

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY, BY THOMAS HENDERSON, JUN. FOR SELF & CO. AT THE UPPER END OF FAYETTEVILLE STREET, NEAR CASO'S CORNER.—PRICE THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, PAYABLE HALF YEARLY IN ADVANCE.—SINGLE PAPER 10 CENTS.

### ADVERTISEMENTS.

#### Advertisement.

**R**UN-AWAY from the Subscriber on the 16th day of May last, a Negro fellow named JACK, but perhaps he may have gotten a pass by the name of **EZEKIEL WATKINS**. He is about 30 years of age, about 5 feet eight or nine inches high, has lost some of his fore-teeth, and is much marked with the small-pox. He is very sensible, smooth and plausible in conversation. A generous reward will be given for taking up the said Negro, and securing him in goal so that the subscriber may get him again.

DANIEL WOOD.

Howan County, near Salisbury, June 13, 1869.

#### Advertisement.

**T**HE Subscriber having qualified as Administrator of the Estate, with the Will annexed, of **ALEXANDER WORKE**, late of Iredell County, deceased, hereby gives notice to all persons having claims or demands against the said Estate, that they exhibit such claims or accounts properly authenticated within the time prescribed by law for presenting demands against the Estates of deceased persons, or they will be barred of a recovery.

It is the desire of the Heirs and Legatees of the late Alexander Worke, and it accords with my own wishes, that a speedy settlement and distribution of the Estate be made. Those indebted will therefore be pleased to make payment of their respective debts as soon as possible.

The Heirs and Legatees who are not indebted more than their distributive shares of the said Estate, will not be required to make payment of their debts, but they must give such bonds as will be a sufficient security and indemnity for what they have taken received.

M. STOKES, Administrator of Alex. Worke, deceased.

Salisbury, May 23, 1869.

#### Notice.

**W**HEREAS, my wife Susannah Bressie hath deserted my bed and board without having any just cause, and has, therefore, ceased to perform the duties of a virtuous wife, by which conduct she has caused me to experience all the horrors of a miserable life; I am, therefore, compelled in this public manner to caution all persons from boarding, trading with, or crediting her on my account, as I am determined not to pay any debts which she may contract.

IRBY BRESSIE.

Granville County, N. C. June 14th, 1869. 34—sw. pd

### STATE OF NORTH-CAROLINA.

Edgemore County.

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions—May Term, 1869. Evans and Hines, vs. The Heirs of Abraham Combs, dec.

CITATION.

In this case it appearing to the Court that the personal estate of the said deceased is insufficient to discharge the debts; and on motion it appearing that the heirs of said deceased are not residents of this State—the Court therefore Order, that unless the heirs of said deceased do appear at the next Court, to be held for the said county of Edgemore, at the Court-House in Tarborough on the fourth Monday in August next, to show cause, &c. that the real estate of said deceased will be condemned for the payment of his debts.

It is further Ordered, That a copy of this order be published in the Raleigh Star for three weeks successively. Extract from the Minutes, E. HALL, Ck.

Positively to commence drawing, On Monday the 9th of October next.

### INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT.

TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS May be gained for the small sum of two and an half dollars!! IN THE THIRD CLASS OF THE River Lehigh Lottery.

The capital prizes are, viz. 2 of \$10,000 3 of \$1000 2 of 5,000 6 of 500 2 of 2,500 15 of 200, &c. Less than two and an half blanks to a prize, the lowest of which is 5 dollars.

To draw 500 numbers each day, at the state-house in Philadelphia, where the prizes will be paid by Thomas Allibone, Esq. the Treasurer, 30 days after the conclusion of the drawing; subject to a deduction of 15 per cent.

This is one of the richest Lotteries published here for many years, and the moderate price of the tickets places the grand prizes within the reach of every individual who chooses to become an adventurer, which he may do for so small a sum as *two and an half cents*. The object, moreover, is such as must interest every well-wisher to the internal improvement of the state.

Letters post paid, and inclosing the cash, will be duly attended to, and prizes of lotteries of this city and of New York, as well as bank notes of the different states, received in payment. The price of the tickets will advance with the approach of the drawing.

Whole tickets, \$2 50 Half do. 1 25 Quarter do. 62 1/2 cents.

GEO. TAYLOR, junior, No. 85, South Second-street, Philadelphia.

N. B. The earliest information will be given to distant purchasers, of the state of their tickets. Those of the Second Baptist Church, Universalist Church, Pennepack Academy, and Vineyard Lotteries, also for sale as above.

The price of Tickets will be raised to three dollars on the 15th of July next.

May 1, 1869. 30—3m.

TICKETS in the above Lottery for sale at the Star Office.

### Improved Still.

**W**HEREAS the subscriber has obtained a patent for an improvement on Stills, by which he can fix a common Still to run off twelve times in twenty-four hours, any person living in the counties of Wilkes, Iredell, Lincoln, Cabarras, or Mecklenburgh, by applying to Mr. Archibald Frow, in Charlotte, N. C. (who has an exclusive right for the above counties) may see a model of the above improvements, and know the terms on which a single right or for a whole county may be had.

ED. RICHARDSON.

### CERTIFICATES.

I do hereby certify that I went to Mr. William Murray's Still-House, in Davidson County, State of Tennessee, to see an improvement Edward Richardson had made on stills, at which time I saw the said Edward Richardson run off a still that holds upwards of one hundred and twenty gallons in one hour and twenty minutes, sixteen gallons singlers; and from the time the Still was filled it took her twenty-two minutes to boil; which was an hour and forty-two minutes it took her to run off from the time she was filled; and as I have kept a distillery and do understand the business, I do believe the above-mentioned improvement to be a very valuable one.

SAMUEL WEAKLY.

Nashville, April 23d, 1868.—The above Certificate sworn to before me, R. WEAKLY, J. P.

I do hereby certify that Edward Richardson fixed a Still in my Still-House to run with four Worms, and I attended and saw the said Richardson fill the still with a hoghead of beer, and she boiled in seventeen minutes from the time she was filled, and run off in an hour and ten minutes; and I attended to the measuring of the singlers, which was fourteen gallons and a half; and I believe she makes as much and as good yield as when run in the usual way. Given under my hand in Davidson County, Tennessee.

WILLIAM MURRAY.

Davidson County, April 25th, 1868.—The above Certificate sworn to before me, R. WEAKLY, J. P.

We do hereby certify that we went to Mr. William Murray's Still-House, in Davidson County, State of Tennessee, to see an improvement Edward Richardson had made on Stills, and saw the said Richardson run a hoghead of beer into the Still, and she boiled in seventeen minutes from the time she was filled, and run off in an hour and ten minutes from the time she began to boil; which made an hour and twenty-seven minutes it took her to run off from the time she was filled, in which time she run fourteen and a half gallons of singlers; and as we do understand the distilling business, do believe the above-mentioned improvement to be a very valuable one.

J. A. PARKER.

DAVID VAUGHAN.

Nashville, April 23d, 1868.—The above Certificate sworn to before me, R. WEAKLY, J. P.

### UNITED STATES.



### CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Tuesday, June 20.

### NON-INTERCOURSE ACT.

Amendment permitting armed vessels of both France and England, under consideration.

**Mr. Gold.** This amendment, as to England, our state of amicable negotiation will justify its provision as proper; but as to France, we see no such amicable disposition manifested to make it apply to her, and I fear we will not. What does this bill propose? That there shall be a non-intercourse in commerce, as it regards France, yet her armed ships, her public vessels are to be admitted into our waters. Is it consistent with the ground taken on the last session of Congress, for excluding armed vessels? That ground was not taken on account of violence committed by such in our waters, but upon the ground of commercial non-intercourse; to exclude all nations having in force orders or edicts in violation of our commercial rights; and this had a like common application to both belligerents. To admit the armed national shipping of a nation and exclude her mercantile shipping will present a perfect anomaly. The only ground which can guard us against the charge of partiality to foreign nations is to have a broad principle of action which we must not deviate from. But if this amendment is adopted, it will be an abandonment of that impartial principle we enacted at last session of Congress.

**Mr. Love.** I am of opinion with the gentleman just sat down, if the amendment could be viewed as submission to France we should reject it; but I think it is but justice to France and England in our present state of foreign affairs. When we enacted the measure of exclusion, it was not considered an act of hostility to either nation, but an act of impartial restriction and justice towards ourselves. It was urged as a precursor to negotiation by Great-Britain, not that we should act hostilely to France, but that we should place both nations on an equality, and we did so: now apply the principle at the present session to France. The gentleman contended that the interdict

should be continued against France and discontinued with England, but this might lead to a war with the former power. I would now ask what act has France done to merit this severity from us? But we are not in the same relation with France that we were last session; it is intimated that ameliorations are about to take place in her decrees, we have a knowledge of sundry vessels being liberated in her ports; and a proclamation of the king of Holland, a dependent upon France, shews a return of regard for neutral rights: We should not widen the breach: Besides, we are not sure that even the British government will fulfil its engagements to the extent we were given to expect. I am assured that France will rescind her orders; they were enacted to injure the commerce of Britain; and their perseverance in now would but assist her. Nay, I think the decrees say, that they shall cease whenever G. Britain abandons her unjust principles, and returns to a sense of respect for neutral rights.

**Mr. Livermore.** At the late session of Congress it was said if we submit to illegal decrees, it would be an abandonment of national honor: What were we to do? Have resort to war, no; yet something must be done; and a non-intercourse law was produced—it speaks for itself—it was considered a hostile measure against both France & England; but authorized the President, if either of those nations should rescind their decrees or orders, this hostile measure would be revoked as regarded them? But would it be contended that when one did so, this revocation applied as related to both. This restriction was viewed as a HOSTILE MEASURE, acting against BOTH THE COUNTRIES in question, to cease on the rescinding of either of their unlawful acts, as related to them. The President informs us G. Britain has annulled hers, and that it must cease as relates to her. This is the fact—then as Great-Britain made this stipulation on the faith of our law, would she not as part of her bargain, insist that our interdict should continue against France, as such interdict would be advantageous to her, until France, according to the law, should rescind her decrees. The gentleman who spoke last, was afraid to offend our sister France—and indeed, I believe this was a measure meant to soothe her. The gentleman asks what has France done? The decree of Berlin itself, was a sufficient justification, if not of war, of the interdict intended to be repealed by this act.

**Mr. Randolph.** This law appears to be a very flimsy coverlid to our national nakedness. A proposition is made, lest obscurity should arise, to admit the armed ships of France and Great-Britain, and to this I will give my negative. I understood the inhibition of last session was to repeal the outrages of the belligerents, tho' I confess I am no friend to attacking 74 gun-ships with paper. France has still in force her edicts authorizing the capture of our ships bound to or from England or even spoken to by a British man of war, and lest she should not have opportunities enough to depredate on us we will open our ports for her succor and extend to her the rights of hospitality, that after they recruit they may go out and will take our vessels at the very mouth of our harbours. Though I don't think a contrary conduct to this would ever keep out the Patriot, or other ship, yet I am unwilling to give them the right and title to enter. I wish to see when the relaxations on the part of France can authorize this relaxation on our part. What does the 11th section of the non-intercourse law say? That "when either power shall rescind her restrictions as they relate to us, we will rescind ours as they relate to her;" this is now our situation; and it is proposed to change this situation by expressly admitting the ships of G. Britain and France into our ports and harbours; so that while the President of the United States has very wisely and very properly changed the situation of relations between this country and Great-Britain, we are to change it with respect to France so as to keep the balance even between both. Suppose the first relaxation had come from France, and the President had suspended restrictions with respect to her, what would be said, if we would extend this relaxation to G. Britain to preserve a balance between the one who had and the one who had not come upon terms? I want to see the relaxations of France, that authorize our relaxations towards her; or why we should admit her armed ships and exclude her merchantmen. I must not be understood as wishing a war with France. I would as strongly oppose a measure of that kind as I did in '98, '99, 1800, and as I did last session a war with England; but situated as we are with respect to France it will be highly improper to pass a law opening our ports to French vessels.

**Mr. J. G. Jackson.** It will be recollected I had on a former occasion stated it would be more compatible with our dignity to prohibit the admission of armed vessels of all nations, but gentlemen think that under present circum-

stances, on the tapis of negotiation, when every measure is liable to perversion, it would be best to pursue the present policy, and it was on these suggestions that I made the amendment to obviate any difficulties of construction.—Gentlemen oppose it without drawing a distinction; do they wish the armed vessels of all nations to be excluded? In answer to the gentleman from (Va.) the present amendment is not an authoritative admission—we merely remove the exclusive power.

On motion of Mr. SMILIE the committee rose, reported progress and obtained leave to sit again.

Monday, June 26.

On motion of Mr. Smilie, the house resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of the whole, on the bill from the Senate, to revive and amend certain parts of the act interdicting commercial intercourse.

**Mr. Sheffield** observed that when the bill had been before the committee he had the honour to move an amendment which he now renewed as follows: "And provided also, that nothing therein contained shall be considered to prevent any public vessels from entering the waters and harbours of the U. States belonging to any nation with whom commercial intercourse shall be permitted."

**Mr. J. G. Jackson** moved to amend the amendment by adding to the end of it the following: "Whenever a full and satisfactory adjustment of our differences shall have been made with such nation."

In a debate of about four hours, which took place on these motions, Messrs. Dana, Livermore and Holland supported Mr. Sheffield's amendment, and Messrs. Taylor, Fisk, Burwell, Johnson, Smilie, Cook and J. G. Jackson opposed it.

When Mr. J. G. Jackson concluded, Mr. Sheffield, in order to obtain a direct question on his own amendment, adopted Mr. Jackson's rider to it, as a part of his own motion, and called for a division of the question, taking it first on his own amendment as first moved.

Some doubt arising whether it was correct thus to act according to the rules of the House, Mr. Macon produced a precedent in which he had himself done the same in the case of a motion for the repeal of the second section of the sedition act, nine or ten years ago.

The question was then taken on Mr. Sheffield's amendment as follows:

**YEAS**—Messrs. Baylies, Bissell, Campbell, Chapman, J. C. Chamberlain, W. Chamberlain, Ely, Goldsborough, Gold, Hale, Haven, Holland, Hubbard, R. Jackson, Jenkins, Knickerbacker, Lewis, Livermore, Livingston, Lyon, Matthews, Miller, Minor, Pearson, Pickman, Pitkin, Sheffield, Stanley, Stevenson, Swann, Van Dyke, Van Rensselaer, Wheaton, Whitman, Wilson—35.

**NAYS**—Messrs. L. J. Alston, W. Alston, Anderson, Bacon, Bard, Bassett, Bibb, Boyd, J. Brown, R. Brown, Burwell, Butler, Calhoun, Clay, Clopton, Cobbs, Cochran, Cook, Cox, Crawford, Cuts, Dawson, Desha, Epes, Findley, Fisk, Franklin, Gannett, Gardner, Ghoidson, Goodwyn, Heister, Helms, Howard, Hufty, J. G. Jackson, Johnson, Jones, Kennedy, Love, Lyle, Macon, Marion, McKim, Montgomery, N. R. Moore, T. Moore, Mumford, Newton, Nicholas, J. Porter, P. B. Porter, Randolph, Rea of Pen. Rhea of Ten. Richards, Rome, Root, Ross, Sage, Sammons, Shaw, Smilie, G. Smith, J. Smith, S. Smith, Southard, Stanford, Taylor, Thompson, Tracy, Van Horn, Weakley, Whitehill, Wynn, Witherspoon—77.

This motion having been negated, Mr. Jackson's amendment to it fell of course.

**Mr. Taylor** said that, as the House had decided that they would not discriminate between the admission of British and French public vessels, he wished to try the question on the exclusion of both. He made a motion having in view that object, which was decided as follows, without debate:

**YEAS**—Messrs. Bard, Bibb, Boyd, Crawford, Desha, Holland, Macon, Marion, Morrow, Pickman, Ross, Geo. Smith, Taylor, Whitehill, and Witherspoon—15.

**NAYS**—Messrs. L. J. Alston, W. Alston, Anderson, Bacon, Bassett, Bissell, J. Brown, R. Brown, Burwell, Butler, Calhoun, Campbell, J. C. Chamberlain, Chapman, Clay, Clopton, Cobb, Cochran, Cook, Cox, Cuts, Dawson, Ely, Emott, Epes, Findley, Fisk, Franklin, Gannett, Gardner, Ghoidson, Goldsborough, Goodwyn, Gold, Hale, Haven, Heister, Helms, Howard, Hufty, J. G. Jackson, R. Jackson, Jenkins, Johnson, Jones, Kennedy, Knickerbacker, Lewis, Livermore, Livingston, Love, Lyle, Matthews, McKim, Miller, Minor, Montgomery, N. R. Moore, Thomas Moore, Mumford, Newton, Nicholas, Pearson, Pitkin, J. Porter, P. B. Porter, Quincy, Randolph, Rea, Rhea Ten. Richards, Rome, Root, Sage, Sammons, Sawyer, Shaw, Sheffield, Smilie, J. Smith, S. Smith, Southard, Stanford, Stanley, Stedman, Stephenson, Swages, Swann, Tallmadge, T. Thompson, Tracy, Troup, Upham, Van Dyke, Van Horn, Van Rensselaer, Weakley, Wheaton, Wilson, and Wynn—160.

**Mr. Montgomery** observed that the decision of the courts of the United States had been, that after a law had expired, they had dismissed all suits pending for the recovery of penalties incurred under that act. He conceived that this bill should have a saving clause that penalties and forfeitures incurred under it should be recoverable and distributable after the act itself had expired. He therefore moved an amendment to that effect.

**Mr. J. G. Jackson** concurred in opinion with Mr. Montgomery.

The amendment was agreed to without opposition.

**Mr. Livermore** said that he had an amendment to propose to the bill which he conceived would essentially benefit the people of the