on Mr. Naylor's right to vote, by tellers, and stood, Ayes 119, Noes 112.

[This vote excited great sensation in the House, it being the first vote where the Whigs had the majority. The effect of this vote was to sustain the vote of yesterday, that Mr. Wise's resolution should be laid upon the table.]

The next question that came up was upon the right of Mr. Aycrigg, of New Jersey, to vote.—His commission was read, and the law of New Jersey, and the evidence in part connected with the facts in the case, when the vote was taken upon Mr. Aycrigg's right to a seat. Tellers were demanded, and the result was—in favor 117, against him 122. Four of the Whig members from New Jersey voting in his favor, and three of the Administration claimants against him. So the House decided that Mr. Aycrigg's vote should not be counted.

The House was very quiet when Mr. Adams gave the decision, and all eyes were upon him when he said, "The Chair considers the vote unconstitutional"—(laughter and excitement)—"but in consideration of the fact that the majority have reversed his decision, he feels bound to state that Mr. Aycrigg's vote cannot be counted."

The meeting then decided, 122 to 116, that Mr. Maxwell's vote should not be counted, and a decision immediately followed of a similar result in regard to other members. The last vote was 110 to 117 against allowing the New Jersey Whig members to vote.

The next question on which a vote was taken was whether Mr. Ingersoll should be allowed to vote.

Mr. Ingersoll attempted to speak, but was called to order.

Mr. Peck of N. Y. told him if he had a speech to make, he had better go to the Rotunda and make it; he did not belong here.

The vote was then taken upon Mr. Ingersoll's right to a vote, and decided against Mr. Ingersoll's right, 158 members voting against it, and not one for it. After this vote had been taken, Mr. Adams in the chair stated the position of the questions before the House. They had decided upon Mr. Naylor's right to vote. His own decision, that Mr. Naylor had a right to vote, was sustained.

Mr. Wise then again brought forward his resolution that the New Jersey members should be enrolled and take part in the organization.

The ayes and noes on this question were then called—a breathless silence almost pervading the Hall during the time of reading the names of the members. The vote was

In favour of Mr. Wise's resolution	115
Against it	118

The New Jersey members did not vote, except Mr. Randolph, whose seat is uncontested. Mr. Naylor voted.

Mr. Rhett, of South Carolina, then moved an important resolution, the effect of which was that the Clerk should call the names of all the members whose seats are uncontested, and that the members thus called shall be a quorum to settle the claims of members—that Mr. Naylor's seat shall not be included in the contested seats, and that the quorum shall decide the contested elections before proceeding to the election of a Speaker. The ayes and nays were demanded upon Mr. Rhett's resolution, which was decided affirmatively.

The vote upon Mr. Rhett's resolution—the last clause of it referring to Mr. Naylor's right to vote,—was

Ayes 138, nays 92.

Mr. Campbell, of South Carolina, has submitted an important proposition, that the House immediately organize by the appointment of a temporary Speaker and Clerk, for the purpose of receiving the Message, &c. After the Speaker is appointed and the House temporarily organized for the purposes named, the contested seats are to be settled, and then new officers appointed. Mr. C. thinks this the only way to get the House out of difficulty.

Mr. Graves said that the proposition of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Campbell) was in substance that offered by the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Wise;) and he saw no necessity for the House acting upon it. Looking at it in that point of view, and that alone, he moved the previous question.

Mr. Hubbard said the right to a division cannot be doubted; I might like one part and not another.

Mr. Wise observed that he presumed the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Campbell) had a right to make his motion in his own way.

The question was then taken, when there appeared—Ayes 102, noes 116.

The second branch of the resolution being then read—

A motion was made to adjourn—carried.

IN SENATE,

Thurday, Dec. 12, 1839.

A message from the President of the United States was received, which being of an Executive character,

The Senate went into an Executive session, and, afterwards,

Adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The question pending was on the motion of Mr. Campbell, of S. C., to reconsider the vote on the second branch of Mr. Rhett's resolution.

Mr. Campbell rose and stated, that as the House had on yesterday refused to reconsider the first branch of Mr. Rhett's resolution, he would now withdraw the motion to reconsider the second branch of the resolution.

The Chair announced that the gentleman from South Carolina had withdrawn his motion to reconsider.

Mr. Wise. Then I presume the resolution which the House has passed will be put in operation, and that the Clerk will proceed under it to call the roll of the House.

The Clerk then commenced at Pennsylvania, where he had left off on the first day of the session, and called the balance of the roll entirely through and immediately upon his concluding the call,

Mr. Randolph of New Jersey rose and said: the list of members having been called, I hold in my hand a paper, which I ask to be read by the Clerk.

Here several gentlemen enquired the character of the paper, and requested Mr. Randolph to give a statement of its contents before it was read.

Mr. Randolph replied and stated, if the Clerk would give him back the paper, he would read it himself, that, said he, would be the best way to give the gentlemen the information they desired.

After some further remarks by the members and the Chair, Mr. Randolph was permitted to read the paper referred to, which was a protest, signed by Messrs. Aycrigg, Halsted, Maxwell, Strother, and Yorke, the excluded members from New Jersey, protesting against the action of the House, by which they were excluded from voting on questions previous to an examination of their case, and concluded by moving that the protest be entered on the Journals of the House.

Mr. Mercer moved the previous question on that motion, and called the yeas and nays.

The motion being seconded, it was carried in the affirmative—Ayes 107, noes 87.

The question was taken on the main question, which was to enter the protest on the Journals, and was decided in the negative—Yeas 114, nays 117.

The Chair then stated that the first part of the resolution of the gentleman from South Carolina, which had been adopted by the House, had been carried into effect. It would now be for the House to carry into effect the second part of the resolution, which was in the following words: "and after the names of such members are called, and before a Speaker is elected, they shall, provided there be a quorum of such present, then hear and adjudge upon the elections, returns, and qualifications of all claimants (Mr. Ingersoll and Mr. Naylor excepted) to the seats contested on the floor.

Mr. Dromgoole rose, and submitted the following proposition, with a view of carrying into effect the latter part of the resolution of the gentleman from South Carolina:

Resolved, That a select committee, to consist of nine, be appointed, viva voce, by the members of this House, to whom shall be referred all the papers in the possession of the Clerk relating to contests for seats on this floor from the State of New Jersey, and that they report thereon.

Upon this resolution, the previous question was moved and seconded, and the main question was ordered.—The yeas upon the main question were 122, nays 84, so the resolution was adopted.

Mr. Thompson, of South Carolina, rose and said that he held in his hand a resolution, which he intended to present, and on which he should not move the previous question to prevent any absurdity that it might contain from being exposed, as other gentlemen had done in the case of the resolutions presented by them. The House had resolved that it would consider these elections, when he was persuaded that they had no power to move one step in the matter. The members from New Jersey who held the Governor's certificates, have presented the *prima facie* evidence of their right to the seats they claimed. The members who contest their seats present evidence to show that they have received a majority of the votes given; and it is contended that theirs is the best *prima facie* evidence, unless it can be shown that that majority was made up of the votes of aliens, as contended for on the other side. Mr. T. then went on to show that it would be impossible to do justice to either party, without hearing all the evidence that might be deemed necessary by both parties; and that the House had no power, in its present state, to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses. He knew not how the House was to act, but he had seen enough to know that the strongest principle in the nature of man was party feeling; and under the influence of that feeling, he had seen the sacred principles of the Constitution trampled down. He deemed it highly necessary that the committee should act under the responsibilities of an oath; but as no oath could be administered, but in an informal manner, he had drawn up a resolution for that purpose, which he now submitted to the House. Mr. T. here read his resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the committee raised on the New Jersey election, have power to send for persons and papers, and to swear witnesses; and that the members of said committee be themselves sworn before entering upon their duties.

Mr. Pickens having obtained the floor, said: I move this resolution as an amendment to that offered by my colleague. I desire, before proceeding into a discussion of the question, to state very briefly the position which I occupy upon it. If the House chooses, in its wisdom, to raise a select committee in this case, I desire that the action of that committee shall be confined to some distinct action, and to the distinct question raised by this House. I desire their action to be confined to the simple question, "who are returned as members from the State of New Jersey?" I agree in the justice of many of the remarks of my colleague in relation to the position now occupied by the House. I understood this from the first, and therefore I voted against the resolution of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Wise] and yesterday voted against the resolution of my colleague, for I foresaw the very difficulties in which we are now involved; and I take the occasion to say, that I voted against the resolution of the gentleman from Virginia for another reason, and that was, I desired a different mode of proceeding than the one contemplated by it. If I had been called upon to vote upon the resolution of the gentleman from Virginia on the first day of our meeting, I would have voted in the affirmative. I thought that those members from New Jersey who held the certificates of the Governor of their State were entitled to take their seats, and to hold them until it should be shown that the contesting claimants had a better title. I desired that course of proceeding in order to give efficiency to our organization; but the House thought proper to take a different course. I thought it due to the country, to our own dignity, and to a sovereign State of this Union, that the certificates of her constituted authorities should be received as *prima facie evidence*; and I regret that a triumphant party, flushed with its recent victories in different sections of the Union, should have taken a different course. They have thought proper to take a course different from the one I approved of, and we are now involved in difficulties very little creditable to an American Congress. It is true that the House has already thought proper to bring forward, in an informal manner, certain testimony connected with the case; but it is a question, whether that is not competent testimony under the Constitution; and I contend that this House has a right to decide the question on the first day of the session, if they thought proper. I will read that clause of the Constitution, under which this House has the power to act on this subject.

"Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members."

It will be perceived that the Constitution, in this clause, makes three distinct subjects on which this House is entitled to decide. I contend that they are, in their very nature, distinct questions. It may decide that a member is returned, and that he is, under the Constitution, totally disqualified. Suppose you judge of the returns of a member who is under twenty-five years of age, or an alien; he may have a majority, and not be entitled, under the Constitution, to take his seat. So we may decide that a member is entitled to the returns, because he has a majority of the polls, and yet not be legally elected, because that majority was made up of persons who had no right to vote. In the progress of this case, we have seen one notorious fact is admitted. It is admitted by the papers, and admitted by the gentlemen from New Jersey themselves, that a majority of the votes of the people of New Jersey were given to other members than those claiming their seats under the certificates of the Governor. That fact was admitted by them, with one qualification; and that was, that that majority was made up of illegal votes. This admission, therefore, is giving up the whole question. Who decided that they were not legal votes? Was it the Governor? The Clerk? Sir, I lay down this broad proposition, and challenge a reply: that there is no officer of State authority whatever, who can decide upon the legality of votes, after they are once deposited in the ballot boxes. You may challenge votes at the polls as is done in the State of Virginia; but the proposition I contend for is this—

Mr. Wise here asked permission to make an explanation.

Mr. Pickens, in continuation. I will yield the floor for an explanation, but I protest against the practice of many gentlemen, for the last two years, of taking the advantage of being allowed to make an explanation, and then making an argument instead of it.

Mr. Wise said there was a law of the State of Virginia appointing a commission to purge the polls—not at the time and place of the elections, but within a given number of days thereafter.

Mr. Pickens continued. I admit the proposition of the gentleman from Virginia. I admit that the State of Virginia has taken upon herself to purge the votes after they have been received into the ballot boxes. I ask if that is the naked proposition? and if so, I am prepared to demonstrate the unconstitutionality of it.

Mr. Wise made a brief explanation, which, from the noise prevailing, the Reporter did not hear. It related principally to the manner of voting in Virginia, which is viva voce.

Mr. Pickens resumed. The proposition I maintain is, that under that clause of the Constitution I have just quoted, we are created, in the very terms of the Constitution, the sole and exclusive judges of the returns; and if any State authority interferes to purge the polls, after the votes have been deposited in the ballot boxes, or after they have been given, viva voce, if you please, as in the State of Virginia, (unless he does it for the purpose of ascertaining whether the votes have the qualifications requisite for the most numerous branch of the State Legislature,)—unless he does it to carry out that provision of the Constitution, it is a monstrous violation of the rights of this House. Here let me observe, in reflecting upon this clause, that it strikingly displays the wisdom of those who framed this instrument. Suppose a contrary result, and that the Constitution gave to the State authorities the power of judging of the returns of the Representatives? This House would be at the mercy of this or that conflicting party in every State. It was essential to the preservation of its purity and independence, that it should possess the power given to it by the Constitution, of judging of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members. You cannot get over the plain and palpable provisions of the Constitution. I do not understand that the question has been raised by any gentleman here, that the State authorities of New Jersey have the right to purge the polls after the elections are over. It being admitted that they have not that right, I contend that we have the right to judge of the returns of the members from New Jersey; that we can do it now; and that in doing so, we are not bound to go into other particulars touching the elections until we are better prepared to do so. I do not mean to cast any censures on the Governor for having given his certificates to persons who did not receive a majority at the polls. He may have supposed that he was doing his duty, and may have looked upon himself as a mere ministerial register of the votes returned by the clerks of the counties. Sir, he may give his certificates to one set of gentlemen, and other gentlemen may be entitled to the returns; and the proposition I mean to demonstrate on this floor is, that there is no authority in New Jersey competent to enter into and decide upon the legality of votes after they have been deposited in the ballot boxes. This House, and this House only, can decide upon the elections, returns, and qualifications of its members. Without that provision in the Constitution, where is our independence? But some gentlemen suppose that we are not constitutionally organized, and that, therefore, we can do nothing. Allow me, sir, to say that there is some confusion on this subject. The Constitution says that "the Congress shall assemble at least once in every year; and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall, by law, appoint a different day." What is Congress?—Analyze it. The members are elected from the different States, and assemble here every year as the Constitution directs. Gentlemen suppose that we must take the oath before we can decide upon the matter now before us; but is this the fact? I will refer to that point of the Constitution which prescribes the oath to be taken. It is in these words: "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all Executive and Judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution." Does the Constitution prescribe the time when we shall take this oath? Does it say that we shall take it on the first or last day of the session? The law of '89 directs that after a Speaker is elected, a member of the House shall administer the oath to him, and that he shall then administer it to the rest of the members.—But, sir, I contend that when we assemble on the first day of December, we are a body competent to decide on the elections, returns, and qualifications of our own members, and that we can do so before taking the oath. Sir, I think it would be inexpedient, though we have the right to do so, to enter at this time into the elections and qualifications of these New Jersey members; but on the other question—that of the returns—we are not only competent to enter into it, but it is highly expedient that we should do so. Suppose it to be declared that Mr. A. and Mr. B. should be the judges, and exclusive judges, of the returns of these New Jersey members. Would there be any difficulty in it? The whole difficulty arises from there being 242 judges, instead of one judge.

In offering this proposition, I have acted solely in consequence of the dictates of my own judgment, and with a view to obviate the difficulties in which the House is involved. I believe that the gentlemen who have produced certificates are not entitled to the returns, and I am prepared to meet that question. I thought we were competent to decide it on the first day of the session, and think it would have been better if we had decided it on that day, fearlessly, boldly, and frankly, instead of being delayed and mystified by special pleading. I have acted under the dictates of my own judgment, and have not been influenced by party drill or the dictates of a caucus.

[Mr. P., after portraying in forcible language the evils flowing from party spirit, said, that for some years past there had been too strong an Executive action in this Government, and that it was time for the Representatives of the people to spurn at Executive dictation, and assert their own independence. It was time, he said, that they should redeem the House from a base subserviency to that monster god, party, and to look with a single eye to the welfare of the country.]

I have introduced the resolution, Mr. P. continued, to meet the case before the House. I maintain that we are, by the Constitution, the exclusive judges of the return of our own members, and that there is no concurrent jurisdiction in any State, Governor, or Legislature; and, in maintaining these principles, I maintain the principles that are essential to the preservation of American liberty. The propositions I lay down are, 1. That this House is the sole and exclusive judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members; 2. That no State officers have the right to take into consideration the legality of the votes after they have been deposited in the ballot boxes; and, 3. That those who have the majority of the votes have a right to the returns. Upon these principles I voted against Mr. Ingersoll's right to vote. The majority of the votes were given to his opponent, Mr. Naylor; and, though it was contended that this majority was the result of fraud, I voted against Mr. Ingersoll because I believed that the judges had no right to throw out the votes, because they deemed them fraudulent—that in so doing, they were usurping the powers of this House. When the question, however, comes up to be finally decided between the two gentlemen, I will meet it, and decide according to the evidence before me; but I protest against the right of the officers of the State of Pennsylvania to judge of the legality of votes after they have been deposited in the ballot boxes. I know, said Mr. P. the delicacy of the position I occupy. I know that the course I have adopted may be misunderstood, and perhaps censured; but I would not wear the proudest jewel on a monarch's brow, if I could not wear it unshackled. There is no sentiment I ever proclaimed in the closet, that I would not proclaim to the world. I am prepared to meet this question frankly, boldly, fearlessly; and I am willing to go into it now.

Mr. P. here read the following resolution:

Resolved, That the committee to be raised on the New Jersey elections, be confined to the question who is entitled to the "returns" of elections for the Twenty-sixth Congress.

Mr. Craig then gave notice that he would move a reconsideration of the vote ordering the appointment of a committee, in case a reconsideration should be ordered of Mr. Rhett's resolution.

On motion of Mr. Wise,

The House adjourned.

THE WESTERN CAROLINIAN

SALISBURY:

Friday Morning, December 20, 1839.

☞ We are authorized to announce Col. RICHARD W. LONG as a Candidate for the office of Sheriff of Rowan County.

☞ We are authorized to announce JOHN H. HARDIE, Esq., as a Candidate for re-election for the office of Sheriff of Rowan County, at the next election.

THE NEW JERSEY CONTESTED ELECTION.

The contested election from New Jersey has, in a great measure, obstructed all the proceedings of Congress. Nearly two weeks have been consumed in disputes in the House of Representatives, and that body still in a state of *disorganization*.—No Speaker elected;—no Clerk appointed;—no Message received, and *all in most admirable confusion.*

The question then naturally suggests itself to all enquiring minds, why all this confusion and delay?

So far as we can judge by a careful examination of the whole history of the subject, with no other view than to arrive at a just conclusion, it is, in substance, as follows:—New Jersey elects her members of Congress by general ticket. At the last election for this purpose, there were two sets of candidates before the people, one for the Whigs, and the other for the Democrats—that is six on each side. The election took place, and it appears from the result that one of the Whig candidates, Mr. Randolph, received a majority of all the votes given in, and, as a matter of course, his seat is not contested; but five of the Democratic candidates were ahead of the other five Whig candidates from 100 to 200 votes. But when the returns were examined, it was found that the statements from two of the precincts were missing, or withheld, by which means the Whigs had a majority of all the votes returned; if however, these two precincts had been returned and counted as they ought to have been, the Democrats would have had a clear and decided majority.

The Governor, being a Whig, gave his certificate to the Whig candidates, although *he knew* when he did it, that the other party had the majority. At the opening of Congress both parties presented themselves.—The Whigs claimed their seats because they hold the Governor's certificates, and the other party claim theirs, because they have a clear majority of the people, certified by the Secretary of State, the recording officer—and under these circumstances of the case, the House has now to decide who shall have their seats, it being "the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its members," according to the Constitution.

As we stated on a former occasion, if party feelings and party influences were not in the way, it seems to us that there could be no question about the *matter*, no *if* to alter the case, as the Lawyer said to the Farmer.

The Constitution gives to the people the right of choosing their members of Congress, and in our opinion, whoever gets the majority of the popular vote, whether he be Whig or Democrat, ought to be entitled to the seats, and any other principle once recognized and adopted, will destroy the very essence of our free institutions. Those five members who insist upon retaining their seats, and whose claims have thrown confusion and disorder in the whole proceedings of Congress, may be, for aught we know, *whigs*, but *Republicans* they cannot be, especially when they attempt to hold their seats against a decided will of the freemen of New Jersey. Party prejudice and political excitement may for a while, *overlook*, and even *justify* this act, but when cool reason takes up the question and carefully examines all the grounds of dispute, a judgment, yes, a judgment of condemnation will be pronounced by every friend of popular rights throughout the United States.

We well remember, and no doubt it is recollected by all, the efforts that were made by the Administration party, to thrust General Newland in the House.

The Whigs denounced it; our Representative, Mr. Hamilton, made an able speech against it, and the result was, the base attempt revolutionized the Mountain District.—How stands the case now before us? Why, the same party calling themselves Whigs, are now attempting to do, what they then (three years ago) condemned, by forcing on Congress five men, whom the people of New Jersey have, by a majority of their votes rejected; but to whom a partisan Governor, *illegally*, and we might add, *knowingly* too, gave his certificate.

These things are not only wrong in principle, but wrong in practice, and ought to be met, as we trust it will, at the threshold of Congress.

The President's Message.—This is the third time we anticipated the pleasure of being able to lay before our readers the President's Message, but we are now more than ever convinced, that so long as the New Jersey question can be made debatable, or a question of order be raised, we shall not have the opportunity of doing so.

The President cannot communicate the Message until the House is organized. When this will be, we cannot foretell. We are in hopes, however, to be able to give it next week.

We must apologise to our miscellaneous readers for occupying so much of our paper this week with the proceedings of Congress. They are so extraordinary in character, and with all, so exciting, that we could not do otherwise than publish them. It would seem by reference to the proceedings of the 12th, taken from the Globe, that the House was not yet organized; that the contested seats of the Jersey members were still pending; and that no definite action could be expected for days to come. So long as matters are thus situated in the House, we may look in vain for the President's Message.

POSTSCRIPT.

The Northern Mail of last night brought intelligence from Washington City up to the 14th inst. In the published proceedings of that day, (14th,) we find the House had proceeded to ballot for Speaker. They had made six trials without success, and on motion of Mr. Lewis Williams of North Carolina, the further balloting was postponed until Monday next (16th.) The House then adjourned.

The ballotings stood thus:

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
John W. Jones,	113	113	110	101	71	39
John Bell,	102	99	1	2	22	21
Wm. C. Dawson,	11	11	108	77	4	1
F. W. Pickens,	5	5	7	8	6	4
Dixon H. Lewis,	3	5	6	14	49	79
R. M. T. Hunter,			5	29	63	63
Levi Lincoln,					4	11
Scattering,	1	1	2	3	10	10

Fayetteville and Western Rail Road.—Below will be found the address of the Commissioners to the citizens of Rowan, on the above important subject. We commend its perusal to each and every citizen of the County, who has at heart the interest of this great and important enterprize.

TO THE CITIZENS OF ROWAN COUNTY: The undersigned, having been appointed Commissioners to receive Subscriptions to the Stock of the "Fayetteville and Western Rail-Road Company," under the amended Act of Assembly passed at the last Session of that body, take this occasion to make to you a simple statement of facts, and to urge upon you some considerations which we think important.

By the Act of 1836–'7, the State of North Carolina agreed to subscribe two-fifths of the sum necessary to complete the Rail-Road from Fayetteville to some point above the Narrows of the Yadkin River, provided individuals would subscribe the other three-fifths. The persons interested were proceeding rapidly to avail themselves of what then was thought to be a most liberal act of the State, and the prospects of success seemed most encouraging when the sudden change in the times that overwhelmed all other kind of business—crushed also this great project. Things remained in this discouraging state until last Winter, when another appeal was made to the Legislature in behalf of the citizens of the West, and that body was informed, that if *another fifth* of the whole sum should be subscribed by the State, individuals would *assuredly* raise the *remainder*. After much contention and difficulty, the Act passed as asked for: that is to say, the State, by this Act agrees to subscribe *three-fifths* of the Capital Stock, provided individuals will take the remainder. Under this Law, the people of Fayetteville have commenced a very spirited action, and have raised on the Cape Fear, a majority of the sum wanted. Something less than two hundred thousand dollars, however, must be raised by the people *of the West* before we can reckon on the certain success of this great and long desired work of internal improvement. If that sum is raised speedily, we are willing to pledge our characters to our fellow citizens that the Work *must be made*. If, however, this amount subscription be not made, we are equally certain of the entire failure of the scheme. The limits of this address will not permit us to explain the circumstances that have brought about this crisis; but it does most certainly exist, and our fellow citizens are called upon to *act* upon it.

The property-holders in the country, are most deeply interested in this Work; they *must gain* whether the Stock yields a dividend or not: they will gain on the increased value of their land and its productions. We have no idea that the Stock will be unprofitable: the State has too much interest at stake to permit this; but in case this should be certainly the fact, you, the Farmers of the country ought *to do something* at any rate. The Road *is*, and always has been presented as an Agricultural Scheme. You are to be mostly benefitted: you ought therefore to take up this subscription and fill it at once. Small sums only are required from each, and many facilities are presented even for meeting these small sums. Will you, the *strong backed* men of Rowan, not come forward and save your own great Scheme from failure and your own great interest from hopeless ruin?

We are not enthusiasts. We have well considered what we say, and we know we speak truly. It will be a lasting reproach for you to hang back at a crisis like this.

Yours respectfully,

WILLIAM CHAMBERS,
R. MACNAMARA,
D. A. DAVIS,
R. W. LONG,
H. C. JONES, } Comm'rs.

Salisbury, Dec. 20, 1839.

DENTISTRY.

W. A. M'CORMICK, M. D.

SURGEON DENTIST.

RESPECTFULLY informs the citizens of Salisbury and its vicinity, that he has taken an office at the Mansion Hotel, for the purpose of practising DENTAL SURGERY, in all its various branches, on the most improved and scientific principles, viz. *Sealing, Plugging, Extracting, Inserting Teeth on Pivot, Gold Spring, Plate, &c.*

He is a regular graduate of Medicine, and hopes by attention and assiduity in the line of his profession, to receive a share of public patronage.

N. B. He is in possession of a material, not only innocent and easily applied, but far superior to any thing that ever yet has been discovered for *Plugging*, particularly in large cavities where the nerve is exposed and tooth otherwise much diseased, and would particularly recommend it to all before having their teeth extracted, which otherwise might be saved by having them plugged.

P. S. Ladies waited on at their private residence.

December 20, 1839. 2t.

THE SUBSCRIBER

OFFERS FOR

Rent,

THE STORE HOUSE formerly occupied by himself, situated in the very centre of business, immediately above Mr. Geo. W. Brown's store for one, two, or three years. Much might be said in favor of this stand, but the subscriber deems it unnecessary to say more than it possesses advantages both as to location and arrangement not inferior to any other in the place. KINCHEN ELLIOTT.

☞ Those who are indebted to the Subscriber, either by note or account, are respectfully, and urgently requested to call and make payment at the earliest possible day. K. E.

Salisbury, Dec. 20, 1839. 2t.