

between the monarch and the people, there was little occasion to suppose that any injustice had been done to the Pope, or much likelihood of hearing complaints from the latter. The Pope has struggled sometimes with sovereigns, but never with the sovereign. He has exercised a power voluntarily placed in his hands by Kings, and invoked by the people; and he has defended the monarch. But not as a subject of the monarch. The Pope, in the fulfillment of the consent of Kings and the conditions of the people, has made a duty, have released subjects from the oath of allegiance to the sovereign, but never have they released the sovereign from his coronation oath to respect, guard, and rightly govern the people.

Because I have neither time nor space for such an inquiry, I do not pursue the subject in detail. I have taken the strongest case of the exercise of the power of deposing monarchs—which is now called the power of releasing subjects—and I have shown that the Pope did not rely upon the general spiritual power as head of the Christian Church for authority to depose the Emperor, but that he rested on, and sustained by, the constitution which authorized the election of an Emperor, and made his authority conditional of holding the crown. And it would have been equally easy, generally less difficult, to have shown that every instance of such exercise of power by the Pope was authorized by the admitted constitution or acknowledged compact, provided that the offices of the Prince had brought him within the operation of the laws, and admitted to the Emperor, and for the execution of which all turned to the Pope.

Now, as this kind of secular power had its origin in the consent of the sovereigns, at a particular time, and long after the apostolic age, it follows that not only could it not have carried with it the *jure divino*, which belongs to the spiritual power of the Bishop of Rome, but that the proof of the existence of the secular power would have been weakened by attempting to prove the right of deposing to be divine. At that time, then—at a time when men were the most willing to yield assent to such species of usurpation, as released King—at that time the divine right was not claimed, and the whole power of deposing rested upon the consent, not merely of the Kings, but of the deposed Princes themselves.

But it is charged that Roman Catholics even now admit the right of the Pope to interfere between subjects and their allegiance, and between citizens and their duties to the Republic, in some other form, since the power to depose Kings is no longer possible. I deny it. I have denied it for myself, plainly, clearly, specifically. But, in this case, it is said that, though I may be expected from this to change my mind, and to give up the means of treason to this government in my breast, and warning them into germination by deprecation, but others are liable to the charge, and especially the church, the Roman Catholic Church itself.

But the Roman Catholic Church is represented by the Bishop, and therefore I turn to the statements of those having the means of knowing, and the right to make known, the doctrines of that church, and ask the attention of the committee to the following remarks of the Right Rev. Dr. England.

"God never gave to St. Peter any temporal power, any authority to depose Kings, any authority to interfere with political concerns. And any rights which he might claim, for any of those purposes, must be derived from some other source. A Roman Catholic has no further connection with the Pope than that he succeeds St. Peter. St. Peter had none of these rights—as a Roman Catholic. I know nothing of them in the Pope. He is equally a Pope with or without them."

In the early part of my remarks, I took occasion to say what would be my course, if, by any remarkable (but really impossible) concurrence of circumstances, the army and navy of the Pope should invade the country. Hear now how the Bishop of Charleston sustains my declaration:

"The American Constitution leaves its citizens in perfect freedom to give or withhold their assent to regulate their spiritual concerns. But if the Pope were to declare war against America, and any Roman Catholic, under the pretext of temporal obedience, was to refuse to oppose this temporal aggressor, he would deserve to be punished for his refusal, because he owes to this country to maintain its rights, and to oppose its aggressors, and cannot, destroy the claim which the Government has upon him. Suppose a clergyman of England were convicted for some crime—for instance, Dr. Dodd—and he were ordered for execution: must the law be inoperative because the criminal is a clergyman? Think you that no one could be found in a Roman Catholic country to sentence, or to execute the sentence upon a clergyman who was a criminal? All history testifies to the contrary. So, too, does all history show that, upon the same principle, Catholic Kings, and Princes, and peers and people, have disobeyed improper mandates of the See of Rome, and have levied war carried on against Popes, and still continued members of the Church."

Mr. Chairman, I have thus shown that the Church, in the middle ages, did not claim for the Pope the authority to exercise temporal power over other sovereigns, by Divine right, even when the exercise of that authority seemed to be so great a blessing to the people that it would scarcely seem wonderful if the people should have hailed it as of Divine origin. And I have shown that the best writers of the Catholic Church, of later days, and of the present century, in the same manner, denied that it was part of a Catholic's belief that the Pope possesses any power to depose Kings, or release subjects, or to violate faith with those who are or are not of the Catholic Church. I now offer other proof that the Church sets up no claim to such power. And, before I do it, I may be permitted to say that, in pursuit of information with regard to the Catholic Church, it has been my chance to converse with every rank and degree of her hierarchy—Popes, Cardinals, Nuncios, Archbishops, Bishops and Priests, and I never heard one of them speak upon the subject who did not disavow any belief of its existence.

The vexed question of governing Ireland, and of granting to the people of that Kingdom a share of the rights enjoyed by the subjects of Great Britain, has often led the British Parliament to inquire into the charges made against Roman Catholics, with reference to the asserted right of the Roman Pontiff to interfere with the internal affairs of other governments.

Three propositions were prepared and sent to the faculties of the principal Catholic universities in France and Spain; those of the University of Paris, of Douay, of Louvains, of Alcalá, of Salamanca, and of Valladolid. I give the proposition and abstracts of the several answers.

Extracts from the declarations and testimonies of six of the principal universities of Europe, on the three following propositions, submitted to them at the request of Mr. Pitt, by the Catholics of London, in 1789:

THE PROPOSITIONS.
1. Has the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatever, within the realm of England?
2. Can the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with His Majesty's suite from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever?
3. Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or with persons differing from them in religious opinions, or in practice, either in a public or a private matter?

assembled, has power to interfere with the affairs of other kingdoms. I give the answers.

After an introduction, according to the usual forms, the sacred faculty of Divinity of Paris, answer the first query by declaring:

Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any other person of the Church of Rome, hath any civil authority, civil power, civil jurisdiction, or civil pre-eminence whatsoever, in any Kingdom, or in any sovereignty, name in the Kingdom of England, by reason or virtue of any authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence by Divine institution inherent in, or granted, or by any other means belonging to the Pope or the Church of Rome. This doctrine the sacred faculty of Divinity of Paris has always held, and upon every occasion maintained, and upon every occasion has rightly proscribed the contrary doctrines from her schools.

Answer to the second query.—Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any person of the Church of Rome, can, by virtue of the keys, absolve or release the subject of the King of England from their oath of allegiance.

This and the first query are so intimately connected, that the answer of the first immediately and naturally applies to the second. Also, Answer to the third query.—There is no tenet in the Catholic Church by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics or those who differ from them in matters of religion. The tenet, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics, is so repugnant to common honesty and the obligations of Catholics, that there is nothing of which least who have defended the Catholic faith against Protestants have complained more heavily, than the practice and calumny of their adversaries in imputing this tenet to them, &c., &c.

Given at Paris, in the general assembly of the Sorbonne, held on Thursday, the eleventh day before the Ides of March, 1789.

UNIVERSITY OF DOUAY, January 5, 1789.

To the first and second queries the sacred faculty answers:—That no power whatsoever, in civil or temporal concerns, was given by the Almighty, either to the Pope, the Cardinals, or to the Church herself, and consequently, that Kings and sovereigns are not, in any manner, subject to the ordination of God, to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever; neither can their subjects, by any authority granted to the Pope or the Church, from above, be freed from their obedience, or absolved from their oath of allegiance.

This is the doctrine which the Doctors and Professors of Divinity hold and teach in our schools, and which all the candidates for degrees in Divinity maintain in their public theses, &c., &c.

To the third question, the sacred faculty answers:—That there is no principle of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, who differ from them in religious opinions. On the contrary, it is the religious doctrine of Catholics, that the respect and honor which God has bestowed upon the Pope, Priests and Bishops, should be directed to the ordinance of God, to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever; neither can their subjects, by any authority granted to the Pope or the Church, from above, be freed from their obedience, or absolved from their oath of allegiance.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN.

The faculty of Divinity at Louvain, having been requested to give her opinion upon the questions also stated, does it with readiness—but struck with astonishment that such questions should, at the end of the eighteenth century, be proposed to any learned body, by inhabitants of a Kingdom that glories in the talents and discernment of its natives. The faculty being assembled for the above purpose, it is agreed, with the unanimous assent of all voices, to answer the first and second queries absolutely in the negative.

The faculty does not think it incumbent upon her in this place to enter upon the proofs of her opinion, or to show how it is supported by passages in the Holy Scriptures, or the writings of antiquity. That has already been done by Rosner, De Marca, the two Bishops, Goldastus, the Pithois, Argente, Widdington, and His Majesty, King James the First, in his dissertation against Bellarmine and De Peron, and by many others, &c., &c.

The faculty then proceeds to declare that the sovereign power of the State is in wise (or not) under directly, as it is termed, subject to, or dependent upon, any other power, though it be a spiritual power, or even though it be instituted for eternal salvation, &c., &c.

That no man, nor any assembly of men, however eminent in dignity and power, not even the whole body of the Catholic Church, though assembled in general council, can, upon any ground or pretext whatsoever, weaken the bond of union between the sovereign and the people; still less can they absolve or free the subjects from their oath of allegiance.

Proceeding to the third question, the said faculty of Divinity (in perfect wonder, that such a question should be proposed to her) most positively and unequivocally answers: That there is not and there never has been, among the Catholics, or in the doctrine of the Church of Rome any law or principle which makes it lawful for Catholics to break their faith with heretics, or with any other persons who dissent from them in matters of religion, instead of being an article of Catholic faith, is entirely repugnant to its tenets.

Signed in the usual form, March 17, 1789.

UNIVERSITY OF SALAMANCA.

To the first question, it is answered: That neither the Pope nor Cardinals, nor any assembly or individual of the Catholic Church, have, as such, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence in the Kingdom of England.

To the second, it is answered: That neither the Pope nor Cardinals, nor any assembly or individual of the Catholic Church, can, as such, absolve the subjects of Great Britain from their oath of allegiance, or dispense with its obligations.

To the third, it is answered: That it is an article of Catholic faith, not to keep faith with heretics, or with persons of any other description, who dissent from them in matters of religion.

Signed in the usual form, March 7, 1789.

UNIVERSITY OF VALLADOLID.

To the first question, it is answered: That neither the Pope, or Cardinals, nor even a general council, have any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence, in the Kingdom of England, or over any other Kingdom, or province, in which they possess no temporal dominion.

To the second, it is answered: That neither the Pope nor Cardinals, nor even a general council, can absolve the subjects of Great Britain from their oath of allegiance or dispense with their obligation.

To the third, it is answered: That the obligation of keeping faith is grounded on the law of nature, which binds all men equally, without respect to their religious opinions; and with regard to Catholics, it is still more cogent, as it is confirmed by the principles of their religion.

Signed in the usual form, February 17, 1789.

Can anything be more explicit than the responses of these Universities? Ought they not to be satisfactory? I, perhaps, ought to rest here. Laymen, Priests, Bishops, Cardinals, and faculty of Divinity, in any Kingdom, or in any sovereignty, name in the Kingdom of England, by reason or virtue of any authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence by Divine institution inherent in, or granted, or by any other means belonging to the Pope or the Church of Rome. This doctrine the sacred faculty of Divinity of Paris has always held, and upon every occasion maintained, and upon every occasion has rightly proscribed the contrary doctrines from her schools.

assistance; that they, by all means, avoid public assemblies of idle men and taverns. The Vicars themselves are particularly charged to punish, in such manner as they can, but severely, all those who do not speak of the public government with respect.

England herself can witness the deep-rooted impressions such admissions have made on the minds of Catholics. It is well known that, in the late war, which had extended to the greater part of America, when most flourishing provinces, inhabited almost by persons separated from the Catholic Church, had renounced the government of the King of Great Britain, the Province of Canada alone, filled, as it is, almost with innumerable Catholics, although artfully tempted, and not less so by the French government, remained most faithful in its allegiance to England. Do you, most excellent prelates, converse frequently on these principles; often remind your subaltern prelates of them; when preaching to your people, exhort them, again and again, to honor all men, to love the brotherhood, to fear God, to honor the King.

Those duties of a Christian are to be cherished in every Kingdom and State, but particularly in your own, of Great Britain and Ireland, where, from the benevolence of a most wise King, and other most excellent rulers of those Kingdoms, towards Catholics; no cruel and grievous burden is imposed, and Catholics themselves experience a mild and gentle government. If you pursue this line of conduct manfully; if you act in the spirit of charity; if while you direct the people of the Lord, you have nothing in view but the salvation of souls, adversaries will be ashamed (we repeat it) to calumniate, and will freely acknowledge that the Catholic faith is of heavenly descent, and calculated not only to procure a blessed life, but likewise, as St. Augustine observes, in his one hundred and thirty-eighth letter, addressed to Marcellinus, to promote the most lasting peace of this earthly city, inasmuch as it is the safest prop and shield of kingdom. Let those who say (the words are those of the holy doctor) that the doctrine of Christ is hostile to the republic, produce an army of such soldiers as the doctrine of Christ has required; let them furnish such inhabitants of provinces, such husbands, such wives, such parents, such children, such masters, such servants, such Kings, such judges, finally, such payers of debts, and collectors of the revenue, as the doctrine of Christ enjoins, and they may dare to assert that it is inimical to the republic—rather let them not hesitate to acknowledge that it is, when practised, of great advantage to the republic. The same holy doctor, and all the other fathers of the Church, with one voice, most clearly demonstrate, by various arguments, that the whole of this salutary doctrine cannot exist with permanent consistency and stability, or flourish except in the Catholic society, which is spread and preserved all over the world, by communion with the See of Rome, as a sacred bond of union, divinely connecting both. From our very high esteem and affection for you, we earnestly desire, that you may very long preserve you safe. Farewell.

As your lordships most affectionate brother,
L. CARDINAL ANTONELLI, Prefect.
A. ARCHBISHOP OF ADEA, Secretary.
Rome, June 28, 1761.

While on the disavowal of the Pope I may as well make an addition to assist in the testimony. The same day, the 28th of June, 1761, by the Roman Catholic committee in Dublin, and published by them on the 17th of March, 1792, after it had been submitted to the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, and received their entire sanction. To give it greater weight, the same instrument was put into the form of an oath, retaining, as far as possible, the very words. It was then submitted to the Pope and Cardinals, who solemnly declared that it was consonant to, and expressive of, the Roman Catholic doctrine; and that it was taken by the Catholic Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Laity of Ireland:

"We, the Catholics of Ireland, in defence to the opinion of many respectable bodies and individuals among our Protestant brethren, hereby, in the face of our country, of all Europe, and before God, make this our deliberate and solemn declaration!

"We abjure, disavow, and condemn the opinion, that Prince communicated by the Pope and council, or by any ecclesiastical authority whatsoever, can be dissolved, or annulled, by their subjects, or by any other persons. We hold such doctrine in detestation, as wicked and impious; and we declare that we do not believe that either the Pope, with or without the ecclesiastical power whatsoever, can absolve the subjects of this Kingdom, or any of them, from their allegiance to His Majesty King George III. who, by his authority of Parliament, the lawful King of this Kingdom, has declared that he will not be bound by any such declaration."

"We abjure, condemn and detest as unchristian, and impious, the principle that it is lawful to murder, or destroy, or injure any person whatsoever, for or under the pretence of being heretics; and we declare solemnly, before God, that we believe no act in itself unjust, immoral or wicked, can ever be justified or excused, by or under the pretence or color that it was done either for the good of the Church, or in obedience to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever."

"We further declare that we hold it as unchristian and impious principle, that no faith is to be kept with heretics. This doctrine we detest and reprobate, not only as contrary to our religion, but as destructive of morality, of society, and even of common honesty; and it is our firm belief that an OATH made to any person not of the Catholic religion, is equally binding as if it were made to any Catholic whatsoever."

"4. We have been charged with holding, as an article of our belief, that the Pope, with or without a general council, or that certain ecclesiastical power, can absolve or absolve us before God from our oath of allegiance, or even from the just oaths on contracts entered into between man and man."

"No we utterly renounce, abjure and deny that we hold or maintain any such belief, as being contrary to the peace and happiness of society, inconsistent with morality, and above all, repugnant to the true spirit of the Catholic religion."

Here, then, is another clear, explicit disavowal on the part of the Pope and his Cardinals of the doctrine imputed to the church, and another full and complete response to the challenge of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, the Roman Catholic church neither holds nor inculcates the doctrine of power in its head to interfere in the affairs of temporal governments, to disturb the monarch, or release the subject. It never has held any such doctrine. It never has taught that its professors were to be influenced by its doctrines to combine against the government, and Catholic citizens have been as faithful to the government under which they lived as those of any other denomination of Christians. In this country, Mr. Chairman, where, by the nature of our institutions, no creed is allowed to be molested, and where, by constitutional provisions, no advantage can be allowed the professors of a creed on account of that profession, how unjust is it to the public, how cruel to the confessors of a creed, to create and keep alive an excitement of morose and unchristian passions, which has invested with every right that any American citizen can claim, who are able, by their talents, character, attainments and patriotism, to the honor to the citizenship which they are not allowed to enjoy. I must not be told that "all the rights of citizenship are open to Catholics when office is denied." The man who asserts that, is ignorant of the first principles of our Constitution. I venture to say, of the strongest motives of his own action.

The right of suffrage is connected with the right of office, and the freeman's privilege of voting for the man whom he elect, would be not worth the exercise, if it did not include the right of presenting himself for votes for an office whose functions are beyond his faculties.

you create a dangerous party in the Commonwealth. Inequality of political condition can only be maintained in a republic where there is inequality of mind, talents, and attainment. Allow to any class in this country the rights of education, the attainment of wealth, the right of social equality of suffrage, and it will not be long before that class will demand the boon that freemen seek, and demand will be mischievous.

It is mean, it is cowardly, as well as false, for any man, or set of men to assert that, in combating to exclude all Catholics from office, they do no more than exercise the right not to vote for individuals, which is as clear as the right to vote for them.

Sir, if the opposition cease and felt abroad, and heard here, in this hall, means anything more than a miserable, beggarly appeal to low prejudices, with a view of holding office, it means that Catholics ought to be excluded from all office; and if they are, because they are Catholics, ineligible to place, then those who assert it are bound to change the Constitution or openly violate its provisions. Will that be done? Will they have courage to do it? They must be to be consistent. They must forego to be honest—a much more difficult effort.

Will that be done, and the question of the constitutional rights settled? or shall the Catholic Christian hear himself insulted, as he has been more than once here, with the offensive imputation which I have endeavored to refute? Shall the heart of the American Catholics be wounded with stale rumors—rumors revived for party advantage—uncredited tales to their dishonor, or hypothetical charges of concealed treason, which, while it ventures upon no specification, disturbs the public mind, awakens slumbering prejudices, sharpens religious animosities, and gives occasion for the mean, the ignorant, and the vulgar animosities to rise into power, by the combination of their own class with those who, falling in their former opinions hide their disgrace, and avenge their defeat by such associations as make minorities dangerous to the republic.

Mr. Chairman, one more word and I will close. I have fairly and fully met the accusations made by the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts, against the church of which I am a member.—Step after step he retreated, until he had planted himself on the Bishop of Rome; and there he challenged the citation of a single disavowal on the part of the Pontiff, that he claimed temporal power over the subjects of other governments.—Step by step I have followed him, and concluded the array of disavowals by a presentation to this committee of an explicit denial on the part of the Pope that any such authority or right was claimed by the church or by him.

Mr. Chairman, to the warnings expressed here, and the nervous apprehensions expressed abroad, that the prevalence of the Catholic religion will be dangerous to the country, I have only to say, that we of this country are in no danger from Catholicity, Episcopacy, Calvinism, Lutheranism, or any form of better than Infidelity and Atheism. And Atheism is now at work, as it ever has been, against the Christian faith and Christian prohibitions. It assails the Roman Catholic first, because that creed is more extensive, and without considering the evil which is doing to religion, Christian men are yielding them to it, in consequence of the hostility by which their active hostility to each other.

Mr. Chairman, if this country is to fall by any other means than ordinary decay or local convulsions, it is not Christianity, nor the Christianity of Geneva, Rome, Scotland, or England, that will produce the ruin. The mischief will be wrought by Infidelity. Stripping first the confidence of the people in each other, and then the foundations of Christian charity, breaking the bonds of social life, relaxing the ties of moral obligations, setting creeds in hostile attitudes, till there is nothing left for hostility. And bringing down the whole scheme of domestic, social, and political life to the plans and ends of selfishness and avarice, which is the aim of Infidelity, and which triumphs in the obliteration of the doctrines and teachings of Christ.

Mr. Chairman, I have forbore to-day all retaliatory imputations, all irritating comparisons, and confined myself to a refutation of charges made against men of the Roman Catholic creed. I have no complaint to make, nor do I desire the honor, of truth, of myself and my co-religionists, for the sake of the institutions and the Constitution of my country, I could not decline it. I have evaded no point, nor attempted to darken counsel. I have met the charge fairly, candidly, and truthfully. I have dealt in no strictures. I have confined to no idle gossip. I have adduced no testimony, nor do I desire to speak to those who are authorized to speak to the question at issue, and with reference thereto, with my hand upon my heart, and my eye on Heaven. I call this House, and I speak with reverence. I call my God to witness the truth of all the assertions made from my own convictions and knowledge, and my entire confidence in the credibility of all the testimony which I have adduced from others.

PUBLIC SALE.
THE subscriber will offer at public sale on Wednesday the 14th day of February next, his farm situated in the County of Allegheny, Cambria County, Pa., one mile East of Jefferson, on the road leading to Munster, within half a mile of the Portage and Pennsylvania Railroads, and adjoining lands of John Kean and others, containing thirty-five acres and eighty perches, the most of which is cleared and in a high state of cultivation. There is a good orchard of excellent fruit on the place. The improvements are good frame dwelling house and a good barn, together with all necessary out buildings. For particulars apply to the subscriber on the premises.

An indisputable title will be given. Sale to commence at 1 o'clock, P. M., when terms will be made known.
THOMAS BENNETT.
January 18, '55.—317.

Strayed.
FROM the residence of the subscriber in Allegheny township, about the 1st of November last, one sheep, four of which were old ones and had both ears cropped; the other five were young, and had a notch cut in the right ear. Any person giving information where the sheep may be found shall be liberally rewarded.
SIMON FAGAN.
January 18, '55.—31.

Sheriff's Sale.
BY virtue of a writ of Vend. Exponas, issued out of the Court of Common Pleas of Cambria County, and to me directed, there will be exposed to public sale at the Court House, in Ebensburg, on Monday the 6th day of February next, the following property, to wit:

All the right title and interest of Abraham Albach, of, in and to a piece or parcel of land situated in Conemaugh township, Cambria County, adjoining lands of Peter Livergood, H. Goughnour, A. Hilderbrand and others, on which is erected a two story frame house, not now occupied, said land containing forty-nine acres more or less, to wit:—
A. DURBIN, Sheriff.
Sheriff's office, Ebensburg, Jan. 15, 1855.

Notice.
TO the Heirs and Legal Representatives of Nicholas Kollis, late of Allegheny township, Cambria county, deceased.
Take notice, that in pursuance of a writ of Partition, issued out of the Orphans' Court of Cambria county, to me directed, I will on the 26th day of February next, proceed to hold an inquisition upon the premises of the real estate of said deceased, adjoining lands of Nicholas Thank, Bartholomew Tribas and others, at which time and place you may attend if you think proper.
Form a class of citizens, or, in this country, with any disability not imposed upon others, and

M. D. MAGERAN. C. D. MURRAY.
MAGERAN & MURRAY,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
Ebensburg, Pa.
OFFICE No. 2, "Colonnade Row," near the Court House.
December 7, '54—1y

10 Brs Mackerel;
10 Brs Herring, and
1,000 lbs Cod Fish, just received and for sale at the cheap store of
EDWARD ROBERTS.

Auditors Notice.
IN the matter of the real estate of Francis Bradley, deceased, On motion of M. Hasson appointed Auditor by the Court, to marshal the assets of deceased among the creditors. In pursuance of the above appointment, the undersigned will sit at his office in the Borough of Ebensburg, on Monday, the 8th day of February next, at one o'clock P. M.
M. HASSON.
January 4, 1855.

Orphans' Court Sale.
BY virtue of an order of the Orphans' Court of Cambria County, and to me directed, there will be exposed to public sale, on the premises, on Monday, the 20th day of January, 1855, at one o'clock, P. M., the following described real estate. A certain piece of land in Cambria township, containing ten acres, adjoining lands of William Davis on the East, Edward Shoemaker on the North, and the Clay Pike leading from Ebensburg to Indiana on the South.

TERMS OF SALE:—One third of the purchase money to be paid on confirmation of the sale, and the residue in two equal annual payments, with interest; to be secured by the bonds and mortgage of the purchaser.
MARY ANN LITZINGER,
WILLIAM LITZINGER,
Administrators.
Jan. 4, 1855.

Stray Calf.
CAME to the residence of the subscriber, in Munster, Cambria county, on the 20th of August last, a red and white spotted Bull Calf, with a white heart mark in the face; no other particular marks. The owner is requested to come forward, prove property, pay charges, and take him away, otherwise he will be disposed of according to law.
PATRICK STOIRM.
Jan. 4, 1855.—31

Wholesale Taken by the Allies.
DEBSONS wishing to save money, can do so by calling at the "Railroad Store Depot," one door West of the Union House, High street, Ebensburg, Pa., where Stoves and Tinware will be sold 20 per cent. cheaper for CASH, than usual. I am determined to sell at some price.
ALSO:—A two horse Spring Wagon and Harness for sale.
N. B. This opportunity is only given during January, 1855.
Dearest friends, when thus you save,
Do not for time (credit) crave;
For what come along—don't delay,
But when you buy—the money pay.
J. AIRFORD.
January 4, 1855.

Sheriff's Sale.
BY virtue of a writ of Vend. Exponas, issued out of the Court of Common Pleas of Cambria County, and to me directed, there will be exposed to public sale on the premises, in the town of Munster, Cambria county, on Friday the 20th day of January, 1855, the following property to wit:

All the right, title, and interest of William Diver, dec'd., of, in and to two lots of ground, situate in the town of Munster, Cambria county, adjoining lands of Nancy McGonigle on the west, Thomas Porter on the east, and fronting on the Huntingdon, Cambria and Indiana Turnpike, and having thereon erected a two story log house and log stable not now occupied.

Taken in execution and to be sold at the suit of Peggy McGonigle.
A. DURBIN, Sheriff.
January 4, 1855.

SONS OF TEMPERANCE.
Highland Division, No. 84, Sons of Temperance meet at their Hall every SATURDAY evening, 2 doors below Blair's Hotel.

HOUSEKEEPER'S DEPOT.
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL TIN, COPPER, AND SHEET IRON WARE MANUFACTORY,
Caval Street, Johnstown, Penna.
THANKFUL for past favors, the subscriber now calls the attention of his friends and the public generally to the large stock on hand which is offered at the old price, notwithstanding the great advance in labor and material, either at Wholesale or Retail.
F. W. HAY.

COAL BUCKETS, Shovels, Pulkers, Tongs, Hammered Iron Bread pans, Sheet-iron pans, Rat Traps, Wash-boards. For sale low by
F. W. HAY.

TINWARE of all kinds, Copper Kettles and Brass Kettles of all sizes, for sale by
F. W. HAY.
**ENAMELLED and Tinned Sauce Pans, Boilers, Tea kettles, preserving kettles, &c., from 3 pints to 4 gallons, for sale for cash, by
F. W. HAY.**
**EXCELSIOR, Large Oven Etna, Diamond, Complete Cook, Aurora, Crescent, and North American Air-tight Cooking Stoves, trimmed out complete and sold at city prices, by
F. W. HAY.**
PARLOR STOVES; among which are the Franklin, and Room Stoves, from two dollars up to twenty, by
F. W. HAY.
SUGAR KETTLES, Iron Wash Kettles, English Pots, Skillets, Brake Ovens, Tea kettles, &c., sold by
F. W. HAY.
COFFEE MILLS from 37¢ cents to \$1.25. Mining knives, 25 to 75 cts, Meat Tender, Straw Cutters, Gravy Strainers, Sugar Strainers, English and French Racking Spoons, Skinning Ladles, &c., for sale at cash prices, by
F. W. HAY.