years would deprive the Government whose laws he had violated of the power to enforce their execution.—The very same principle, and no other, is applicable to the case of a naturalized citizen, should he choose to return to his native country. In that case, if he had committed an offense against the law before his departure, he is responsible for it in the same manner as the native American citizen to whom I have referred. In the language of the late Mr. Marcy, in his letter of the 10th January, 1854, to Mr. Jackson, then *Charge d'Affaires* to Vienna, when speaking of Toussig's case, "every nation, whenever its laws are violated by any one owing obedience to them, whether he be a citizen or a stranger, has a right to inflict the penalties incurred upon the transgressor, if found within its jurisdiction." This principle is well established to admit of serious controversy. If one of our native or naturalized citizens were to expose himself to punishment by the commission of an offense against any of our laws, State or national, and afterwards become a naturalized subject of a foreign country, he would have "the hardship to contend, upon voluntarily returning within our jurisdiction, that his naturalization relieved him from the punishment due to his crime; much less could he appeal to the government of his adopted country to protect him against its responsibility to the United States or any of the States. This Government would not for a moment listen to such an appeal.

Whilst these principles cannot be contested, great care should be taken in their application, especially our naturalized citizen. The moment a foreigner becomes naturalized, his allegiance to his native country is severed forever. He experiences a new political birth. A broad and impassable line separates him from his native country. He is no more responsible for anything he may say or do, or omit to say or do, after assuming his new character, than if he had been born in the United States. Should he return to his native country, he returns as an American citizen, and in no other character. In order to entitle his original Government to punish him for an offense, this must have been committed whilst he was a subject and owed allegiance to that Government. The offense must have been complete before his expatriation. It must have been such a character that he might have been tried and punished for it at the moment of his departure. A future liability to serve in the army will not be sufficient—because, before the time can arrive for such service, he has changed his allegiance, and has become a citizen of the United States. It would be quite absurd to contend that a boy, brought to this country from a foreign country with his father's family, when but 12 years of age, and naturalized here, who should afterwards visit the country of his birth when he had become a man, might then be seized and compelled to perform military service, because, if he had remained there throughout the intervening years, and his life had been spared, he would have been bound to perform military service. To submit to such a principle would be to make an odious distinction between our naturalized and native citizens. For this reason, in my dispatch to you of May 12, 1859, and again in my letter to Mr. Hofer, of the 14th ult., I confine the foreign jurisdiction, in regard to our naturalized citizens, to such of them as "were in the army, or actually called into it" at the time they left Prussia. That is, to the case of actual desertion, or a refusal to enter the army after having been regularly drafted and called into it by the Government to which at the time they owed allegiance. It is presumed that neither of these cases presents any difficulty in point of principle. If a soldier or sailor were to desert from our army or navy, for which offense he is liable to a severe punishment, and, after having become a naturalized subject of another country, should return to the United States, it would be a singular defence for him to make that he was absolved from his crime because, after its commission, he had become a subject of another Government. It would be still more strange were that Government to interpose in his behalf for any such reason. Again, during the last war with Great Britain, in several of the States—I might mention Pennsylvania in particular—the militia man who was drafted and called into the service, was exposed to a severe penalty if he did not obey the draft and muster himself into the service, or in default thereof, procure a substitute. Suppose such an individual, after having incurred this penalty, had gone to a foreign country and become naturalized there and then returned to Pennsylvania, is it possible to imagine that for this reason the arm of the State authorities would be paralyzed, and that they could not exact the penalty? I state these examples to show more clearly both the extent and the limitation of rightful Hanoverian jurisdiction in such cases. It is impossible to foresee all the varying circumstances which may attend cases as they arise; but it is believed that the principles laid down may generally be sufficient to guide your conduct.

It is to be deeply regretted that the German Government evince so much tenacity on this subject. It would be better, for them, considering the comparatively small number of their native subjects who return to their dominions after being naturalized in this country, not to attempt to exact military service from them. They will prove to be most reluctant soldiers. If they violate any law of their native country during their residence there, they are, of course, amenable like other American citizens. It would be a sad mistake for them, for the sake of an advantage so trifling to such Governments, they should involve themselves in serious difficulties with a country so desirous as we are of maintaining with them the most friendly relations. It is fortunate that serious difficulties of the kind are mainly confined to the German States, and especially that the laws of Great Britain do not authorize any compulsory military service whatever.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
WASHINGTON, June 14, 1859.

To Mr. Felix LeClerc, Memphis Tenn.,

Sir—Your letter of the 13th instant, has been received. In reply, I have to state, that it is understood, that the French Government claims military service from all natives of France who may be found within its jurisdiction. Your naturalization in this country will not exempt you from that claim if you should voluntarily repair thither.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
LEWIS CASS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
WASHINGTON, June 14, 1859.

Sir—In answer to your letter of the 6th inst., I have to inform you that the brief letter from this Department to which you referred dated the 17th day of May last, and addressed to Mr. Felix LeClerc, was in reply to an application for information, and was principally intended to recommend caution to our naturalized citizens, natives of France, in returning to that country, as the operations of the French conscription law were not precisely known here, and might bear injuriously upon that class of American citizens. Most of the Continental European nations have a system of military organization by which their citizens are compelled to serve in the army by conscription, as in France, where the duty is designated by lot or by draft, as in Prussia, where every young man is required to take his turn as a soldier.

The condition of American naturalized citizens returning to their native country where the system of compulsory service prevails, and who had left before performing such service, has frequently been the subject of discussion with some of the European powers. Quite recently it has arisen between the United States and Prussia, and the representative of that country at the Court of Berlin has brought the matter to the attention of the Prussian Government. In the instructions which were sent to him, dated May 12, 1859, it was explicitly stated that this government is opposed to the doctrine of perpetual allegiance, and maintains the right of expatriation and the right to form new political ties elsewhere. Upon this subject it is observed, that in this age of the world the idea of controlling the citizen in the choice of a home, and binding him by a mere political theory to inhabit for a lifetime a country which he constantly desires to leave, can hardly be entertained by any government whatever.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
WASHINGTON, June 14, 1859.

To Mr. Felix LeClerc, Memphis Tenn.,

Sir—Your letter of the 13th instant, has been received. In reply, I have to state, that it is understood, that the French Government claims military service from all natives of France who may be found within its jurisdiction. Your naturalization in this country will not exempt you from that claim if you should voluntarily repair thither.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
LEWIS CASS.

## REVIEW OF THE MARKET.

CAREFULLY CORRECTED WEEKLY.

WHEAT,	\$1 25	BUTTER,	16
RYE,	75	EGGS,	12
CORN,	75	TALLOW,	12
OATS,	57	LARD,	10
BUCKWHEAT,	50	POTATOES,	50
FLOUR pr. bbl. 90		DRY APPLES,	2 00
CLOVERSEED,	5 00	HAMS,	12

## DIED.

In Bloomsburg, on Thursday, July 15th, 1859, Charles M. son of Joshua and Rebecca Fetterman, aged 5 years, 5 months and 19 days.

In Bloomsburg, on Friday last week, Alvin Hill, only son of Jacob and Martha Dieffenbach, aged 7 years, 2 months and 15 days.

In Beach Haven, on the 21st inst., of Complicated Typhoid, Daniel D., son of George W. Fisher, aged about 4 years.

At his residence in Bridgetown township, Columbia County, July 15th, Joshua Fowler, aged 99 years.

On Friday last week, in Danville, Mr. Isaac Moore, aged 94 years.

LOCATED AT  
PHILADELPHIA, NEW YORK, BUFFALO,  
ALBANY, CLEVELAND, DETROIT AND CHICAGO.

PHILADELPHIA COLLEGE,  
S. E. Corner Seventh and Chestnut Streets.

—REFERENCES—  
JNO. B. MEYERS, H. COWPERTHWAIT,  
Prof. JOHN S. HART, J. B. LIPPINCOTT,  
MORRIS L. HOLLOWELL.

COUNTING HOUSE COURSE.  
Comprises Book Keeping for Mercantile, Banking, Railroad, and Manufacturing Business with Penmanship, Calculations, Correspondence, &c. &c., fully qualifying the Student for actual business. Students receive individual instruction. Diplomas are awarded to Graduates. \$35.00

Pays for Life Scholarship good in seven Colleges; \$25 for partial course.

For Catalogue and Specimens of Writing, Address  
BRYANT & STRATTON, Philad'a.  
July 27, 1859.

## Court Proclamation.

WHEREAS the Hon. Warren J. Woodward, President Judge of the Court of Oyer and Terminer and General Jail Delivery, Court of Quarter Sessions of the Peace and Court of Common Pleas and Orphans' Court, in the 26th Judicial District, composed of the counties of Columbia, Sullivan and Wyoming, and the Hon. Jacob Evans and Peter Kline, Associate Judges of Columbia County, have issued their process, bearing date one thousand eight hundred and fifty-nine and to me directed for holding a Court of Oyer and Terminer, and General Jail Delivery, Quarter Sessions of the Peace, Court of Common Pleas and Orphans' Court, in the County of Columbia, on the first Monday (being the 5th day) of Sept., next, and to continue one week.

Notice is hereby given, to the Coroner, the Justices of the Peace and Constables of the said County of Columbia, that they be 10 o'clock in the forenoon of said day, with their records, inquisitions and other remembrances to do those things which to their offices appertain to be done. And those that are bound by recognizance, to prosecute against the prisoners that are or may be in the Jail of said county of Columbia, to be then and there to prosecute them as shall be just. Jurors are requested to be punctual in their attendance, agreeably to their notice, dated at Bloomsburg, the 26th day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-nine, and in the 33rd year of the independence of the United States of America. (God save the Commonwealth.) JOHN SNYDER, Sheriff.

## Cases for September Term, 1859.

1. Township of Conynham, vs. Jacob Dirk, et al.
2. John Johnson, vs. Daniel Ziegler.
3. Amos W. Creamer, vs. Charles B. Troy.
4. John Bonner, vs. Benjamin W. Stewart.
5. Wm. Simons, et al. John Covenhoven.
6. Benjamin A. Cole, vs. William Simons.
7. L. F. Rupert, et al. vs. Washington Lee.
8. Strawbridge A. Wilson vs. Wm. Robison.
9. Henry M. Fuller, vs. Nathan Stecker.
10. Jacob Sanders, vs. William Metz.
11. S. Bittenbender, vs. S. E. Fowler, et al.
12. A. B. Wilson's Ex. vs. A. Vanbouts, et al.
13. John Pealer, vs. Thomas Pealer, et al.
14. George Stricker, vs. Stephen Baldy.
15. Peter Miller, et al. vs. Cattawissa, Wil-Hampert & Erie Rail Road.
16. Wm. Robison, vs. T. C. Eise, et al.
17. Samuel Lemon, vs. A. W. Creamer.
18. James B. Parks, vs. Jacob Masteller.
19. Sylvester Aie, vs. Samuel Conner, et al.

## Grand Jurors for Sept. Term, 1859.

- Benton—Stephen Keifer, Samuel McHenry, Borough of Berwick—Frees Fowler.
- Briarcliff—Eugene Benjamin, Wm. Stewart, Conynham—Jacob Dirk, William L. Kline, Centre—Benj. Fowler, Henry Dietterick, Cattawissa—Sam'l B. Diemer, Joseph Gearhart, John Sharpless.
- Fishingcreek—Joseph Fullmer.
- Hemelock—Zabulon Robbins, Henry Shaffer.
- Locust—Francis Karns.
- Madison—Jacob Girton, William Fersel, Jacob Bechtel.
- Mifflin—Charles Workheiser.
- Montic Pleasant—Samuel Ale.
- Orange—Moses Everitt, Conrad Rader, David Herring, Edward Delong.

## Travelers Jurors—Sept. Term, 1859.

- Bloom—Jacob Deiffenbach, Andrew Madison, Palemon John, David M. McKinney, Borough of Berwick—John Eggart.
- Briarcliff—Jacob W. Dietterick, Ephraim Evans.
- Cattawissa—Nathan Helwig, Joseph Claywell, Isaiah John.
- Centre—Sam'l Bower, Andrew Fears, Paul Zaner.
- Franklin—Washington Parr.
- Fishingcreek—Bernard Ammerman.
- Greenwood—John Fikington.
- Hemelock—Wm. Miller, Franklin McBride, William Cool.
- Locest—Samuel Keller, George Fetterman, Jonas Helwig, Rohland Hughes.
- Mifflin—William N. Brown.
- Madison—Rouben Hartman.
- Orange—Wm. Eitenberger, Abner Welsh.
- Pine—Albert Hunter.
- Roaringcreek—Michael Federoff.
- Sugarloaf—John Kile, Reuben Larish.
- Scott—Jackson Eyer, Jacob Cloew, Henry Tremblay, Huston Robison, Jacob D. Melick.

JOHN SNYDER, Sheriff.  
Bloomsburg, August 1859.

## SHERIFF SALES.

By virtue of several writs of venditioni exponas, to me directed, there will be exposed to public sale, at the Court House in Bloomsburg, on Monday the 5th day of September, the following described property to wit:

The undivided one half part of a certain lot of ground situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman. Also on the undivided half part of three other lots of ground lying contiguous to each other, situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman. Also on the undivided half part of three other lots of ground lying contiguous to each other, situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman.

Also, on the undivided half part of a certain lot of ground situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman. Also on the undivided half part of three other lots of ground lying contiguous to each other, situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman.

Also, on the undivided half part of a certain lot of ground situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman. Also on the undivided half part of three other lots of ground lying contiguous to each other, situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman.

Also, on the undivided half part of a certain lot of ground situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman. Also on the undivided half part of three other lots of ground lying contiguous to each other, situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman.

Also, on the undivided half part of a certain lot of ground situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman. Also on the undivided half part of three other lots of ground lying contiguous to each other, situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman.

Also, on the undivided half part of a certain lot of ground situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman. Also on the undivided half part of three other lots of ground lying contiguous to each other, situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman.

Also, on the undivided half part of a certain lot of ground situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman. Also on the undivided half part of three other lots of ground lying contiguous to each other, situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman.

Also, on the undivided half part of a certain lot of ground situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman. Also on the undivided half part of three other lots of ground lying contiguous to each other, situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worman.

Also, on the undivided half part of a certain lot of ground situated in Esopus, Columbia County, and numbered twenty-four, [24] bounded by Main street, a lot of George Vanslyke, an alley and a lot of Samuel A. Worm