

Debate in the Senate.

In the U. S. Senate, on Thursday, a warm and exciting controversy arose between Messrs. Allen, Hannegan, and Haywood. When the latter concluded his speech on the Oregon notice, Mr. Hannegan rose to address the Senate. He promised not to detain the Senate very long. Before proceeding to make a few remarks in reply to some parts of what he considered as the most extraordinary speech he had ever heard in his life, he begged to ask the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Haywood) one question, which, for greater accuracy, he had reduced to writing:—We did not get a copy of the question; but it was in substance this: whether he had the authority of the President of the United States, direct or indirect, for declaring here that it was his wish to terminate that existing controversy with Great Britain by compromising on the parallel of 49 degrees?

Mr. Haywood replied that he had already said that which, for fear of mistake, he had previously written, and which he should print. For the President to authorize any Senator to make such a declaration as that stated by the Senator from Indiana was not to be expected, and would be out of character.

Mr. Allen said he should construe the reply of the Senator from North Carolina into a negative, unless forbidden by the Senator himself to do so.

Mr. Haywood. I have already endeavored to prove my friend from Ohio a bad hand at construction. [A laugh.]

Mr. Allen. Then I shall adopt the other construction, and consider his answer as in the affirmative; and I demand it—as a public right—that he shall answer the interrogatory put to him. If he does not answer, I am here to deny that he has expressed the views of the President.

Mr. Haywood's answer was but partially heard, but was understood to say that his constituents had not sent him there to answer questions put to him by any man; but in regard to the inquiries of the Senator from Ohio, if he (Mr. H.) occupied the position which that Senator did, and was driven to the necessity of asking questions here about the opinions of the President, he should quit. [Much laughter.]

Mr. Westcott here called Mr. Haywood to order, if he was about to state any thing as from the President.

Mr. Haywood. The Senator need not be alarmed. [Increased merriment in some parts of the chamber.] No Senator has a right to make demands of him on the floor of the Senate, and he should submit to no such demand. Nevertheless, he might consent, if properly requested, to reply to any reasonable inquiry, either in the house or out of it. He had often done things in that way out of doors, that he considered rather humiliating, for the sake of peace and good fellowship; but he recognized in no man a right to demand answers from him in his place in the Senate.

Mr. Allen said he had not demanded an answer as a private or personal right, but as a public right. When a Senator assumed to speak for the President, it was a public right possessed by every Senator to demand his authority for doing so.—The avowal here made by the Senator from North Carolina was, that he was the exponent of the views of the President of the United States on a great national question. The gentleman had assumed this; and Mr. A. now again asked whether he was in possession of any authority from the President for saying what he had?

Mr. Westcott called Mr. Allen to order. It was not in order to inquire here what were the President's personal opinions or purposes.

Mr. Allen said that he had not asked what the opinions of the President were.

Mr. Haywood said that he was not at all excited. He would, however, take leave to observe that he did not see any thing like a catechism in the rules of order. He had not assumed to speak by authority of the President.

Mr. Allen. Then the Senator takes back his whole speech.

Mr. Haywood. I am glad to see that the speech takes. [Much laughter.]

Mr. Allen (much excited.) With the British. [Much excitement and conversation here (as, indeed, throughout this entire scene) prevented the Reporter from bringing all that Mr. Allen said.]

Mr. Hannegan wished the Senate to notice that though the Senator from North Carolina had written his speech, he had not printed it, so that other Senators might be able to refer to it in reply. It was not to be found in any of the papers.

Mr. Haywood. I desired that, for fear of mistakes; and it seems I was right; for one of the papers, in its brief account of my remarks this morning, has said of my speech that it was a speech in favor of arbitration.

Mr. Hannegan said it was quite immaterial whether the Senator from North Carolina gave a direct answer to Mr. H's inquiry or not. The Senator had said that there was no meaning in language, no truth in man, if the President had any where committed himself to the line of 54 degrees 40 minutes. Mr. H. would say, in turn, that there was neither meaning in language nor truth in man if he had not so committed himself, and that in language strong as that of the holy book itself. Before the Baltimore Convention met he stood already committed to the whole of Oregon up to 51 degrees 40 minutes before all the world. Mr. H. would go back to the year 1844, and call the Senator's reply to a committee of the citizens of Cincinnati. Their inquiries referred to the annexation of Texas; but, in replying, Mr. Polk volunteered opinions in regard to Oregon; also; and this while

THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

BRUNER & JAMES,
Editors & Proprietors.

"KEEP A CHECK UPON ALL YOUR
IS SAFE."

RULES. DO THIS, AND LIBERTY
Gent. Harrison.

NEW SERIES,
NUMBER 47, OF VOLUME II.

SALISBURY, N. C., FRIDAY, MARCH 20, 1846.

he was before the nation as a candidate for the seat he now occupies.

In reply to a question as to the date of the letter, Mr. H. said it was the 23d April, 1844. [Mr. Polk expressed the opinion that the Union ought never to have been "disembled" by the separation of Texas. Did the speech of the Senator from North Carolina sustain the principle of this declaration? Mr. H. would leave it to the world to say.]

[He further quoted the letter where it declared we ought to assert and hold our right of dominion over the whole territory of the Republic.] Where defined the limits of Oregon? Did not the President himself? [Mr. H. here quoted the following passage from the President's message: "The extraordinary and wholly inadmissible demands of the British Government, and the rejection of the proposition made in deference alone to what had been done by my predecessors, and the implied obligation which their acts seemed to impose, afford satisfactory evidence that no compromise which the United States ought to accept can be effected. With this conviction, the proposition of compromise which had been made and rejected was, by my direction, subsequently withdrawn, and our little to the whole Oregon territory asserted, as is believed, maintained by irrefragable facts and arguments." What did this language mean? The offer of 40 degrees? What compromise could he make short of the Russian line of 54 degrees 40 minutes? Did he not assert our little to be clear and indisputable to the country between 49 degrees and 54 degrees 40 minutes? Besides, Mr. H. held the language of the Secretary of State to be virtually the language of the President; and had not Mr. Buchanan claimed the whole territory up to 54 degrees 40 minutes? He had. Mr. H. here read, from the closing part of Buchanan's last letter to Mr. Pakenham:—

Mr. B. here declared that it was still the opinion of the President that our title was the best in the world to the whole territory. Did not the Secretary here speak for the President? And did not the President see this document before it was sent? And did not the President adopt the language as his own, and plant himself upon 54 degrees 40 minutes? It was his own doctrine—his own position; he planted himself on 54 degrees 40 minutes, and nothing short of that line.

Mr. H. well remembered that Mr. Polk had been his own first choice, not that of the Senator from North Carolina. Neither of them had preferred him for the office of the Chief Magistrate. They both preferred another; but he was happy to see that Mr. Polk had won his way so fast in the regard of the Senator as to induce him to volunteer his defence against the attacks of men who never made any.

But Mr. H. would here say that if the President had betrayed the standard of the Baltimore Convention to its enemies—he would not do as the Senator from North Carolina had threatened to do—turn his back upon him—the President would care but little if they both turned their backs upon him—but he would denounce him as recreant to his own avowed principles—recreant to the weighty trust confided to his hands—recreant to the generous confidence of the American people. Mr. H. would not on that account abandon his principles, nor abate one jot or tittle of the demand he set up to the whole of Oregon. He would speak of those who did, in the language of truth and fearlessness.

The Senator from North Carolina had undertaken to give to the Senate the language of the resolution of the Baltimore Convention on the subject of Oregon.—He understood him as professing to read it as it stood; if that was what he professed, what he did was unworthy of a Senator.

Mr. Haywood said that, in reply to this, he would read to the Senator a part of Mr. Briggs's speech; and he quoted a passage from that speech.

Mr. Hannegan, resuming, said there was a great difference between this, as explained by the Senator, and the resolution as adopted at Baltimore. He would read the resolution as it was. Mr. H. here read as follows:

"Resolved. That our title to the whole of Oregon is clear and unquestionable; that no portion of the same ought to be ceded to England or any other Power; and that the re-occupation of Oregon and the re-annexation of Texas, at the earliest practicable period, are great American measures, which this Convention recommends to the cordial support of the Democracy of the Union."

This committed the Democratic party to the whole of Oregon—every foot of it. Let any Senator rise in his place, and tell in what quarter of the Union the names of Texas and Oregon had not flown, side by side, upon the Democratic banners.—Wherever Mr. H. had been, it was so.—Texas and Oregon—Oregon and Texas—always went together.

Did the Senator from North Carolina flatter himself that he could win the applause of the Democratic party, and blind the eyes as he seemed to think he had tickled their ears, while he withheld from them the substance of what they were contending for? If he did, he was greatly mistaken. Texas and Oregon were

two measures, and they dwelt together in every American heart. With all who had gone for Texas, and (as he was told) in Texas itself, the two names floated together on all the Democratic banners. And now, when "Texas" was admitted when they had stretched forth their hands and seized on one of the two and secured the prize, did they mean to turn about and say we meant by "Oregon" just so much of it as we should afterwards choose to give you? They little knew the people of the West, if they even dreamed that they were going to be trampled upon in this way.

Let gentlemen look at their own recorded votes in favor of taking up the Oregon bill at the close of the last session, and then let them look at the language of that bill, and see if it did not propose to take possession of Oregon up to 54 degrees 40 min. after giving unqualified notice to Great Britain that the Convention must cease. At that time we still held Texas in our hands; and this was a test question; and every man in the Senate voted for it save the Senator who sat there, (understood to refer to Mr. McDuffie) and the peerless Huger. And that most excellent Senator (Huger) had afterwards told him, that he had voted in the negative because it was suggested to him that unless he did so the civil and diplomatic bill would fail which was then pending; but on further conversation and consideration he wished to move a re-consideration of the vote, but his friends would not consent that it should be done. In the House of Representatives but four out of fifty Southern Democrats had voted against the bill. These were the reasons given to him why he should not distrust the South on the question of Oregon; the results were now manifesting themselves; and let the speech just concluded by the Senator from North Carolina show whether or not he was justified in his distrust.

The Senator put language in the President's mouth which Mr. H. would here undertake to deny; not that he appeared here as the champion of the President—he claimed no such position. He only defended the right; and, personally, he would prefer doing it in behalf of the humblest man in the country than of the greatest. But he would here deny for the President what the Senator from North Carolina imputed to him. If the statement of the Senator was true, and the President meant what the Senator understood him to mean, then he was an infamous man. The gentleman from North Carolina had told the Senate that, in the message, there were, here and there, in various parts of it, "stickings in" parenthetically, to gratify the ultra-truists of the country; but which he never meant to carry out. The meaning of this could only be that the President, in these "stickings in," employed false and hollow words to hide his real motives and purposes. What was this but deliberately and wilfully deceiving the country. If this was true it must soon come to light; and then what must be his fate but disgrace? The story of his infamy would be circulated from one end of the land to the other, and his perfidious course would sink him in an infamy so profound, in a damnation so deep, that the hand of resurrection could never reach him. A traitor to his country so superlatively base need hope for neither forgiveness from God nor mercy from man. Mr. H. cared not if the Senator from North Carolina was charged with missives from the President; or whether (as he should suspect from the dogmatical style Mr. H. sometimes displayed here) he made these assertions "on his own responsibility."

Mr. Mangum here called Mr. H. to order.

Mr. Hannegan immediately apologized, saying that, if he had used language that was disrespectful to the Senate, it had not been his intention. He would not knowingly forget for a moment the respect due to the body and what he owed to himself. He would endeavor to reply in the spirit which the Senator from North Carolina so repeatedly professed, declaring that he meant nothing personal while he used the plainest language.

The Senator had told them that the country had been agitated from one end to the other for the sake of "putting small men into large offices." Mr. H. had seen such things before to-day.—"Small men in large offices!" And the country agitated for an end like this! Mr. H. had seen small men in large offices. There was an old proverb which said that men who lived in glass houses should not throw stones: it was true to the letter. Mr. H. might turn on the Senator and reply, that he had far rather be a small man seeking a high office, than be a supple subservient tool, bending before the footstool of power and considering it honor enough to run from the back stairs of the palace, on errands to win the favor of a great man.

Mr. H. would be the last to show to Europe such a spectacle as the relinquishment of all Oregon north of 49 degrees, and the acceptance of a fine commercial treaty with the bonus of free trade. Free trade, Mr. H. said, he dearly loved, but it never should be bought by him with the territory of his country.

It was outrageous in any—and in a Western Democrat it would be treason—moral treason of the deepest dye. To surrender any part of the soil of an empire

destined to stand through all time, was treason. He did not speak for other parts of the Union; but for his own he could speak; and this was its sentiment. Free trade—with the surrender of Vancouver's Island and the harbor of Nootka—(and he remembered Britain had never offered to make it a free port—she understood its value too well)—what did it amount to? Who did not know that the opening of her ports was forced from the British Government by the frantic cries of starving millions? And that the haughty aristocracy were compelled to submit to it, to save their lives from the avenging knife of the assassin and their palaces from the torch? But he was told we must put Oregon and the Tariff together; that the West was to have a market, a vast market, for their breadstuffs and pork and beef. Was she? True it is (said Mr. H.) we in the West are born in the woods, but there are some among us who know a little, and, amongst other things, know that, long before our supplies could reach the British market the granaries of the Baltic and the Black Sea and the Mediterranean would have been poured into it to overflowing.

In conclusion, for he would not longer detain the Senate, he could only say of the whole tone and meaning of the speech of the Senator from North Carolina, that, if it spoke the language and breathed the feelings and purposes of James K. Polk, he had uttered words of falsehood and spoken with the tongue of a serpent.

Mr. Allen rose to speak; but—

On motion of Mr. Evans, the Senate adjourned.

THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

MR. WALKER'S FREE TRADE REPORT!

We invite the attention of the public to the following interesting articles from the able Correspondent of the Baltimore Patriot, under the signature of *Potomac*.—It is a humiliating fact for us to know that our dearest interests—the prosperity afforded by the act of 1842, is to be sacrificed by those now in power for the sake of a barren tract of land. As much as we desire to see the Oregon Territory under the jurisdiction of the United States, we are not prepared to surrender the Tariff under any circumstances. No. Let all who love their country begin to move on this subject, and signify to those who presume to sacrifice the interests of this confederacy at the shrine of British rapacity, that it will not be submitted to:

Correspondence of the Baltimore Patriot.
WASHINGTON, March 1, 1846.

The official organ again denies that Mr. Pakenham received a copy of the annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury through the courtesy of Mr. Walker himself and at the latter's room. It admits that he had an early copy, but says that he sent for and obtained it at the office of the 'Union.'

I do not wish to be captious at all about this matter, but not being in the habit of making statements without authority for their correctness, I am not willing to have those statements contradicted with impunity!

Mr. Walker's propensity to originate great measures and have the credit of them, is well known. His Texas letter, and the manner in which he ascertained (or thought he had) and informed Capt. Tyler how many Senators would vote for a Texas annexation treaty, cannot easily be forgotten. The fact that he was, in October and November last, making extraordinary preparations to frame a free trade system of revenue, to supplant the present Tariff, was well known to every body in general, and to Mr. Pakenham in particular. The British minister is a shrewd man. At the time I refer to, his negotiation with Mr. Buchanan was at an end. But Mr. Pakenham was by no means at the end of his row. He knew that Sir Robert Peel designed reducing the British Tariff, as well as 'Sir Robert Walker' that of the United States. It is well known that he then paid his respects to the latter functionary—visited him at the Treasury Department. What the distinguished functionary talked about or speculated upon, I of course make no conjecture. Whether it entered the head of either that the Oregon question could be settled amicably enough if the American Tariff were broken down, I profess not to know. What documents, statistics and facts, if any were then presented to Mr. Pakenham by Mr. Walker, I will not undertake to surmise. It is only known that Mr. Pakenham had an early copy of Mr. Walker's free-trade report—the report which the British House of Lords ordered to be re-printed! How did he obtain the copy? The official organ says, in reply, that Mr. Pakenham never at any time received a copy of the report from Mr. Walker. This certainly is explicit, and not wishing to remain one moment in error, or to delay making the *amende honorable*, if I had been led into an error in the matter, I went to see the gentleman to-day who gave me the information that I have published in regard to the manner in which Mr. Pakenham obtained his first copy of the report,

and called his attention to the organ's denial of its truth. That gentleman replied: 'It is true, nevertheless. Mr. Walker himself told me that he gave Mr. Pakenham the first printed copy he had of his report, which was lying on his table in his room when Mr. Pakenham visited him. And not only so, but Mr. Pakenham has told me the same thing.'

Such was the declaration of my informant. He is acquainted both with Mr. Walker and Mr. Pakenham—and is far from being a Whig. He may possibly speak on this subject himself. It was upon his authority, who said he had just had an interview with Mr. Walker, that I made the statement—which, by the way, I probably should not have made, if I had not seen in the general summary of the foreign news by the Cambria the announcement that Mr. Walker's report was communicated to the British ministry long before it was sent into the proper committee of the American Congress.

It is amusing to see what parade the 'Union,' and other free-trade, anti-tariff newspapers, make of two letters which have recently appeared in reply to the masterly letters of Abbot Lawrence, of Boston, to Wm. C. Rives, of Virginia, on the subject of the advantages and blessings of the existing tariff! One of these free trade letters is from Mr. Bradford, a gentleman connected with a large English manufacturing establishment, who has lived for many years in England, has imbibed English sentiments and notions, and is eminently English in all his feelings. This is well known to all who are acquainted with Mr. Bradford. Who more fit than such a man to write against Mr. Lawrence's American Tariff doctrines! Who more fit to expiate upon the beauties of the doctrine in regard to the American Tariff entertained with mutual relish by Sir Robert Peel, Sir Robert Walker and Sir Richard Pakenham!

The other free-trade letter is the production of Mr. Sidney Homer, and is addressed to Mr. Edmund Burke, of the Patent Office. It is personally disrespectful toward Mr. Lawrence: abounds in suppression of fact and gross misrepresentations; and the way it lays down premises and draws conclusions is very scattering and ridiculous, to say the least of it.

In speaking of the operatives in the Lowell factories who work by the piece, Mr. Homer says triumphantly that he has a letter from Lowell stating that the girls now only receive eleven cents per piece for weaving the same cloth for which they were paid fifteen cents in 1842.—And he brings this up against the denial of Mr. Lawrence that wages have fallen since 1842. But Mr. Homer chooses to suppress an important fact in this connection, which is, that such has been the improvement in machinery worked by those girls, since 1842, one girl can now weave two pieces at eleven cents each, as quick as she could one piece at fifteen cents at the former period.

Mr. Homer says 'the chief causes of our national prosperity and advancement is the freedom of trade between distant and extensive sections of this country.' Very good! He then goes on to say, 'could this area of the freedom of trade be enlarged so as to embrace the whole world, could all nations be brought to believe that their wisest course was to freely interchange their various productions, then would follow a rapid advance of wealth and greatness, &c. Yes, indeed! Who doubts it! If the sky were to fall, Mr. Homer might catch larks! If all nations could be made to believe, &c., then there would be no difficulty. But they will not believe. They prefer legislating for themselves—and we in self-defence must do likewise. Mr. Homer's truism to the reverse notwithstanding.

A friend of mine from Boston says Mr. Homer's letter reminds him of the inopportune preacher in the stage coach who proved every thing by the Bible, quoted disjointed and disconnected sentences all along from Genesis to Revelations. At length one of the passengers, getting tired, observed to the preacher that he had not proved justifiable suicide. No, said he, that can't be done. Why, replied the passenger does not the Bible say in one place that 'Judas went away and hanged himself,' and in another, 'Go thou and do likewise.' Yes, said the preacher, there is no connection between the two passages! Its as much, drily answered the other, as there has been anything you have been proving!

I have much to write in a future letter about the manner in which the President and his Cabinet, Messrs. Dallas, Cass, Calhoun and Allen are all at six and sevens, heads and tails, on the compound question of the Oregon and the Presidency. The heart-burnings, the jealousies, the rivalships, and the current of crimination and re-crimination are vehement. No two of them have the least particle of confidence in each other. This is here well understood. Who will come out ahead remains to be seen.

POTOMAC.

A TARIFF AND ANTI-TARIFF SCENE.

WASHINGTON, March 2, 1846.

The ways and doings of the British Free-Trade party in this country, and their co-workers and co-adjutors, the lordly manufacturers of England, are rapidly developing themselves!

The proceedings of Congress being dull to-day, I accepted an invitation to visit the room of

the House Committee of Post Office and Roads, where I found a Mr. Homer, a Sydney Homer, whose anti-tariff views are in the last number of the 'Union,' and about 200 specimens of goods of English manufacture, with like goods of American origin, and prices attached to each—in order to convince members of Congress that the tariff ought to be struck down.

I don't know when I ever enjoyed a time more heartily. Mr. Homer is a man of a mainly-looking person, who seems to understand the wants of the English manufacturers very well. Indeed he told those present that he had resided in Manchester, England, many years, engaged in sending British goods to this country, and that he left England to reside in the United States in 1842. He has a large fortune and seems to come to this country in behalf of 'Sir Robert Walker,' the other. He brings a letter of introduction from a great capitalist in Manchester, which is dated January 3d, 1846, and was received by Mr. Homer exhibits to those who wish to see the British writer of it, in speaking of Polk's anti-tariff message to Congress, and—'A second Daniel came to judgment, and could Sir Richard Golden.' He speaks in a message very much—thereby showing highly it is appreciated by the British manufacturers.

In regard to Mr. Homer's mission to Congress into the belief that it would break down the American manufacturers' exalt those of Great Britain, Mr. Homer is glad that you, whose long experience as an importer, enables you so well to understand the subject, have taken it in hand; for the object of those at Washington is to sound information and arrive at a conclusion in the proposed alterations of the present tariff, the information which you can lay before them will be highly valuable.

There were present in the room where I was, Messrs. Stewart, Colman and Homer of the House, and Mr. Wethered, of Baltimore. Also two or three anti-tariff members, who left. You may well imagine that such a scene as I have named, would under the circumstances, put some searching questions to Homer, coming there for such a purpose as recommended! And I assure you that I did put them! Mr. Homer answered that perhaps as any free-trader could—himself. I have seen a man so completely converted.

He exhibited two pieces of calico which said were manufactured by Senator Simons of Rhode Island, who sold them, one for 12 cents per yard and the other for 14 or 15. Mr. Wethered thought there must be some mistake, and went up to the Senate and requested Simons to come down to the Committee, who readily assented to the request. The pieces in question were none of his manufacture, and from the quality the best not worth over 12 cents, and the other over 10 cents per yard. Those persons from Mr. Homer had obtained them, had he not?

Mr. Homer said the manufacturers of species of goods made a profit of from 50 to 100 per centum. Mr. Hubbard asked him how many persons did not invest their capital in profitable business? He asked Mr. H. why he did not embark in the business. He latter replied, that he would invest \$50,000, if he did not fear that so many would do the same enterprise as to bring down the fits by competition, so low as to destroy the business. Mr. Stewart asked that if it was not the American doctrine, that competition should not only profits, but the price of Colman asked who but the great manufacturers reaped the benefit from this competition among manufacturing capitalists? Mr. Hubbard wanted Mr. Homer to say, if the why he did not invest his capital in this business was because competition would down the prices of the goods manufactured. Mr. Homer faltered in his reply, and there were several reasons why he would not invest in manufactures. One was, that they would be fluctuating.

Mr. Wethered, seeing the state of the exercise his compassion, said it was for so many to be against one. He said tariff folks in Congress would also have a committee Room, as well as the British manufacturers, with specimens for examination, and that they would appoint a sensible gentleman to superintend it, and the matter single-handed with Mr. H. Whereupon the gentleman made the remark and took their leave. I fear Mr. H. found his mission too hot for him. They can people don't like these kind of men in behalf of British manufacturers, who are the destruction of the American tariff. A plausible and right the thing my eyes of Mr. Polk or Mr. Walker.

POTOMAC.

TO ALL TEACHERS.

VALUABLE SCHOOL BOOKS.

PUBLISHED BY GRIGG & ELLIOTT.

Philadelphia.

GRIGG & ELLIOTT's new series of common school Readers, No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. They contain the best series of Reading, Spelling, and Grammar, ever published in this country. Among many other letters of recommendation, the following has just been received from one of the best teachers in Pennsylvania.

LEES FORT, Berks Co., Aug. 25, 1845.
Messrs. Grigg & Elliott: Gentlemen.—I thank you for the series of Readers you were so kind to send me by my friend Dr. Darrach, which I have just received. I consider them decidedly the best I have met with. I have introduced them into my school at this place and find them fully to answer my expectations. I have also introduced Grinnings' History of the United States, another of your valuable school books. I am very much pleased with Dr. Darrach's works on Anatomy and Botany, which you were so kind to send me. They appear to me to be just the works for bringing the subject of Natural History within the reach of our common schools, and I intend during the winter to make an effort to introduce the subject into my school; and for this purpose, I would like to have the whole series of eight annual volumes which you requested Dr. Darrach to procure for me. Very respectfully,
H. C. BAKER,
Principal, Lees Fort School.

All the above are for sale, wholesale and retail, by D. Turner, the Bookseller in Fayetteville, N. C. and Brown and other merchants in Salisbury. Teachers invite all teachers, who have the interest of their pupils at heart to examine their valuable series of books before introducing any others.
Feb. 13, 1846—Gw-42.

CORN FOR SALE!

The subscriber offers for sale four or five bushels of Corn. Apply to the subscriber or his overseer at his plantation, eight miles from Salisbury.

CHARLES L. TORRENT,
February 3d, 1846—G-41.

ALL KINDS OF BLANKS.

Neatly printed and for sale at this office.