



The Tarborough Press, BY GEORGE HOWARD,

Is published weekly at Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per year...

H. Johnston,

BEGS leave to inform his customers and the public, that he has

Received his Fall Supply of GOODS,

Of all the most Fashionable Articles, Suitable for Gentlemen's wear.

Such as Superfine Cloths, Cassimeres & Vestings, Beaver cloth and Lion skin, for overcoats, Cravats for cloaks.

Fine black beaver Hats,

Of the latest fashion. Gentlemen wishing to purchase Goods in his line, will do well to call and examine before they purchase...

COFFIELD KING,

MERCHANT TAILOR, RESPECTFULLY informs his friends and the public generally, that he has received his

Fall and Winter GOODS,

Consisting of superfine blue and black Cloths, Invisible green and brown do. Striped and corded Cassimeres of various colors.

All of which he will sell low for Cash, or on a short credit to punctual customers.

Ready made Clothing,

Tarboro', Nov. 5th, 1838.

At the cheap Cash Store.

JAMES WEDDELL,

HAS now on hand a large and general assortment of

Groceries, Hardware, cutlery. China, Glass and Earthenware, Cotton Bagging, Rope, Twine, &c &c

When he offers cheap for Cash, & country produce, or on a short credit to punctual men.

State of North Carolina, MARTIN COURT OF EQUITY.

Sophia Griffin vs. James Griffin. Petition for Divorce and Alimony.

M. R. JAMES GRIFFIN: Sir, you are hereby notified personally to be and appear before the Judge of our said Court...

Witness, C. B. HASSELL, Clerk and Master of our said Court, at office, the 1st November, 1838.

C. B. HASSELL, C. M. E. Price adv \$10 00. 45 3m

State of North Carolina, EDGECOMBE COUNTY.

Superior Court of Equity, SEPTEMBER TERM, 1838.

Martha and Zilly Scarborough vs. Stephen Wooten & Richard T. Eagles, ex'rs &c. et al.

Origin at bill. Appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, that John R. Scarborough, one of the defendants in this case, is not a resident of this State...

Witness, ISAAC NORFLEET, Clerk of said Court, at office, the second Monday in September, 1838.

I NORFLEET, C. M. E. Dec. 5th, 1838. Price adv \$5 00

State of North Carolina, EDGECOMBE COUNTY.

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, NOVEMBER TERM, 1838.

State vs. James E. Lewis. Bastardy.

Appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, that JAMES E. LEWIS, the defendant in this suit, is not a resident of this State...

Witness, JOSEPH BELL, Clerk of said Court, at office, the fourth Monday in November, 1838.

JOS BELL, C. C. Price adv \$5 00. 1 6

State of North Carolina, EDGECOMBE COUNTY.

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, NOVEMBER TERM, 1838.

State vs. Edwin Ellis, John Ritter and John Carter, Sr. Bastardy.

Appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, that EDWIN ELLIS and JOHN RITTER, defendants in this suit, are not residents of this State...

Witness, JOSEPH BELL, Clerk of said Court, at office, the fourth Monday in November, 1838.

JOS BELL, C. C. Price adv \$5 00. 1 6

State of North Carolina, EDGECOMBE COUNTY.

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, NOVEMBER TERM, 1838.

James Norvell, Enos Taylor, Samuel Taylor, Nancy Odom, Elizabeth Norvill, David Norvill, Hezekiah Langly and wife Cherry vs. Stephen Wooten & Ephraim Wooten, adm'rs of Enos Norvill, dec'd., James Taylor, Enos Norvill, Eli Johnston and wife Charity, Exum Revel and wife Patey, James E. Lewis and wife Penny, and Dorcas wife of Josiah Kail. Petition for sale of slaves and distribution.

Appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, that Stephen Wooten and Ephraim Wooten, administrators of Enos Norvill, dec'd., James Taylor, Enos Norvill, Eli Johnston and wife Charity, Exum Revel and wife Patey, James E. Lewis and wife Penny, and Dorcas wife of Josiah Kail, defendants in this suit, are not residents of this State...

Witness, JOSEPH BELL, Clerk of said Court, at office, the fourth Monday in November, 1838.

JOS. BELL, C. C. Price adv \$7 50. 1 6

POLITICAL.

We copy from the Globe the following remarks, made to the U. S. Senate by Mr. Brown, on introducing the

RESOLUTIONS

Of the Legislature of North Carolina.

Mr. BROWN said he rose to present to the Senate certain resolutions which had been adopted by the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina, at their late session, expressive of their views and opinions in regard to some of the important measures and questions of public policy, which have been, and now are, pending before the country.

It was alike due to himself, to his constituents, and to the importance of the occasion itself, to state very explicitly the view he took of the resolutions, and the course which high considerations, of public duty required that he should pursue in regard to them.

In regard to most of the resolutions it would readily be perceived that the opinions expressed in them directly conflict with the course which he had heretofore pursued on the measures of public policy to which they refer, and that a principle is asserted in one of them, in regard to a question of constitutional power, entirely at variance with his vote on the resolution ordering the expunction of the condemnatory resolution passed against President Jackson.

Having very briefly adverted to the political character of the resolutions, the next inquiry which presented itself for consideration is, whether they are to be viewed by my honorable colleague and myself as instructions, or as the mere expressions of the opinions of the Legislature, leaving to us a discretionary power in exercising our judgments on the subjects to which they relate.

The resolutions did not merely omit to instruct, but they contained, on their face, expressions which constituted a direct attack on that great fundamental principle of the Republican creed. They declare that act of the Senate of the United States, expunging from its journals the condemnatory resolution against President Jackson, to have been 'an act of party severity, calculated to degrade the Senate.'

Mr. B. said in referring to the journals of the Senate, he perceived that the late venerable Mr. Macon, then a member of this body, had presented resolutions, passed by the Legislature of North Carolina at their session of 1816, instructing their Se-

nators to endeavor to procure certain amendments to the Constitution in relation to the mode of electing President and Vice President of the United States. The Legislature which adopted them resolved, in one of the resolutions, 'that our Senators in the Congress of the United States be instructed, and our Representatives be requested, to endeavor to obtain the said amendment to the Constitution of the United States.'

Mr. B. said, he held, when resolutions directly instructing had passed a legislative body, that it was not competent to go beyond the instructions themselves to ascertain the meaning of the Legislature; but when instructions were not given, on the face of the resolutions, that it was competent to look beyond them to arrive at the intentions of those passing them.

The resolutions did not merely omit to instruct, but they contained, on their face, expressions which constituted a direct attack on that great fundamental principle of the Republican creed. They declare that act of the Senate of the United States, expunging from its journals the condemnatory resolution against President Jackson, to have been 'an act of party severity, calculated to degrade the Senate.'

Mr. B. said, so far as his own vote had had any agency in carrying into effect that just sentence, vindictory of the Constitution and the liberties of the people, both of which had been wantonly assailed in the unauthorized and unjust sentence against the Chief Magistrate of the nation, that he had acted under resolutions passed by the Legislature of his State commanding it to be done.

But in order to have all doubt removed as to the intention of those who passed them, his honorable colleague and himself had addressed a respectful communication to the Legislature of their State, asking to be informed if the resolutions were to be taken as instructions. We had publicly declared that we would obey or resign, if instructed. We considered, that to have done either under resolutions not containing instructions, was not required by our pledge, and would have been a manifest dereliction of public duty under all the circumstances.

When the issue was thus fairly presented, we had a right to expect, on every principle of candor, an emphatic expression of opinion one way or the other, in regard to the intentions of the Legislature on the question of instruction. If they had asserted their intention to instruct, I was prepared, as is known to many of my friends, instantly to have surrendered to them the public trust which I hold. They, however, again decline to assert the principle of instruction, in the resolution passed by them, and thus afford clear and unquestionable proof that they do not intend to commit themselves to the doctrine.

When, therefore, he took into view the circumstances which formed a part of the history of the resolutions, the guarded caution with which the party passing them avoided committing themselves on the record to the right of instruction, and the open and avowed hostility of some of those voting for the resolutions to the doctrine of instruction, the direct attack on that great principle itself, on the face of the resolutions, and the refusal of the Legislature, on a candid appeal made to them, to assert the right—the most irresistible proof is afforded, by positive acts, that they (the Legislature) did not intend to recognise the right of instruction; and if not, on what principle of honor, or by what right, either moral or political, can it be expected that they will be considered and acted on by others as instructions?

The resolutions profess to speak the will of the people. If they were instructions, he admitted that they would be obligatory in the fullest sense of the term; but they were not, and did not profess to be, and therefore the question as respects public opinion, as well as every other in relation to them, is open to the freest inquiry. He did not, himself, believe that they expressed public opinion, as to many of the important topics on which they undertake to declare it. He believed the people of the State had heard with utter surprise, that the subject of the expunging resolutions had been introduced. It was a topic that had not been brought before them at the elections, and therefore could not have been anticipated. Again, he did not believe they expressed public opinion, as no question had ever been brought more directly and immediately before the people of North Carolina than was that, at the elections in 1834, involving the course of President Jackson in regard to the Bank of the United States, and the justice of expunging the sentence pronounced against him from the journals of the Senate.

The Legislature, at its session of 1834, in obedience to that public will, commanded their Senators, by express instructions, to vote for it. The people elected two successive Legislatures, which ratified and re-affirmed, in effect, that decision, as the resolutions remained unrevoked by them. It would, therefore, be in derogation of the well known political consistency of the people of North Carolina, to suppose that a decision so well considered, and so deliberately made, had been reversed by them. No President had ever been more strongly sustained than was President Jackson, at three successive elections, by the people of that State, whose well-earned fame the resolutions which the Legislature had passed aimed so strong a blow at. He could not, therefore, admit that his constituents had abandoned their long cherished political attachments, and were prepared to aid in sacrificing the public character of the honest soldier and patriot statesman. He could not consent, therefore, to record, by his vote, a sentence so derogatory to the people, and to the Legislature of 1834, to whose favor he was indebted for his re-election. To resign, would, in his opinion, be a tacit admission, on his part, that the people had changed their opinion on this question, and an acquiescence in the charge of inconsistency against them, which it involved, which he should consider it a departure from his duty to do, unless acting under instructions that left him no other alternative.

He had declared, in his speech on the Constitutional Treasury, and other occasions, that if instructed by his Legislature, he would obey or resign. He had used the word in that sense which conveys a meaning universally acted on and understood by the Republican party of this country, and had likewise asserted it in his speeches, to be a duty, in the absence of instructions, to pursue the dictates of his own judgment. In the absence of instructions, therefore, his decision as to the present resolutions, which did not recognize, in any part of them, that right, was entirely consistent with his often repeated declarations on that subject.