

THE ROANOKE NEWS.

W. H. DAY,
W. P. BACHELOR, Prop's.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 1878.

OUR TICKET.

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT,
HON. DAVID SCHENCK
OF LINCOLN.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE FROM THE EAST,
T. N. HILL.
OF HALIFAX.

The article in our last issue on the Supreme Court should have been credited to the Hillsboro Recorder.

THE COUNTY CONVENTION.

As will be seen by our report of the proceedings of the convention held at Halifax last Saturday, the democracy of this county gave forth no uncertain sound that day in relation to the stand she will take in the ensuing State Convention.

In the first place the delegates to the State Convention were instructed to vote for Thomas N. Hill first, last and all the time. This was to have been expected:

for a residence of forty years in their midst had endeared Mr. Hill to the people of the county of Halifax, and, while every man, with so much force of character as Mr. Hill has ever shown, must have enemies, we know of no one in the county who will not feel personally gratified if he should be chosen as one of the Associate Justices.

To the resolutions of Mr. Kitchen endorsing Judge Schenck for Chief Justice there was some appearance of opposition, but the opposition was not caused by any disinclination on the part of the gentlemen by whom it was manifested to seeing Judge Schenck exalted to that high position, but it arose only because certain gentlemen thought it best to leave the delegates untrammeled by any instructions further than those relating to Mr. Hill.

In relations to the resolutions introduced by Mr. Batchelor we have at present simply to say that they cover a matter affecting deeply the vital interests of the Democratic party in the East. We shall recur to these resolutions before the State Convention meets and shall present such facts and figures as will, we think, lead all the Eastern delegates to demand the incorporation of the principle covered by them in the platform of the party.

The Convention was, we are glad to say, entirely harmonious and except in regard to the resolutions in relation to J. D. Schenck unanimous on all matters brought before it. We hope and believe that the councils of the party throughout the State will be marked by a like spirit, and that the year 1878 may be marked by sweeping Democratic victories in every quarter.

OUR NEXT CHIEF JUSTICE.

The opinion is growing stronger and stronger every day that there is, in certain circles, in this State, a disreputable intrigue going on to prevent the approaching State Convention from nominating Judge Smith for Chief Justice. It is lamentable that such a scheme should exist, and it would be calamitous if it should succeed.

The above extract we clip from the Asheville citizen.

The liberality of the sentiment expressed by our co-worker in the Democratic organ of North Carolina, ought to be preserved as an evidence of our neighbor's liberality towards those who are acting from motives quite as honest as its own. Why it should be a calamity to defeat Judge Smith for Chief Justice our neighbor ought to say. But instead he treats his readers to a column of naughty speeches.

And why it should be disreputable to vote against Judge Smith, when we honestly prefer another, we fail to see. We have said this much because we were one of the first papers in the State to advocate Judge Schenck for Chief Justice. In urging his claims, we believe that we are serving the best interests of Democratic North Carolina. We do it, in the interests of the young men of North Carolina who must solve this problem of State and Federal Jurisdiction.

On that point his record rang out clear and clean cut. In that moment of Supreme trial he had the nerve and the manhood to say to Federal usurpation, half! North Carolina is amply able to vindicate her own laws, and to punish all those who transgress them.

At the same time we said, we had no unkind feeling for Judge Smith. But since to oppose him is to be an intriguer in the eyes of our neighbor, we must ask. What services has chief Justice Smith done the State since the war, to entitle him to this proud position, more than hundreds of others. We further ask our neighbor, if at one time since the war when all was chaotic and dark in North Carolina, when the wheat trembled, as they contemplated the future of our

proud old State, Chief Justice Smith did not leave us in those hours of supreme agony, and take himself and his family to a State over which a carpet-bagger had never flapped his funeral wings?

If there were no other reasons, the last is enough, why Judge Smith should not be Chief Justice.

[Special correspondence of the News.]

Thomas N. Hill, of Halifax for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

RIDGEWOOD, N. C., March 8, '78.

Let me endorse a man for the high and dignified position of Supreme Court Judge. I allude to Thomas N. Hill, Esq. of this county. As a gentleman, Mr. Hill is upright and open; as a lawyer, intelligent and energetic; and as a Judge, would be impartial & dignified. The fear of enemies, the favor of friends, nor the hope of reward, could sway him from the path of equity, law and justice. In urging Mr. Hill, I do so without a y dispensing meat toward the many names already suggested, but do so in recognition of his eminent fitness for the bench. Ridgeview.

We copy the above from the Ridgeview News of the 13th inst., and with pleasure endorse every word the writer says. Cabarrus will gladly give her voice for the promotion of Mr. Hill, the worthy and eminent choice of the East, to the Supreme Court Bench.—Concord Register.

1812 PENSIONS.

Under this act, any person who served fourteen days or participated in one battle in the War of 1812, is entitled to a Pension of \$1 per month from date of approval of act. Widows of such soldiers as have died in similar service, or master what was the date of their service to the soldier, are entitled to the same.

No other pensions are entitled.

All 1812 Pensioners dropped from the rolls because of alleged disability are restored by this act.

Applicants must be examined before an officer of record.

Send to us every information or blanks needed.

GILMORE & CO.,
619 F Street, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.

March 23, 1878.

AGENTS WANTED FOR THE PICTORIAL HISTORY OF THE WORLD

Entertaining and authentic accounts of every nation of ancient and modern times, and including a history of the rise and fall of the Greek and Roman Empires, and of the nations of modern Europe, the middle ages, the crusades, the feudal system, the reformation, the discovery and settlement of the New World, etc. etc.

It contains 679 fine historical engravings and 120 large double column pages, and is the most complete History of the World ever published. It sells at sight. Send for specimen pages and extra terms to Agents, and see why it is faster than any other book. Address,

NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

mchd 41.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

Northampton County.

Superior Court.

James W. Lassiter, James L. Lassiter and Dorsay Dolotich and wife, Martha Dolotich, Plaintiffs

Against

Wm. P. Edwards, Burgess Allen, Emory Allen, Wm. Allen, Richard Allen, Adriana Edwards, Alfred D. Edwards, Thomas R. Edwards, Sarah Edwards, Mary Eliza Edwards, Delta Edwards, William Edwards, Lydia Edwards, Jim Edwards, Eleanor Edwards, Julia Edwards and Elizabeth Lassiter, daughter of David Lassiter and the other children who were born at law, David Lassiter, whose names are unknown, Defendants.

The above named Elizabeth Lassiter and the other children and heirs at law of the said David Lassiter, deceased, will take notice that the above entitled action has been commenced in the Superior Court for the county of Northampton and State of North Carolina, to have divided for partition the tract of land owned by the late Edwards, containing three hundred and eighty acres, and known as the old "Stokes' place," and that if they do not on or before Thursday, March 28th, '78, file their answer to the complaint filed in action, the plaintiff aforesaid will apply to the court for the relief demanded in the complaint.

Wm. N. R. Odom, Clerk Superior Court, Northampton County, at office, in Jackson, this 23rd day of February A. D. 1878.

N. R. ODOM,
Clerk Superior Court,
Northampton County.
R. B. Peabody Atty.

March 24, 1878.

MANUEL LEVY,

— MANUFACTURER OF THE

COCKADE CITY

DRESS SHIRTS,

DOMESTIC SHIRTS, DRAWERS, OVERALLS,

A.C. & C. & C. & C.

A FULL LINE OF FURNISHING GOODS.

NO. 209 SYCAMORE ST.,
PETERSBURG, VA.

Feb 23, 1878.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

Northampton County.

Superior Court.

Wiley M. Colson, Everett Davis and wife, Martha Ann and Thos. R. Colson, A. J. Harrell, Margaret and Charles Colson, Defendants.

John W. Bishop, Wm. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson are not residents of this State, and that the affidavit in this case is false, after due diligence, to be found in the records of the Clerk of the Superior Court for said county, before whom the sum of \$1000 was paid, on or before the 22nd day of April 1878, and answer or demur to the petition and complaint a copy of which has been filed in said office, let them take notice, that the facts contained in the affidavit in this case are false, and that the object of this proceeding is to obtain partition of the foregoing tract of land to wit:

A tract of land in Northampton County, bounded by the lands of Joseph Colson, the land known as the "Lassiter" land, also by the lands of Cornelius Lassiter and A. J. Harrell and others containing 170 acres, and that the defendant, John W. Bishop, Sheriff, and affidavit that the defendants Margaret Colson and Charles Colson