

this course, than I had anticipated, though I still think the treaty would have been safer without this clause.

I appreciate the reluctance of the Senator to debate this subject. It is no pleasant task. As he well intimates, it demands strong reprobation, in strong language. I believe I have not, certainly I have not intended, to employ expressions, which do not fairly belong to the circumstances. I recollect, some years since, that Lord John Russell, in the British House of Commons, called Mr. Polk's Oregon message a "blustering display"—I think that was the term. His lordship's display was an unfortunate one, for their was nothing to warrant the aspersion. But there are pretensions so grossly unjust, that no mild epithets befit their character. One of these we are dealing with to-day.

Lord Clarendon, in a dispatch to Mr. Crampton, connects the Mosquito protectorate with the honor of England, and distinctly avows that he has no intention to abandon it. He, indeed, tells Mr. Buchanan that the Government "did intend to reduce and limit that happy." Mr. Buchanan's retort is a very happy one. He intimates that some proof of this design, more substantial than the mere declaration, might remove this subject from the controversy. It is not denied, on the part of England, that it must be exercised without bringing with it occupation, or fortification, or colonization, or dominion.

Now, sir, what is this protectorate, which cannot be abandoned without leaving a dishonorable stain upon the English escutcheon? How has it been exercised, and what good has it done? I need not go over the historical narrative, showing the unjustifiable progress of this assumption of supremacy over the Indians. The story has been often told, and the interference itself has been the principal cause of more than one war between Spain and England. It reduced these Indians, or—if it has not actually done that—it has aided in reducing them from a numerous band of high-spirited aborigines to a miserable remnant of a few hundreds—I believe not more than five hundred north of the San Juan—and the decadence has not been less rapid or visible in their moral and physical condition, than in their power and numbers. All accounts represent them as in the lowest state of wretchedness. "Degraded, as Mr. Buchanan says, "even below the common Indian standard"—they can hardly sink lower. And the contemptible exhibition of King crowning has been enacted at Jamaica, as well as in the Mosquito country, by British officers of the highest authority; and the head of a drunken savage chief has been circled with a tinsel royal diadem, and he has been hailed as one of the sovereigns of the earth. And the title in happy coincidence with the farce, and must have sounded enthusiastically to English ears, when the trumpets blew—and I suppose they did, as in the olden time—and the people cried, God save the King of the Mosquitoes!

Lord Palmerston seems to have held a very different estimate of the powers of this monarch, and condition of his monarchy; at different times, or, at any rate, to have avowed one. He said, in a letter dated July 16, 1849, to the Minister of Nicaragua, that "the King of the Mosquitoes had, from an early period of history, been the independent ruler of a separate territory." "E converso," he said to Mr. Rives, "they have what is called a King, but who, by-the-by, is as much a King as you or I." "What a jewel is consistency! Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston both denominated this pretension a fiction. It is so, and a gross one, too. I might, indeed, characterize it by a stronger epithet. But, like other members of the same imaginative family, it is undergoing a metamorphosis which is rapidly converting it into a fact, which, if not now met and resisted, will mark its place in history as having exercised a controlling influence upon the fate of those wide-spread regions. The world is looking on, and doubtless with interest watching the course of the disputants, and regarding the cause of the struggle as an experiment, wondering whether British presumption or American forbearance can be carried furthest or continued longest. While a British Secretary of State is lending his sanction to such an unworthy transaction, referring to the appointing process as one of the foundations of the British claim, in a communication with an American representative, Lord Clarendon calls the present chief "a decent, well-behaved youth." He may be so; but if he is, he does not derive his virtues, as he does his realm, from hereditary descent; for Lord Clarendon further says: "This late Majesty, his father, was a bad fellow." He was a selfish, drunken savage; all accounts agree in that. Lord Clarendon said, inadvertently I should think, with proud frankness it may be, that the present monarch lives in the family of Mr. Green, the consul, denying at the same time the exercise of any British power over the region by means of the royal protegee. He adds, however, "that the consul may be often called upon to give his advice or opinion to the Mosquito Government."

Well, sir, this is cool, if not satisfactory. And has Lord Clarendon so low an estimate of mankind, as to suppose that a single man, either in his country or in ours, can be found, who can be deceived by such representations? It is making a heavy demand upon human credulity. Here is an immense extent of sea-coast—more than five hundred miles—held by the British Government, upon this weakest of all pretenses. Thus held to-day, but to be held to-morrow in full sovereignty by the right of possession, and, if need be, by the application of power. And all this, while the wax is hardly dry upon a treaty, whose whole spirit is incompatible with even the exercise of influence for political purposes by one party, which might, as I have already said, injuriously affect the other in that magnificent region.

But, after all, Lord Clarendon makes the following striking admission—and a strange one it is, considering his general propositions and pretensions. He says, though Great Britain never held possession of the Mosquito coast, yet "she undoubtedly exercises a great and powerful influence over it as protector of the Mosquito king." Who knows, but that this relation may hereafter assume a position in the English heraldic college, and as the sovereign is the DEPENDER OF THE FAITH, the protectorship of the Mosquitoes may take its place alongside the boasted motto of the Pious Henry VIII.

I desire to ask the honorable Senator from Delaware, if this professed abstinence from interference has been observed, and whether the British consul has not issued grants of land, without reference to the authority of the Mosquito King?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, sir; he undoubtedly has done so. If the Senator will refer to a letter of our Minister in Central America, of the 10th day of July, 1849, addressed to this Government, he will see that the Minister states that he distinctly. He says:

"Since the seizure of this port by the English, the municipal and other regulations have been dictated by the English authorities, at the head of which stands her Britannic Majesty's consul general, Mr. W. D. Christy. He has taken up his residence here, and assumed the entire control of affairs. No written laws or regulations have been promulgated; and this gentleman is, de facto, a dictator, his will being the law, beyond which there is no appeal. He has made himself extremely obnoxious to the inhabitants, without exception, and his arbitrary conduct is the subject of complaint on every hand. His sole adherents are half a dozen officials, one of whom is vice consul, another harbor-master, others policemen, &c. Although the so-called Mosquito flag is flying, yet, apart from this, there seems to be no reference to Mosquito authority on the part of the consul-general. He has taken upon himself to disregard all leases and grants of land made by the Nicaraguan authorities before the English conquest, and assumes to sell the same, not as the agent of the Mosquito King, but as her Britannic Majesty's vice consul.

"This assumption may not be deemed of much importance, but it will tend to show that here it is hardly deemed worth the while longer to keep up the shallow disguise of 'Mosquito authority.'"

This will be found on the 135th page of Executive Document, No. 75, of the first session of the Thirty-First Congress.

Mr. SUMNER. What is the date of the letter?

Mr. CLAYTON. July 10, 1849. Again: on page 138 of the same document, there is a specimen of one of these grants, signed by her Britannic Majesty's vice consul, James Green; and a statement of sums of money paid for a survey of the land by Robert Woods, surveyor, an Englishman. Mr. Rives instructs Mr. Buchanan that there is really no Mosquito Government! It is as he says, merely a British Government.

Mr. CASS. Now, sir, I have neither time nor patience to examine and expose this ground, assumed by Lord Clarendon. That the whole of the Mosquito country is just as much under the subjection of England, as the island of Jamaica, is as obvious, as the most palpable fact which is now passing before the world.

A few days ago, sir, when this subject was before the Senate, I recalled some reminiscences connected with English philanthropic professions of regard for the Indians, of which we have heard so much in this country; and upon that occasion, I appealed to the honorable Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CRITTENDEN] as a witness of the truth of my assertions. I renew the appeal to-day, because I know him to be a competent one, both traditional and personal; for having been born and lived all his life on the DARK AND BLOODY GROUND of Kentucky, as it was called by the Indians, he early heard the tales of horror, which Indian barbarities, urged on by British agents, brought upon that country; and I saw him stand up in battle against a combined Christian and barbarian army, where the red man had been subsidized to fight the warfare of the white man. He knew—the country knows, indeed, that these allies, as they were called by the British commissioners at Ghent, were purchased by a lavish distribution of money, and presents, and whiskey, and by the hopes of gaining Indian trophies in the form of human scalps, to be reaped in a bloody harvest on our frontiers. This state of things was never more eloquently or feelingly depicted than by Fisher Ames, in an address in the House of Representatives, remarkable in our oratorical history for its beauty. It took place during the administration of General Washington, on a resolution that it was expedient, to make appropriations for carrying into effect the treaty with Great Britain. The consequences of the failure to do so formed the principal topic of Mr. Ames's remarks; and among these the Indian hostilities, to which we should be exposed by English influence over the Indians, were the most prominent. His thrilling accents yet almost ring in my ears. The eloquent speaker said:

"On this theme, my emotions are unnumbered. If I could find words for them, if my powers bore any proportion to my zeal, I would swell my voice to such a note of reprobation, it should reach every log-house beyond the mountains. I would say to the inhabitants, wake from your false security; your cruel dangers, your apprehensions are soon to be renewed again. The wounds, yet unhealed, are to be torn open again. In the day time, your path through the woods will be ambushed the darkness of midnight will glitter with the blaze of your dwellings. You are a father—the blood of your sons shall fatten your corn-fields. You are a mother—the war-hoop shall wake the sleep of the cradle."

I look with a feeling of loathing upon this interference of one civilized nation with savage tribes living out of its territory, and within the dominions of another Power. And the feeling reaches indignation, when the measure is cloaked by hollow professions of philanthropy, while, in fact, it is dictated by the purposes of power. Our experience has been a long and costly one; and I do not believe, that there has since been any change in this system of political ethics, which accelerated the downfall of our Indians, and which is producing a similar fate upon the coast of Central America. May our aboriginal inhabitants be everywhere delivered from the protection of such a protector!

Let us survey this matter of the treaty from another point of view. A change of position here gives increased interest to the same landscape. Suppose an arrangement like this had been entered into between the French and English Governments, for the purpose of securing a transit across the isthmus of Suez, and a safe communication through the Red sea, for both parties, to the rich regions of eastern Asia. And suppose the French Government had endeavored, under the claim of protection, and by means of money—that key to the heart of an Arab—to gain an ascendancy over some of the Ishmaelite tribes on the eastern coast of the Red sea, with Consuls to board and lodge the chiefs, and to give "them advice and opinion"—those are the words—upon all important affairs; I say, supposing all this, what would be the course of the British Government? And the question becomes still more emphatic, if to these suppositions we join another, that the French should add insult to injury by offering such reasons—no, not reasons, but such pretenses—for their want of faith, as are coolly presented and urged for our satisfaction and acquiescence. I will not pursue the inquiry; it cannot be necessary. The answer may be read in the history of England, and he who seeks it there can find it. I now renew the request that the letter of Mr. Johnson may be read.

The Secretary read the letter as follows: WASHINGTON, December 30, 1853.

MY DEAR SIR: I cannot hesitate to comply with your request, to give you my opinion on the construction of the treaty of Washington, of the 19th of April, 1850. Pending the negotiation of this treaty, I exerted myself

in personal conferences with Sir Henry L. Bulwer, to bring about an agreement between you and him; and, on several occasions, I had the honor to be consulted by you both particularly in reference to the declarations made on both sides, at or about the time of the exchange of ratifications.

In the first draft of the first article of the treaty presented by you for the consideration of the President, the contracting parties were obligated not "to occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America." I thought that, as you did, that these words were sufficient to exclude any nation disposed to observe the faith of treaties from occupying, fortifying, colonizing, or assuming or exercising any dominion, under any pretext, or for any purpose. I still think so; but I remember well that other gentlemen, who were consulted at the time, desired, from abundant caution, that Great Britain should pledge herself not to make use of any protection which she afforded or might afford, or any alliance which she had or might have, to or with any State or people, for the purpose of occupying, fortifying, or colonizing, or of assuming or exercising dominion over that country; and, in consequence, the provision to that effect was introduced as a part of that article. The object of this was still more especially to disarm the Mosquito protectorate of Great Britain in Central America.

My own opinion was then, and it now is, that this provision was not at all necessary. You thought as I did; but as it could not possibly weaken the force or effect of the preceding words, and, if effective at all, could only serve to render them more forcible and operative; we did not object to its insertion. If the former words prohibited, as they clearly did of themselves, the doing any of the particular acts specified, an express stipulation, that such acts should not be done, by or under cover of protectorates or alliances, could only operate still more effectively and absolutely to prohibit them. As one of the advisers of the President, I unhesitatingly gave him my opinion, that the treaty did effectually, to all intents and purposes, disarm the British protectorate in Central America and the Mosquito coast, although it did not abolish the protectorate in terms, nor was it thought advisable to do so, "in *ipissimis verbis*." All that was desired by us was, to extinguish British dominion over that country, whether held directly or indirectly—whether claimed by Great Britain in her own right or in the right of the Indians. But our Government had no motive and desire to prevent Great Britain from performing any of the duties which charity or compassion for a fallen race might dictate to her, or to deprive ourselves of the power to interfere to the same extent in the cause of humanity. We never designed to do anything which could enable the enemies of this miserable remnant of Indians to butcher or starve them; and we thought that both Great Britain and the United States owed it to their high character for civilization and humanity, to interfere so far in their behalf as to prevent the extirpation of the race, or the expulsion of them from the lands they occupied, without extinguishing, by a reasonable indemnity, the Indian title according to the rules of justice, which have been admitted both by the English and ourselves. But we did inter, (and the treaty contains everything for that purpose that could be desired) to prevent the British Government from using any armed force, without our consent, within the prohibited region, under pretext or cover of her pretended protectorate. And when now reviewing what was done, I say, upon my responsibility as a lawyer, and as the legal adviser of the President at the time, that, in my judgment, human language could not be more properly and admirably selected for the purpose, than that which you employed when you signed the treaty.

It has been said, but I can hardly accredit it, that Great Britain now contends, in virtue of the phraseology of the last part of the first article, incidentally speaking of the protection which either party may use, that the treaty acknowledges the protectorate over the Indians. If so, it equally acknowledges our protectorate over the same Indians, or over Nicaragua, or any State which we may choose to protect. The same words apply to both parties, and it is a bad rule that does not work equally for both. The moment Great Britain threatens, with arms, to defend the Indians, and claims a right to do so in virtue of the treaty, we may claim, by the same instrument, with equal justice, the right to take arms in defense of Honduras and Nicaragua. But, in my judgment, the treaty, which was meant for peaceful purposes, denies both to Great Britain and the United States the right to interfere, by force of arms, for any such purpose, or for any other purpose, except mutual consent. If Great Britain may send an army in Nicaragua to defend the Indians without violating the treaty, which binds her not to occupy that country; then by the same rule of construction, she may also fortify the whole of Central America, or introduce a colony there under the same pretext. Any adverse possession of Great Britain in Central America, without our consent, is an occupation in violation of her national faith. The construction which would allow her to place an armed soldiery on the territory, for the purpose of protecting the Indians would also allow her to assume absolute dominion there for the same purpose, and thus annul the whole treaty.

But it may be said that some other nation may invade Central America, and that this construction would deprive both the contracting parties of the power to defend it. Not at all. Both parties have bound themselves to protect the canal, and all the canals and all the railroads that can be made, not only in Central America, but in any part of the Isthmus which separates North from South America. In virtue of this obligation, it would be the duty of both to resist, by the most effective means in their power, all invasion and other acts hostile to their great and philanthropic common purpose. So, too, injuries or torts inflicted either by the Indians, or by any Central American State, upon either American citizens or British subjects, may be punished by their respective Governments without violating the treaty; and no one of these States, by means of a convention, which is marked in every line by a devotion to the true principles of commerce, civilization, and equal justice to all men, can escape punishment for her injustice or oppression. This treaty is the first instance, within my knowledge, in which two great nations of the earth have thus endeavored to combine, peacefully, for the promotion and accomplishment of an object which, when completed, must advance the happiness and prosperity of all men; and it would be a matter of deep regret, if the philanthropic and noble objects of the negotiation should now be defeated by petty cavils and special pleading on either side of the Atlantic.

As to the declaration of Sir Henry L. Bulwer, and the counter-declaration made by you at the time of the exchange of the ratifications, I probably had a better opportunity of understanding the views and objects of both of you, than any other. I assisted, by your request, in the arrangement of the phraseology of the counter-declaration, dated the 4th of July, 1850, to Sir Henry L. Bulwer's declaration of the 29th of June. By your request, also, I examined Sir Henry L. Bulwer's powers, and conversed with him, freely and fully, on the whole subject, at a very moment when, in consequence of his declaration, you threatened to break off the whole negotiation.

I remember well, that, after his declaration was received, there was a period when you had resolved to abandon the treaty in consequence of it; but when Sir Henry consented to receive your counter-declaration of the 4th of July, in which you expressly limited the term, "Her Majesty's settlement at Honduras," to that country which is known as British Honduras, as contradistinguished or distinct from the State of Honduras, and also confined the word "dependencies" in his declaration to those "small islands" known at the time to be such, in which also, while admitting Belize, or British Honduras, not to be included in the treaty, you disavowed all purpose of admitting any British title even there; in which, you declared that the treaty did not include "the Central American States within their just limits and proper dependencies," and in which you expressly stated to him that no alteration could be made in the treaty without the consent of the Senate, and that he was understood as not even proposing any such alteration; you then consented to exchange upon that counter-declaration, which, in your judgment, and in mind, too, completely annulled every pretext for asserting that the declarations of the negotiators had altered the convention, or fixed an interpretation upon it contrary to the meaning of the President and Senate. We both considered then, and, as a jurist, I now hold it to be perfectly clear, the exchange of the ratifications on that counter-declaration, was, on the part of the British Minister, complete a waiver of every objection that could be taken to any statement contained in it.

In point of law, the declarations of the negotiators, not submitted to the Senate, were of no validity, and could not effect the treaty. Both understood that. This Government had decided that question in the case of the Mexican protocol, and the British Government was officially informed of their decision. The very power to exchange ratifications gave them the same formation, and it is absolutely impossible that the British Minister could have been deceived on that subject. I remember well, that you steadily refused every effort on the part of Sir Henry, to induce you to recognize the Mosquito title. The treaty left us at liberty to recognize the title of Nicaragua, or any other Central American State, and left the British Government the right to recognize the title of the Mosquito King. On these points the parties agreed to disagree. But the right to recognize is a very different affair from the right to compel others to recognize. The British protectorate was, I repeat, entirely disarmed by the treaty. How is it possible for Great Britain to protect, if she cannot "occupy, or fortify, or assume any dominion whatever" in any part of the territory? She is equally prohibited, in my opinion, from occupying for the purpose of protection, or protecting for the purpose of occupation. If she observes the treaty, her protectorate "stands" (as you once well said of it, in a diplomatic note) "the shadow of a name."

With regard to the British colony said to have been established on the 17th of July, 1852, in the islands of Roatan, Bonacca, Utila, Barbaret, Helena, and Morat; and designated as the colony of the Bay of Islands, the question whether, by establishing such a colony, Great Britain has violated the treaty of 1850, depends entirely upon facts, in regard to which there are different opinions. The only islands known to this Government on the 4th of July, 1850, to be dependencies of British Honduras or Belize, were those referred to in the fourth and fifth articles of the treaty of London, of the 14th of July, 1786. The fourth article provides that "the English shall be permitted to occupy the small island known by the names of Casina, St. George's Key, or Cayo Cafina," and by the fifth article, they "have the liberty of refitting their merchant ships in the southern triangle included between the point of Cayo Cafina and the cluster of small islands which are situated opposite that part of the coast occupied by the cutters, at the distance of eight leagues from the river Wallis, seven from Cayo Cafina, and three from the river Sibun, a place which has always been found well adapted for that purpose. For which end, the edifices and store-houses, absolutely necessary for that purpose shall be allowed to be built."

These articles in the treaty of 1786 gave us the only knowledge of any small islands which were, on the 4th of July, 1850, "dependencies" of British Honduras. I repeat, that the counter-declaration acknowledges no other dependencies of British Honduras than those small islands, which were known to be such at its date. We knew, indeed, that Great Britain, as well as Honduras, had laid claim to Roatan, but we had no information as to the ground on which the former rested her claim. Your reply to Sir Henry L. Bulwer avoided any recognition of the British claim to it, or other allusion to it, than could be inferred from the positive assertion that the treaty did include all the Central American States, "within their just limits and proper dependencies." If these islands were a part of any Central American State at the time of the treaty, the subsequent colonization of them by Great Britain is a clear violation of it. If, on the other hand, they did not then belong to any Central American State, it would be gross injustice on our part to pretend that the treaty did include them. My impression is, that Roatan belongs to the State of Honduras, but, my knowledge of the facts is too limited to enable me to express it without diffidence.

During the Administration of President Taylor, there was no aggression by Great Britain in any part of the Isthmus which was not properly met and resisted. He had firmly resolved, by all constitutional means in his power, to prevent such aggression, if any should be attempted, considering, as he did, that all the passages through the Isthmus should be kept free, to enable us to retain our possessions on the Pacific. I pretend to know nothing of what has occurred there since his day; but neither he nor his advisers could be held responsible if the treaty negotiated by his orders has been at any time violated since his death.

I can scarcely suppose it possible that Great Britain intends seriously to interpose her protectorate again to obtain dominion over the Isthmus. I am assured, that whatever may be contained to the contrary in any despatches

emanating from the British Foreign Office, of which rumor speaks, the fact is that a portion (represented to be one half) of the claim of the Mosquito King has been lately bought up by American citizens, with the concurrence and approbation of the British Government; and that negotiations are on foot, with a fair prospect of success, for the purchase, by the same persons, of the residue of that claim.

I am, dear sir, sincerely your friend and obedient servant,  
REVERDY JOHNSON.  
Hon. JOHN M. CLAYTON,  
United States Senate, Washington.

HUNTINGDON  
AND  
Broad Top R. R.  
OPEN TO STONERSTOWN!

Winter Arrangement.  
ON and after MONDAY, JANUARY 28TH, 1856, trains will leave daily (Sundays excepted) as follows:

Train	A. M.	P. M.
Going South leave junction with Pennsylvania Railroad at 8 o'clock a. m. and 9 o'clock p. m.		
Going North leave Stonerstown Station at 10 o'clock a. m. and 4 o'clock p. m.		
Trains SOUTH leave		
McConeilstown	8.15	2.15
Marklesburg	8.40	2.40
Coffee Run	8.52	2.52
Rough & Ready	9.00	3.00
Fisher's Summit	9.17	3.17
Stonerstown	9.27	3.27
Trains NORTH leave		
Fisher's Summit	10.14	4.14
Rough & Ready	10.29	4.29
Coffee Run	10.48	4.38
Marklesburg	11.00	5.00
McConeilstown	11.21	5.21
Huntingdon	11.42	5.42

Seventy pounds baggage allowed each passenger.  
Freight received by the Conductor of the train and forwarded to any of the above points at owner's risk.  
For any further information enquire at the office of Transportation Department, Huntingdon. JAMES R. MCCLURE, Superintendent.  
January 30, 1856.

NOTICE.  
LETTERS of administration, on the estate of John Stryker, late of west township, Huntingdon county, deceased, having been granted to the undersigned, all persons indebted to said deceased, will please make immediate payment, and those having claims will present them duly authenticated for settlement.  
PETER STRYKER, Admin'r.  
Alexandria, Jan. 16th, 1856.

Norcross' Rotary Planing Machine.  
WANTED—To sell the Rights and Machines for a Rotary Planing, Tonguing and Grooving Machine, for boards and plank, under the Norcross Patent. Also, the attachment of the Moulding Machine, which will work a whole board into mouldings at one operation.—This patent has been tried, and decided in the Supreme Court in Washington, to be no infringement, being superior to Woodworth's Machine.  
Apply to J. D. DALE, Willow Street above Twelfth, Philadelphia, where the Machine can be seen in operation.  
January 16th, 1856.—3m.

NEW GOODS AGAIN!  
AT THE CHEAP CORNER.  
Dry Goods, Clothing, Groceries, &c. &c.  
BENJ. JACOBS  
RESPECTFULLY informs his old customers, Democrats, Whigs, Know Nothings, Sag Nicks and Republicans, and the public in general that he has just opened a large assortment of New Goods for fall and winter, consisting in part of every variety of LADIES' FASHIONABLE GOODS of the latest styles, and best qualities; and Dry Goods in general too numerous to mention.  
READY-MADE CLOTHING—a large assortment for men and boys.  
GROCERIES—fresh and of all kinds.  
HATS and CAPS, and BOOTS and SHOES of all kinds for men, women, misses and boys.  
QUEENSWARE, and all other articles usually kept in a country store.  
Everybody and the rest of man and woman kind, are invited to call and examine for themselves.  
Huntingdon, Sept. 25, 1855.

"GET THE BEST."  
WEBSTER'S  
QUARTO DICTIONARY.  
WHAT more essential to every family, counting room, student, and indeed every one who would know the right use of language—the meaning, orthography, and pronunciation of words, than a good ENGLISH DICTIONARY?—of daily necessity and permanent value.  
WEBSTER'S UNABRIDGED is now the recognized Standard, "constantly cited and relied on in our Courts of Justice, in our legislative bodies, and in public discussions, as entirely conclusive," says Hon. JOHN C. SPENCER.

Can I make a better investment?  
Published by G. & C. MERRIAM, Springfield, Mass.—sold by all Booksellers in Huntingdon and elsewhere.  
Also, Webster's School Dictionaries.  
February 6, 1856.\*

EXECUTORS NOTICE.  
NOTICE is hereby given that letters testamentary on the will of John W. Berkstresser, late of Hopewell township, deceased, have been granted to the undersigned. All persons indebted to the estate of said deceased, are requested to make payment and those having claims to present them for settlement.  
JACOB WEAVER,  
JACOB S. BARKSTRESSER,  
Executors.  
December, 5th 1855.\*

PROPERTY FOR RENT.  
THE undersigned offers for Rent the large Brick House in Water Street, Pa., formerly occupied as a Hotel, but more recently as a Select School. The House is well situated for either purpose. It contains all the ready furniture such as Bedsteads, Tables, Chairs, Stoves, &c., which will be included in the lease of the House.  
ALSO,  
The Ware House and Wharf situated on the Penna. Canal, and one House and Shop suitable for a shoe maker or tailor. Any persons wishing to rent would do well to call on the Proprietor, or address by letter.  
H. B. MYTINGER.  
Water Street, Pa., Jan. 8th, 1856.

H. ROMAN  
Has just opened a good assortment of  
READY-MADE CLOTHING,  
CONSISTING of all kinds of Coats, Pants, Vests, and other articles of gentlemen's wear.  
Oct. 2.

## THE British Periodicals.

PREMIUMS TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS!!  
L. SCOTT & CO., NEW YORK, continued to publish the following leading British Periodicals, viz:

1. The London Quarterly (Conservative).
2. The Edinburgh Review (Whig).
3. The North British Review (Free Church).
4. The Westminster Review (Liberal).
5. Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine (Tory).

The great and important events—Religious, Political, and Military—now agitating the nations of the Old World, give to these Publications an interest and value they never before possessed. They occupy a middle ground between the hastily written news-items, crude speculations, and flying rumors of the newspaper, and the ponderous Tomes of the historian, written long after the living interest in the facts he records shall have passed away. The progress of the War in the East occupies a large space in their pages. Every movement is closely criticised, whether of friend or of foe, and all short comings fearlessly pointed out. The letters from the Crimea and from the Baltic in Blackwood's Magazine, from two of its most popular contributors, give a more intelligible and reliable account of the movements of the great belligerents than can elsewhere be found.

These Periodicals also represent the three great political parties of Great Britain—Whig, Tory, and Radical—but politics forms only one feature of their character. As Organs of the most profound writers on Science, Literature, Morality, and Religion, they stand, as they ever have stood, unrivalled in the world of letters, being considered indispensable to the scholar and the professional man, while to the intelligent reader of every class they furnish a more correct and satisfactory record of the current literature of the day, throughout the world, than can be possibly obtained from any other source.

EARLY COPIES.  
The receipt of Advance Sheets from the British publishers gives additional value to these Reprints, especially during the present exciting state of European affairs, inasmuch as they can now be placed in the hands of subscribers about as soon as the original editions.

TERMS AND PREMIUMS.  
(See List of Premium Volumes below.)  
Per ann.  
For any one of the four Reviews and one Premium volume, \$3 00  
For any two of the four Reviews and one Premium volume, 5 00  
For any three of the four Reviews and two Premium volumes, 7 00  
For all four of the Reviews and two Premium volumes, 8 00  
For Blackwood's Magazine and one Premium volume, 3 00  
For Blackwoods & three Reviews and three Premium volumes, 9 00  
For Blackwood & the 4 Reviews and three Premium volumes, 10 00  
Payments to be made in all cases in advance. Money current in the State where issued will be received at par.  
The Premiums consist of the following works, back volumes of which will be given to new Subscribers according to the number of periodicals ordered, as above explained:—

PREMIUM VOLUMES.  
FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW (one year).  
BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE (six months).  
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW (one year).  
EDINBURGH REVIEW (one year).  
METROPOLITAN MAGAZINE (six months).  
WESTMINSTER REVIEW (one year).  
Consecutive Premium volumes cannot in all cases be furnished, except of the Foreign Quarterly Review. To prevent disappointment, therefore, where that work is not alone wanted, subscribers will please order as many different works for premiums as there are volumes to which they may be entitled.

CLUBBING.  
A discount of twenty-five per cent, from the above prices will be allowed to Clubs ordering four or more copies of any one or more of the above works. Thus: Four copies of Blackwood, or of one Review, will be sent to one address for \$9; four copies of the four Reviews and Blackwood for \$30; and so on.  
No premiums will be given where the above allowance is made to Clubs, unless the subscription money is paid in full to the Publishers without recourse to an agent.

POSTAGE.  
In all the principal Cities and Towns these works will be delivered, FREE OF POSTAGE. When sent by mail, the Postage to any part of the United States will be but Twenty-four Cents a year for "Blackwood" and but Fourteen Cents a year for each of the Reviews.  
Remittances for any of the above publications should always be addressed, post-paid, to the Publishers,  
LEONARD SCOTT & CO.,  
No. 54 Gold Street, New York.

H. B. MYTINGER  
OF  
HUNTINGDON COUNTY

THE undersigned proposes publishing, provided sufficient encouragement be obtained, a Map of Huntingdon county. Said map to be constructed by actual survey of all the public Roads, Rail Roads, Rivers, Streams, Canals, Township lines, &c., and every place of note contained in said county, such as Churches, Post Offices, School Houses, Stores, Taverns, Mills, Factories, Shops, Crossings, and Stations carefully shown in their respective places, and the name and place of residence of nearly every business man in said county, and the branch of business followed by each one respectively.—And the place marked where near all the farm buildings stand, and the proprietors and the occupants name given. Said Map to contain from fourteen to eighteen square feet of engraving, and to be finished in the most modern style and workmanlike manner, &c.  
WILLIAM CHRISTY.  
December 28, 1855.

NOTICE.  
LETTERS of administration, on the estate of Elizabeth Buchanan, late of Brady township, Huntingdon county, deceased, having been granted to the undersigned, all persons indebted to the undersigned, and those having claims, will please present them, properly authenticated, for settlement.  
SAMUEL T. BROWN,  
Administrator.  
Huntingdon, Jan. 9th, 1856.

NOTICE.  
J. W. SEXTON will take all kinds of counting, try produce in exchange for goods at their cheap store, south-west corner of Public Square