

"Miss Lucretia Elvira," said I, "have you heard of the late act of parliament by which all the ladies with small mouths shall be allowed to marry two husbands?" "No, sir," said she, screwing up her mouth to a pucker, "what a cur's law!" "You are wrong, Edward," said my friend to me, "those ladies with large mouths are to be allowed two husbands." "LAW ME," exclaimed she, opening her mouth as big as a bucket, "what a c-u-r-i-o-u-s law."

Some years since, a young lady was struck in the face by a snow ball, which bruised her face very much, but it soon got well; yet ever since, in snowy weather, a redness appears, and clear water runs down her face in large drops, so as to wet a napkin very soon. She has had advice for it, but to no purpose; yet in fine weather it dries up, and her face appears as if there was nothing the matter with it.

A NEW ESTABLISHMENT.
THE subscriber would inform his friends and the public, that he has just opened a

GROCERY,
in the house formerly occupied by Thos. A. Mera, one door north of Col. Sloan's. He has a general assortment of the best foreign

Spirits & Wines,
that can be procured. Likewise,
Groceries, Confectionaries & Cakes.
And a number of other things which is pleasant to the taste, and would tend to make us happy while sitting over a fine plate of oysters. Among which are the following articles:

-WINES-
Maderia, Tenerife, Moscell, Frontenac, Muscatel, Malaga, Champaign, and Claret, by the single bottle, or in dozens.

-SPIRITS-
Cogniac Brandy, Holland Gin, Jamaica Rum, N. E. Rum, Whiskey, Peach and Apple Brandy, Philadelphia Beer, Newark Cider.

An assortment of Cordials, such as "The life of Man," which by the bye is quite an important drink to us.—Temperance, (this Cordial (Temperance) I would recommend to the Temperance gentlemen as a pleasant drink) Perfect Love, and Clove, Lemon Syrup, &c. &c.

Fruits & Nuts.
Oranges, Lemons, Pine Apples, Figs, Raisins, Currants, Almonds, English Walnuts, Brazil Nuts and Filberts, also, Coffee, Sugars, Candies of all kinds, Chees, Crackers, Herrings, Salmon, Mackerel, Dr. Stoughton's Bitters, Salt, Bacon, Soap, Candles, Pepper, Ginger, Cloves, Nutmegs and Spice, Cakes, (fresh three times a week,) Fire Crackers, Rice, Oysters, &c. &c.

All of which I will sell for the Money up, and if the public doubt this, just call at the *Red Sign*, which has on it "Liquors, Wines, Beer, Oysters, Fish, Candies, Segars," &c.

ISAAC HYAMS.
Charlotte, March, 26, 1834. 824f

Bank of Cape Fear.
THE undersigned having been appointed Commissioners for receiving subscriptions to stock, in the extended capital of the Bank of Cape Fear, hereby notify the public, that Books will be opened at the Store of Messrs. Morrisons & McKee in Charlotte, on the first day of April next, for that purpose.

WILLIAM J. ALEXANDER,
WILLIAM W. LONG,
W. MORRISON.
March 26, 1834. 824f

IMPORTANT SALE.
I will positively sell on Monday of the Superior Court in May next, at the Court House in Charlotte, to the highest bidder, the House and Lot, in which Col. John Sloan now lives.

—ALSO—
his interest in the *Lemond's Mine* (as it is called,) also 26 acres of Land lying in the town of Charlotte, on the west side, adjoining the possessions of Major Long. Also, some household Furniture. Terms made known on the day of sale.

N. W. ALEXANDER, Trustee
OF JOHN SLOAN.
March 25, 1834. 824f

Commission Agency.
E. L. & W. WINSLOW continue their Agency in Fayetteville, for the transaction of Commission Business generally, the collection and settlement of Claims, Discount and Renewal of Notes, at either of the Banks, purchase of Stock, investment and transfer of money, &c. &c.
March 25, 1834. 818f

LAND FOR SALE.
AS I intend moving to the west, during the next year, I wish to sell five hundred acres of land on the Catawba river the residence of the late John Dow. The buildings are extensive and elegant, with a considerable number of acres of first rate river bottom and a good meadow. I am determined to give a great bargain in this land if application is made soon.

WM. S. NORMENT.
March 26th, 1834. 814ar.

Pay the Tailor.
THOSE indebted to me are requested to come and pay immediately by cash or note—the Cash would be preferred.

March 20, 1834. A. GRAHAM.
Timber Wanted.
THE subscriber is authorized by the Commissioners to contract for 250 logs, 17 feet long 6 by 10 inches square—post or white oak—to be delivered as soon as practicable. Those desirous of contracting, would do well to propose immediately, as CASH will be paid on delivery of the timber in Charlotte.

By order of the commissioners,
THOMAS A. MERA, Agent.
N. B. A small number of logs will be contracted for, if it should not be convenient for some person to deliver all. T. A. M.
Eight or ten hands will be employed by the day, week or month. Apply as above. T. A. M.
March 21, 1834. 614f

LETTER

From the Hon. Henry W. Connor to Gen William Allen, chairman of a public meeting held at Concord, Cabarrus County, 21st January, 1834, and to the Voters of the 11th Congressional District of North Carolina.

Washington City, Feb. 26, 1834.

GEN. WILLIAM ALLEN,
Dear Sir.—I have received, from you, the proceedings and resolutions, passed at a meeting of the citizens of Cabarrus County, held in Concord, on the 21st of January last, at which you presided and Major Luzan Cannon acted as Secretary. The 5th of those resolutions is as follows:

"Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting, the public funds ought to be forthwith restored to the Bank of the United States, and that our representative in Congress, the Hon. Henry W. Connor, is hereby instructed to vote for their immediate restoration."

I trust, I need not say to you, Sir, that those proceedings were received by me with the respect due from a representative to his constituents, and such, as I hope on all and every occasion, I have manifested towards them. The one above, and instructing me directly, I have given the most serious and respectful consideration. It is to me a matter of deep regret, in the discharge of the duties confided to me, to differ in opinion with any portion of the citizens of the district, and especially painful to differ knowingly with any portion of my friends, whose opinions I so highly appreciate, and with whom it has so long been my good fortune to agree and act. The republican doctrine of the right of instruction, I concede to the full extent, and the duty of the representative, to obey or resign. But whatever might be my feelings and wishes on this or similar occasions, and certainly I have none others, than faithfully and honestly to discharge my duties, in a manner acceptable, and in my judgment most conducive to the interests of my constituents and my country; yet the meeting held at Concord, and instructing me as above, to vote for the restoration of the deposits, numerous and respectable as I know it was, comprise only a small portion of the district. A meeting held at Lenoir on the same day, being court day of that county, numerous and respectable also, have refused by a large majority to instruct on the same subject; whilst a still larger number by far than both meetings together, have not chosen to give any public expression of their opinion at all. Such then, Sir, is my situation, as your humble representative, and may I not here ask yourself and others what should I do? how should I act under such circumstances? To me, there seems to be but the one course; the responsibility of that I feel and know, and in assuming it I submit to that high minded and liberal feeling, that has and always I am sure, will characterize those I have the honour to represent. Then in the pursuance of a course adverse to the wishes of yourself and those in attendance at the meeting held in Concord, allow me respectfully to express the hope, that it will be ascribed to an honest difference of opinion, about which men may well and honestly differ.

Cool and deliberate reflection, from the best lights within my reach has brought my mind to the conclusion, that under existing circumstances, the best interests of the country require that the public funds should not be restored to the bank of the United States. With due deference for the opinion of yourself and those in attendance at the meeting in Concord, with whom it is my misfortune to differ in opinion, as to the propriety and policy of restoring the public funds, to the bank of the United States, I beg through you, their chairman, to convey to them, the reasons, as I conceive it my duty to do, which have and will influence my vote. Before I proceed to give those, let me say—the removal of the deposits, I regret, as being in my judgment premature and inexpedient at the time; but not because I entertain the opinion, that the power does not exist to remove them. On the contrary, to my mind it is clear and conclusive, and is to be found in the 16th section of the Bank charter, which reads:—"The deposits of the money of the United States, in places in which the said bank and branches thereof may be established, shall be made in said bank or branches, unless the Secretary of the Treasury shall at any time otherwise order and direct." Or would I hesitate a moment, in giving my vote for the restoration of the public funds to the Bank of the United States, were its charter to be renewed; but that it will not be, I consider as a question settled, and would be uncandid, did I not tell you so. The only hope the Bank could have of the renewal of its charter, would be by two-thirds of each house of Congress. All things are possible, though that, that could be probable, I cannot conceive. It is a question that has agitated the country for the last three years particularly, and the minds of the community, I doubt not, is made up. Then the public funds have been removed from the Bank of the United States, and placed in the State Banks.

The question arises then, whether the restoration of the public funds to the U. S. Bank, or the retaining of them in the State Banks, where they are now, would be productive of the least evil to the community. In that light I regard the question. With me it is a principle to take always the lesser rather than the greater evil. The

charter of the Bank of the United States expires on the 4th of March, 1836. Were the public funds now restored to this Bank, it must be apparent and obvious to all, not only as a matter of prudence, but of necessity, they must be again withdrawn in the course of the next year, and placed elsewhere. If the removal of the public funds has occasioned the evils complained of, may it not be calculated on that to return them now and withdraw them the next year will be attended with the same evils and convulsions? The same causes produce the same effects, and it seems to me evident, that, by this double operation, you would inflict on the community a double portion of suffering. That state of things I am sure would not be desired by any. I do not view the removal of the deposits as the cause of the alleged distress beyond the act of the removal, being seized on as a pretext by the Bank to cover what I believe to be her real object:—that of compelling a renewal of her charter. To effect that, she curtails her discounts, calls in her debts, and by her great power over-awes and checks the discounts of the State Banks, by which she has caused excitement and alarm through the country. The simply removing the public funds out of one house into another, or other houses, to be used in the same way, and for the same purpose for which they had been used, could not of itself produce difficulty; and whether A B or C D distributed the public funds could certainly make no difference. That there is a scarcity of money in the market all know, and it would be strange if there were not, under such circumstances, and that that class of the mercantile community in large cities who have over-traded, have felt severely the effects of this course and policy of the U. S. Bank, is doubtless true. And although a curtailment of issues by the U. S. Bank at any time would be felt, yet it must be obvious, had the State Banks been able to resist the power of this moneyed monopoly and continued their issues, the shock would have been but slight. I am brought to the conclusion, then, that the Bank only has the power to relieve. If she has it not without the public funds, they being no part of the capital of the Bank, she must be tottering, and therefore an unsafe depository of the funds of the nation. If, on the contrary, she has the means, (as I am led to believe from her own statements) and will neither relieve herself or permit the State Banks to do so, it proves clearly the opinion before expressed, that her only object has been and is to force if possible the renewal of her charter, though it be at the expense of the distress and suffering of the whole community.

I have, sir, thus briefly but candidly and honestly given my views and opinions on the agitating subject of the removal of the deposits. That they will be satisfactory to all I have not the vanity to hope or expect; but that they may accord with the views of the very many I may be permitted to hope and believe. And however painful it is to me to differ in opinion on this subject with any of my friends, those I trust will extend their charity so far to me as to believe that I am honest and sincere. Could I view this subject in a different light from that which I do, and that a different course would be productive of greater good to my constituents and my country, none would be more prompt to acknowledge and change their vote than myself.

I am, sir, with great respect,
Your humble servant,
HENRY W. CONNOR.

The Beard of the Prophet.—It is said that the ruins of an immense edifice are still to be seen in a province of the East, which was built in 1335, as a sacred depository of a part of the beard of Mahomet. This relic was discovered in a golden casket, the cover of which was crystal. Once a year, the casket with its precious contents was brought with great ceremonies into a spacious Hall, illuminated for the occasion with 2,138 lights where pilgrims from a distance gazed on it with reverence and delight. When Hyder Ali invaded this province, he seized this sacred treasure, and sent it under a strong escort to Seringapatam—but on the downfall of Tippos Saib this inestimable relic was lost—and not yet been recovered.

Ancient and Modern Missiles.—By a calculation made of the number of musket balls expended by the French army in the conquest of Algeria, and a comparison with the number of the enemy killed, it appears that without allowing for the deaths by common shot it took more than three hundred discharges of the musket to kill one man. The old English Archers, are said never to have sped a cloth yard shaft without bringing down a man, and it used to be said that each of them carried 24 Scottish lives in his belt.

Noel Operation.—A gentleman in this city, who has been for some time afflicted with what is called throat consumption, was on Sunday last, subjected to a novel operation, under the direction of Drs. Johnson & Draper. Those gentlemen had leeches applied by means of silver tubes to the inside of the throat, and the result has been, we understand very satisfactory.

The application of leeches to the inside of the throat, is entirely new, but we have no doubt of its utility in many cases.—*Phil. Gaz.*

A Female styled "The Mysterious Lady," has attracted great crowds in some of our Northern Cities, appearing almost to possess the gift of divination. She sits with her back to the person, who writes on a strip of paper, and places it in a cup; upon which she immediately makes the rest of the company acquainted with its contents. No one has yet been able to discern the method by which she obtains the information herself.

Communications.

FOR THE JOURNAL.

Mr. Holton.—As the Editor of the Miners Journal, please to give this a place in your paper.

EMPTY BARRELS SOUND THE LOUDEST.

A Communication appeared in your last paper signed "Liberty," which purports to be an answer to a piece signed "A Citizen" by which I am reminded of the above.

Take up the communication, and you cannot tell what he means, except if he vilify the President and abuse by uncourteous language the piece in your paper signed "A Citizen." Do for a moment hear him. He says "In consequence of the appearance of this tremendous Hercules, this political giant of Charlotte, whose talents shed such a brilliant lustre throughout the village, whose eloquence created a partial atmospherical earthquake, the rays from whose intellect coming down upon the energies of the Bank party with such impetuosity, they were forced to quail under the appearance of this gigantic monster." What fustian!! What arrogance!! what a parade of big words. His talents and style reminds me of the pompous learned gentleman, (and I am sure this must be one of his pupils) when he asked the Lady to take a pinch of snuff by saying—"please extend the summit of your digits into my odouriferous receptacle, and therefrom extract the pulverised particles, that it may create a pleasing titillation in your olfactory nerves, and fortify your pericranium against the inclemency of the weather." The fame and renown of this learned pair, deserves to be handed down to future generations in *pure letters of gold.* Does the gentleman signed "Liberty" answer the argument of the communication signed "A Citizen." No. Does he shew that the facts there stated, are not true—does he give the evidence. No. He does not pretend to argue or give facts, and this for the best of all possible reasons. He cannot argue against light—and as for facts he has none to give.

The communication signed "A Citizen," justifies the president, General Jackson, in the removal of his Secretary *Duane*, and the appointment of his successor Mr. *Taney*, upon constitutional grounds; and the high authority then cited of the President having the power, of President Madison, Fisher Ames, Mr. Lawrence and others, who were leading talented men in the convention who framed the constitution, who tell us that the constitution gives the President this power—and the reason he should possess the power—as he is the revising, controlling and superintending power—and the person that is responsible to the nation for the honest administration of the government. How does the gentleman signed "Liberty" answer this authority? He says "In 1789 this subject was discussed in Congress, and then decided by a small majority, only two, that the President had the right." Here "Liberty" has himself offered additional proofs. He says that in 1789 a majority of Congress decided that the President had the power of removal from office. In addition to this, I have given the authority of those great talented Republicans who were in the convention that made the constitution. Notwithstanding all this authority, this learned gentleman "Liberty" says "as regards the constitutional right of the President to remove the Secretary he questions very much." Yes sir, this wise man of the South, thinks he is more talented than President Madison, Mr. Ames, and others—and also, than the majority of the Congress of 1789. For my part I have no such vanity!! I don't pretend to put my humble self in competition with those learned gentlemen, and I would advise "Liberty" not to put on so many airs of importance—that he should recollect what *Solomon* says about "a wise man in his own conceit."

Again: This learned gentleman says, with apparent triumph, "I ask "A Citizen" if the President did not remove the deposits from the U. S. Bank. He did. It is for this unparalleled act, this assumption of power, not delegated to him, that the friends of the constitution and liberty, brand him with such hard names of Tyrant, Usurper, Despot, &c.!!" What are the facts? Why the President removed *Duane* from office, and appointed Mr. *Taney*—who after his appointment, signed the order for the removal. This the Secretary had a right to do from the 15th Section of the Bank Charter. What becomes of the assertion of "Liberty." Why, he says that which is not true. And he who asserts that in a Newspaper which is notoriously erroneous, deserves the consequences of an exposure.

Again: The small gentleman, signed "Liberty," speaking of the reason given by the Secretary with regard to the 3 per cent stock, says, "Is it possible that "A Citizen" does not know that the affair during the last Session of Congress was made the subject of special investigation in the House of Representatives, and the question looked upon as settled." I ask an honest community what kind of an argument is this? Does this prove the charge to be false. No sir, it is not denied by the Bank itself. What is this 3 per cent stock affair? The Secretary of the Treasury informed Congress that the Bank, as the fiscal agent of the Government, did not act as a faithful agent of the Government in the payment of this claim—that the Government gave the

Bank notice it intended to pay off 34 millions of this debt on first of July, 1833. That the Bank requested the Government to suspend the payment until the first of October thereafter, which was agreed to by the Government; and before the first of October arrived, the Bank sent a private agent to Europe to get the holders of the stock not to present it for payment for 12 months thereafter,—which was done—the Government yet owing the debt. The Bank having in its vaults twice that amount belonging to the Government—and paying no interest for it. And having paid this agent five thousand dollars for his trip. One 7th part of this money belonging to the Government thus used to thwart the wishes of the President to pay off the national debt. This was one reason given by the Secretary for the removal of the deposits:—that it was not a faithful agent. Does the learned gentleman deny the truth of this? He does not. But he says "he considers that question as settled," as such as to say, if the Bank has done wrong it ought not to be told about it more than once.

Again: The learned gentleman signed "Liberty" says, "A Citizen" furthermore asserts that the Bank loaned out in 16 months, 28 millions of dollars, just before the last Presidential election, to make friends to the Bank and to put down Gen. Jackson. Is it possible that "A Citizen" has lost sight of facts so recently transpired, does he not know that this large amount was loaned out before the opinion of the President was known to the Bank or public? To show the glaring absurdity of this, I will lay before you and the public, the statement of "A Citizen" to which this is intended as an answer. "A Citizen" stated, that from the returns of the Bank itself, that the Bank loaned out from December 1830 to May 1832, being 16 months 28 millions of dollars—that from 1824 up to 1830 being 6 years, it also appears from the returns of the Bank, that its loans did not exceed 12 millions a year. That the sum of 28 millions being loaned out just before the election for President, between Gen. Jackson and H. Clay, who were the only candidates—and Clay a warm friend of the Bank. That this sum was unusually large; and that it was done by the Bank to make friends—and to break down General Jackson, who had put his veto on the Bank Bill. This inference is submitted again to an honest community; to answer, whether it is not a reasonable one. I admit we cannot tell the hearts of men, but we judge a tree by the fruit. Does the gentleman deny the Bank loaning out this 28 millions? He does not. He says "the large sum was loaned out before the President's opinion about the Bank was known to the bank or public." To show the perfect absurdity of this statement, and what a desperate cause "Liberty" is defending, I bring forward the President's message in December 1829. To wit: "Both the constitutionality and the expediency of the creating this Bank, are well questioned by a large portion of our fellow citizens: And it must be admitted by all, that it has failed in the end of establishing a uniform and sound currency." Here the President informs Congress and the nation in December 1829, that not only the constitutionality of the Bank, but its expediency also, might well be questioned. The Bank Directors also, in their pamphlet published recently says "that the President Andrew Jackson, made his first attack on the Bank in 1828." Notwithstanding all this proof, the learned small gentleman says, this 28 millions was loaned out before the President's opinion was known towards the Bank. What credit can such statements have before an intelligent and honest community? How absurd! How supremely ridiculous!! He certainly has a very treacherous memory. If this was all, I could excuse him.

Again: This learned, handsome, well gentleman says, (speaking as to the reason there was not a meeting in Charlotte on the day advertised) "in explanation I would add, that the inclemency of the weather prevented the people from the country, attending the meeting, consequently none was called." The inclemency of the weather!! prevented the people from the country, attending the meeting. How farcical! How really laughable this!! It proves the truth of the old adage "a drowning man will catch at straws." Let us examine this. It did not rain that day—neither snow—nor sleet. The people from the country did not attend, and why? because the notice came out in the paper Friday night to meet next day in Charlotte, and the people of the country could have had no notice, (as their paper is issued on Saturday) unless they had all been in town Friday night, and also peeping into the *Miners Journal*. By the by, it was not intended by the Bank gentlemen who give that notice, that the people from the country should be there. I quote the words of the notice itself from your paper. "We are requested to state, that a meeting of the citizens of this town, will be held in Charlotte to day 25th inst. January 1834, for the purpose of considering the recent removal of the deposits from the United States Bank." Can any one doubt now, who can read his A B C's, as to the reason the people from the country did not attend? In the first place, they had no notice. Yet next, they were not invited to attend. Yet this learned small gentleman says, they did not attend in consequence of the inclemency