

"PLEGGED TO THE COMPROMISE."—Whenever complaint is made of the appointment of free-soilers to office we are told that all of them have taken the pledge of allegiance to the Fugitive Slave Law and the Baltimore Platform. Northern National Democrats do not seem to agree with their Southern brethren upon this point. The Albany Argus, the leading paper of the Old Hunker School thus speaks of these "pledged" free-soilers:

"The fact that the Free Soilers in the Assembly professing allegiance to the Democracy, thus recanted from the test proposed by Mr. Taylor, speaks for itself of the actual condition of the united and harmonious Democracy of the State. We venture to say not one of those heretofore known as Free Soilers, if brought to a vote on Mr. Taylor's resolutions, would vote for them. They are essentially Free Soilers in sentiment, as they were in action in 1848. They are as much opposed to the compromise measures and the Fugitive Slave act, as they were when their favorite leader in their name, proclaimed his determination to resist the execution of the law at all hazards. They stand ready, whenever a question shall come up of which slavery is an element, to take ground against the Democracy of the State and the Union, and on the side of agitation and Abolitionism. They do not stand on the National Democratic Platform; but virtually, as heretofore, on that erected at Buffalo, under the auspices of black and white Abolitionists. They are essentially Free Soilers and Abolitionists still."

SUPREME COURT.

The following decisions have been delivered since our last notice:

By NASH, C. J., in the State vs. Orrell, from Guilford, affirming the judgment below. Also, in the State vs. Williams, from Montgomery, directing a venire de novo. Also, in Den ex dem Skipper vs. Lennon, from Brunswick, declaring that there is error in the interlocutory order. Also, in Ward vs. Ward, in Equity, from Onslow, directing a reference to the Master. Also, in State vs. Tom, a slave, from Anson, declaring that there is error in the proceedings of the Superior Court. Also, in Thacker vs. Saunders, in Equity, from Rockingham, making the injunction perpetual. Also, in Daniel vs. Whitfield, from Martin, directing a venire de novo.

By PRABSON, J., in Stokes vs. Kendall, from Stanley, reversing the judgment below. Also, in McLean vs. McDaniel, from Bladen, reversing the judgment below. Also, in Kendall vs. Stokes, in Equity, from Stanley, dismissing the bill with costs. Also, in DeCoursey, Latourette & Co. vs. Barr, in Equity, from New Hanover, declaring the second mortgage null and void. Also, in State vs. Groves, from Sampson, directing a venire de novo. Also, in Den ex dem Leggett vs. Bullock, from Martin, directing a venire de novo.

By BAYLOR, J., in State vs. Jacobs, from Richmond, reversing the judgment below. Also, in State vs. Lockhart, from Robeson, directing the judgment to be affirmed. Also, in Wright vs. Grist, in Equity, from Cumberland, declaring that the motion to dissolve ought to have been allowed. Also, in State vs. Wilmington and Manchester Rail Road Company, directing the judgment to be affirmed. Also, in the State vs. Willis, from Craven, declaring that there is no error in the proceedings of the Superior Court. Also, in Green vs. Allen, from Brunswick, setting aside the nonsuit and directing judgment for plaintiff—*Releigh Register*.

COL. McDUGALD'S SPEECH

On the Land Bill.

[CONCLUDED.]

Dear President Jackson as late as 1829, in his first message:

"It appears to me that the most safe, just and federal disposition which could be made of the surplus revenue, would be its appropriation among the several States, according to their ratio of representation."

Again in his message of 1832, General Jackson said:

"Among the interests which merit the consideration of Congress, after the payment of the public debt, one of the most important in my view is that of the public lands. Provisions for the formation of our present constitution, it was recommended by Congress, that a portion of the waste land owned by the States should be ceded to the United States, for the purpose of general harmony and as a fund to meet the expenses of the war. The recommendation was adopted, and at different periods of time the States of Massachusetts, New York, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia granted their respective lands for the use for which they had been ceded. As the lands were not considered as ceded to the United States, the object for which they were ceded having been accomplished, it is in the discretion of Congress to dispose of them in such way as best to conform to the quiet, harmony, and general interest of the American people. * * * * * It seems to me to be our true policy that the public lands should be sold, as soon as practicable, to be a source of Revenue."

I hope this satisfies gentlemen; I could cite to Chief Justice Marshall, the immortal Clay, and others who would sustain me. I suppose, however, Andrew Jackson is the best authority that can be offered here; and if they believe him, they are bound to surrender. I hope Jackson will not be dissatisfied by the Young Americans. Now, as to the cession of the public lands to the States in which they lie—this is an awful doctrine, a monstrous outrage. What you rob the States of the public domain of the United States? It will amount to that. For if you cede the public lands to the States in which they lie, now every new State as she comes into the Union will claim the same right, and of course claim it justly. Then it does amount to giving away all the lands. Monstrous, Sir; give away more than a billion of acres of lands to States that did nothing to acquire them. The old States will never submit to that—never, never.

I look upon this doctrine as unjust and dangerous. It would not be equal; for some of the States would have very little land, while others would have immense amounts. This would not be just. Collisions and commotions would be the result, and it might lead to the utter disruption of the whole Union. It would be the worst kind of bad faith to the old States. But gentlemen say they would sell the lands to the States in which they are situated. I am more opposed to that than to the actual donation or gift. For by these means you would make the States the debtors of the general Government. And would gentlemen have a sovereign State the dependent and debtor of the Federal Government? No Sir, forever no—put the States under the control of the Government by putting them in debt to it, to amounts, as some of them would be, of \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000; they would scarcely ever pay it; it would hang upon them while they live as States. This would produce great trouble, because most of the lands are in the north-west. Put those States in debt to the general government for the amount of the public lands, and Sir, although I hope I never may know the time, yet I believe it would be short, when these States would repudiate these States, the poorest aspect that can be presented to the mind and eye of man, would totter, and tottering would fall beneath the weight of its own ruin. Suppose the States were to refuse payment, how could the General Government con-

force their obligations? No Judiciary could not aid it. There could be no process by which it could operate. You would not take the lands and seize them, belonging to private individuals to enforce the contract of a sovereign State. This would not be right or just. What then? As between nations the remedy is known; but may I not hope that the time will never arrive in this land, between States now happy and harmonious, to resort to war to settle their disputes. My voice shall ever be to keep the States clear of further dependency upon the General Government, that this magnificent Union may exist, in all the grandeur of its sublimity, while the sun of heaven pours his rays upon its dome.

Well, Sir, if these States were to pay mere nominal prices this would be in direct conflict with the 5th of the Government with the old States, and contrary to the obligations of the United States with the whole people of the Union. Why so? Because the \$20,000,000, which were paid for Louisiana and Florida, were taken from the treasury of the people of the United States, and it would be unjust to the old States, and directly in violation of the solemn trust held by the General Government, to make gratuitous cessions, and would besides, make the distinction as I have before said between the new States.

Mr. HILL, of Caswell. Does the gentleman go for a distribution of the lands acquired by the treaties in which we obtained Louisiana and Florida?

Mr. McDUGALD, I do, Sir, as much as for any.

Mr. HILL, Does the gentleman mean to say, that he is willing that the money should be taken as it was from the Public Treasury, to pay for Louisiana and Florida, and that then their territory should be distributed among the States?

Mr. McDUGALD, Most certainly I do, Sir, without qualification; and I will tell the gentleman why. Now, Mr. Speaker, the constitutionality of the purchase of Louisiana and Florida by the Government has always been questioned. Mr. Jefferson (good authority I hope) said that Congress did not possess the right to purchase Louisiana, and went so far as to recommend an amendment of the Constitution to enable Congress to purchase Louisiana in 1802.

Mr. HILL, Has not Congress the right to make treaties?

Mr. McDUGALD, Undoubtedly; but a purchase or an appropriation is a different thing.

Mr. HILL, If Congress has the right to make treaties, Congress certainly has the right to appropriate the money.

Mr. McDUGALD, It does not at all follow, that if Congress have the right to make treaties, that Congress has the power to effect them, become the right, and the power and the expediency are different matters. The purchase of Louisiana and Florida was not a treaty, strictly speaking; but suppose it were, Congress may have the right to make a treaty; but because Congress has that right, it does not follow that Congress shall appropriate money to effect it. The President and the Senate may appoint a consular agent; yet Congress can refuse to appropriate money for an outfit or to pay him. The Constitution gives Congress the right to make treaties, but it does not give Congress the right to purchase Territory, or to appropriate money for that purpose. I suppose the gentleman is for a right construction of the constitution in all its parts. Sir, I am sustained in this position by the gentleman's own apostle Mr. Jefferson; but, Sir, this is not the question; the purchase or treaties have been made, by which we acquired Louisiana and Florida, and I say they were paid for by the people's money, from the public treasury; and I hold that if the money of the people of the United States paid for these States, then the public land within their boundaries, belong to the people of the United States. What is fought with my money ought to be mine; the gentleman agrees with me that the money, \$20,000,000, as \$15,000,000, for Louisiana and \$5,000,000 for Florida, was taken from the public Treasury of the people of the United States, and certainly the equivalent must belong to those who have paid the money for it. In addition to this, the General Government has received more than the costs of Louisiana and Florida from the sales of the public lands. As early as 1822, the whole costs, interests and cost of sales of our public lands, amounted to \$48,077,551.40; and the sales up to the same time amounted to \$47,272,713.81. The balance, a little over ten millions, has been paid long since from the sales. I hope the gentleman is satisfied.

Mr. HILL, in his seat. I am satisfied.

Mr. McDUGALD, I am indeed happy that there is another species of disposing of the public lands, which is in bad faith to the old States, Ohio, Illinois and all the North Western States have received millions of acres of the public lands, for Railroads, Asylums, State Houses, Court Houses, and the like. Sir, this is in direct conflict with the deeds of cession, the agreement entered into between the old States and United States; it is contrary to the trust; it is not done for the "use and benefit" of all the States; and it is ruinous to the States which have not received any part of these lands. It is a betrayal of the trust reposed by the States in the general Government. These donations are dangerous and ought not to be tolerated.

Why, Sir, if Congress continues to appropriate these lands to such purposes, give them alike to all the States. It is a system of robbery to the States which receive none—like the Homestead bill, a species of speculation, and speculation to the injury and injury of the old States, and for the "use and benefit" of Corporations and Wall Street Brokers. It is indeed time for North Carolina to speak, and to demand her rights, before it be too late. In the conclusion of my remarks I propose to show what has been done with these lands, how much money the general government has received from an sales, and the number of acres yet remaining, and I desire gentlemen to notice the statement, which is official from the land office at Washington City.

Now, Sir, I propose to show that according to the deeds of cession, the proceeds of the sales of the public lands can be and ought to be distributed among the States. I say, the principle of the distribution is contained in the trust. All the deeds of cession say, the "fund" shall be applied according to their (the States') usual respective proportions in the general charge and expenditure."

Here is the principle and the rule. It must mean money; for lands are not strictly a "fund." The United States accepted the trust with these conditions. This rule clearly shows that the general Government was to pay the debts, in proportion to the "charge and expense" of each State. Certainly the rule of distribution would not have been given, if the principle did not exist. Then, I say the General Government is bound to distribute according to the agreement and the trust.

Again, gentlemen here, on all hands, admit that the lands can be divided among the States, but not the money. I call upon the gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Dobbin) as a statesman, as a lawyer, or as a gentleman, to give me the distinction between the distribution of the lands and the distribution of the proceeds. The gentleman (Mr. Dobbin) has made his speech, and believes in the right to divide the lands, but not their proceeds. I do not aspire to the Senate of the United States, to interpret and construe the

Constitution for the people of North Carolina, and I would be glad if the gentleman (Mr. Dobbin) before he goes would explain, as he did not in his speech of last Saturday, how it is that you can divide among partners, tenants or corporators the capital stock, the "common fund," and not the dividends, profits or "proceeds," arising therefrom. I will give way if the gentleman will answer me. Sir, he has not another gentleman here, or elsewhere can answer. He (Mr. Dobbin), the gentleman from New Hanover, (Mr. Strange) the gentleman aspiring to the Judgeship, and all others holding the distinction, are called upon to answer me. They will not do it—they cannot do it. Gentlemen try to get around it, by referring to the third section of article fourth of the Constitution, which is in these words:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States or of any particular State."

This had the seeds of cession in view, by saying that the claims of no State should be prejudiced in disposing of the territories. They rely on the word "dispose"—that "Congress may give or sell the territory to the States, but cannot sell it and give the money to the States. This is the first time that I learned that the word "dispose" means to give or sell exclusively to transfer, to sell, to give or get clear of in any way. This argument, I mean *quibble*, is but a small showing for legal gentlemen and Senators at least.

Gentlemen say, because the lands are real property and in large quantities, you can divide them! But if you sell the land and put the money in the treasury, you make it personal property, and it cannot be divided. Well, I have learned something again—that you can make partition of lands, but you cannot distribute personal property. Really Sir, this is learning worth of prize. I very much fear, if I were to argue this sort of law before a Justice of the Peace, he would "rule" me for contempt. Why, Sir, if gentlemen are afraid to *win* the money arising from the sales of the lands, and that it cannot again be found or separated, they will have a separate order for such money. If gentlemen have scruples about this matter, the lands, by express act of Congress, can be sold expressly for the distribution of the "proceeds," and certainly that would save their conscience. And now, Sir, in all candor, does the word "dispose" mean any more to distribute the lands than it means to sell the lands, and distribute the money among the States? Aspirants for Senator and Judge, tell it not to school boys!

But Mr. Speaker, another serious objection is urged why the public lands should not be distributed among the States—that is, that the States could not recover them. Sir, in a conversation with the Representative in Congress from the Wilmington District, a few days ago, upon this subject, that gentleman asked me the following questions, and contended that I was wrong in everything I said—that the Constitution did not confer the right in the Federal Courts for suits to be presented between a State and citizens of another State, &c. He said, "Suppose the General Government gives North Carolina 1000 acres of land in Indiana, and North Carolina wished to sell, could she convey a good title? and suppose persons in Indiana trespassed on the land, and Indiana would close her Courts to North Carolina, and not allow her to sue in the Courts of Indiana, what would be the remedy?" Well, really Sir, our Representatives are good lawyers! These questions are very plain. I say North Carolina could convey a good and legal title to any purchaser, through an agent, or otherwise, as directed by the General Assembly. Of course, if the General Government has the right to the lands, it can pass the right to a State or to an individual, and clearly that State or individual could pass it to another; and thus the title would be complete, just as much as if conveyed from one man to another, and as the old States conveyed to the United States; and as to the last clause of the question, in regard to the right to sue clearly the General Government, having the whole control of the matter in the first place, could provide the means of protecting the right of North Carolina.

Again, by referring to the second section of the third article of the Constitution, it will be found that suits can be maintained in the Federal Courts, between a State and citizens of another State, and between a citizen of one State and a citizen of another State.

The section of the Constitution referred to is in these words:

"The Judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States and treaties made, or which shall be made under their authority; to all cases of ambassadors, or public ministers and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; to controversies to which the United States shall be a party; to controversies between two or more States, between a State and citizens of another State, between citizens of different States, between citizens of the same State claiming lands and grants of different States, and between a State and the citizens thereof and foreign States, citizens or subjects."

This section was amended in article eleventh, amended constitution, as follows:

"The judicial power of the United States shall not be extended to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign State."

So a citizen of one State cannot sue another State—but it still leaves a State the right to sue citizens of another State, and of one citizen of a State to sue a citizen of another State, in the Federal Courts.

Now, Sir, this is all clear, and gentlemen can have no difficulty on these points.

Gentlemen tell me that they are States-rights men—and believe in the doctrine of secession. It seems to me that such gentlemen would be the first to claim and endorse the doctrine of Distribution. Now, Sir, I put this question to gentlemen—and when I say I put the question, I mean I want an answer, and will yield the floor for gentlemen to explain.

Suppose the Government were divided into one, two or thirty-one Confederacies, nations or Governments; would I gentlemen then say that neither the several States nor the people would have the right to an equal share of the public lands, the "proceeds," money and all other property now belonging to the United States? I can get no answer. Sir, I hold that the property of every description now held by the United States belongs, and certainly would in that sad event belong respectively to the States. As it now stands, all the property held by the United States, is so held as a common fund, for the "use and benefit" of all the States; and certainly if the States would, in the event of a dismemberment of this grand Union, have the right to share and share alike the property of the United States, the States have the right now as much as they could have after dissolution. The right would not be affected in the least, neither weakened nor strengthened by the mere act of the separation of the States. The expediency of exercising that right, while the States are in the Union, is a different thing. For the safety and welfare of the general government, and of the United States, require that the arsenals, forts, treasury and property of that kind

should be held by the United States. Not so with the public lands; the United States do not absolutely require them. Besides, the purposes for which they were ceded have been accomplished—and most of them having been owned first by the States, and the balance purchased with the money the "common fund" of all the States, it is but right and just that the States should have them whenever they choose. Sir, I say the States have as much the right now as they would have after a dissolution of the Union, and in such an awful event, the States, the people, would have their equal portion of the property of the United States, or made up to their shoulders in blood.

The only question remaining now is, whether the public lands or their proceeds would be worth anything to North Carolina, if she had her portion. I have said that I would give an official statement in regard to these lands; at this time I shall only show the number of acres and the amount of money to which North Carolina is entitled according to her ratio of representation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the 30th Sept. 1851, there were of lands, 1,399,586,140 acres—divide the number of acres by the number of representatives from all the States in Congress, and you have to each representative 6,006,807 acres of land. North Carolina has eight representatives; multiply the 6,006,807, the number of acres to each representative, by 8, and you have 48,054,456 acres for North Carolina. Valuing it at less than the minimum price established by law, and North Carolina would have the round sum of fifty millions of Dollars—(\$50,000,000.) Each county in the State, if it were divided out, would have six hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, — (\$225,000.) The white male population in North Carolina is 272,369. Divide the \$50,000,000 between the white male population of the State, and you have one hundred and eighty-four dollars (\$184) to each white man and boy. The white male population in Baden, for instance, is 2,539; therefore if the money were divided according to Counties, then divided among the men and boys, the white males of Baden would get \$243 to each.

Will gentlemen hesitate longer which side of this great question to take? Will they say that the public lands are worth nothing to North Carolina? Will the gentleman from Duplin, (Mr. Reid) say now that this question is a "humbug"? But those facts before the people of North Carolina, and then tell them that it is a "humbug"! Again, I tell gentlemen beware of the day when they do that, I believe if the people of North Carolina knew their rights to these lands, they would rise in all their might and never cease to imperatively demand of the Government their fair proportion of the public lands; and I believe the day is not far distant when they will do it. And I say it is the duty of every member of this General Assembly to inform their constituents of the situation and condition of the lands—that they may say whether they will take them; but some gentlemen cannot do it because they did not use to think it was right. I tell gentlemen the people of North Carolina, before many years, will cause them to think that their rights shall not longer be neglected for or on account of party principles and tactics.

Mr. Speaker, can a North Carolina man stand? Let gentlemen reflect that at a moment upon the inexhaustible resources of our glorious Old State! Here she stands calling for aid to develop her riches; her soil has no superior; her coal mines unsearched to be the best in the world; her minerals immense; her iron itself sufficient to supply the whole world for a century; her water power cheap and sufficient to turn and bring into active operation the machinery of the globe; there is no State in this Union that contains the wealth and comforts that North Carolina possesses. With a mild, healthful climate unsurpassed; her mountains abound in a romantic scenery; there drawn by nature herself, with rivulets springing from every direction and making their way for the Atlantic, impeded alone by her rocky mountains which stand there with an obligation upon her citizens to remove—while in her valley bottoms grow the most luxuriant crops of grain for the support of her citizens—while on the other hand Wilmington, Beaufort and Ocracoke, invite the commerce of the world—and her citizens, industrious, enterprising, intelligent and virtuous, are calling from every quarter of the State for money to facilitate their travel and transportation, to elevate still the morals of her people, and to disseminate learning and the cultivation of science—high moral obligations resting upon her legislators! Let gentlemen remember her past history, marked with a patriotism worthy all imitation and emulation, and remember that here, too, was first failed the iron tyrant, and here Freedom breathed her first emotions, yes here,

North Carolina, Eden of the Earth.

Lord, our Sires and their scene of our Birth. Sir, gentlemen appear to forget that they stand on North Carolina soil.

Brothers there a man, with soul so dead, Who never to himself had said, This is my own, my native land?

No Sir, "My father is my native land, my name is Montgomery."

Mr. Speaker, give to North Carolina these fifty millions of dollars, and you will not hear applications so daily made for appropriations of a few hundred dollars, but the whole State will be one broad check-board of Railroads and Plank roads, with navigable streams floating the vast products of her soil.

With this great fund, the taxes of the people will be lightened. You will see schoolmasters in every neighborhood for the education of the poor hidden and dying intellect of the poor boy—yes, Sir, you will see that class of people now so poor and ignorant standing in its proper sphere, in morals and education, that class from which all the great talent of this country emanates. That class is thrown upon the humanity of this Legislature for relief. Then take poor neglected worth by the hand and elevate bleeding humanity to the position it claims. And you will see churches, with their spires piercing the clouds and pointing the road to Immortality, erected in every neighborhood, for the salvation of the souls of the way-farers through this pilgrimage of life.

The progress of improvement has been commenced, the State has tasted its blessings, and you ought not, you cannot arrest it. Place this fund in your treasury, and if judiciously applied, it will surmount the obstacles of nature on the face of the country and under the surface of the earth; it will create more intimate relations between all parts of the State; it will bring the mountains and the seaboard together in daily communication, and cement the interests of the honest and free people of this glorious Old North State with stronger and undying social, political and commercial ties. Intelligence will circulate on the wings of the elements, and travel, tread upon its heels. It will

—Bid harbours open, public ways extend,
—Bid temples worthy of God ascend,
—Bid the broad arch the dangerous flood contain,
—Bid the mole projecting break the roaring main,
—Back to his bounds their subject sea command,
—And roll obedient rivers through the land."

Mr. Speaker, let gentlemen stand firm and bold, for when they shall have achieved this high object, they may rest assured that they will have bequeathed unto their posterity the grandest and the proudest and the richest legacy with which a kind Providence could bless them. They

may fall, but if devoted, they will fall undying. And still will
The meaneast rill, the mightiest river,
Roll mingling with their fame for ever.

The vote was then taken, and the Resolutions passed, Ayes 64—Nays 45.

STATEMENT of Public Lands sold, and otherwise disposed of, to the 30th September 1851; showing, also, the Lands remaining unsold and undispensed of at that time.

State and Territory.	No. of Acres.	Value.
Ohio	33,340	\$1,276,600.00
Indiana	32,340	\$1,182,000.00
Illinois	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Missouri	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Michigan	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Wisconsin	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Minnesota	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Iowa	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Arkansas	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Alabama	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Mississippi	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Florida	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Georgia	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
South Carolina	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
North Carolina	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Virginia	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
West Virginia	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Delaware	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Maryland	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
District of Columbia	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Territories	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Total	1,399,586,140	\$50,000,000.00

There appears besides to have been the usual number of serious accidents. A child fell overboard from one of the steamers and was drowned a man lost one of his eyes by the accidental discharge of a gun; two boys were injured in their lower limbs by similar accidents; and three boys had their hands shattered or lacerated by the bursting or careless handling of pistols. The houses, in different parts of the city, were on fire in the night of the third, by the careless explosion of fire-trackers or of gunpowder.

FREE-SOIL APPOINTMENTS.—The Albany Argus the leading Locofoco paper in New York of National party, after commenting upon certain Massachusetts appointments, thus speaks of them made in New York:

"An analysis of the list of appointments to office in this State, recent and remote, would exhibit similar freesoil triumphs here—proportionally even greater than those in Massachusetts. Five fifths at least of the whole number belong either to the Free Soil—or what is infinitely worse—the "S.O." or "condition category."

NOTICE.
THE Subscriber begs leave to inform all persons that he has sold all his notes and accounts to John C. Gally, P. B. McDUGALD, No. 111, Laured Hill, N. C., June 18, 1853.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
MONTGOMERY COUNTY.
Superior Court of Law, Spring Term, 1853.
Martia Sansbury ex. Janet W. Sansbury,
Petition for Divorce from the Bonds of Marriage.

In this case it appearing to the satisfaction of the Court that Janet W. Sansbury, the Defendant is not an inhabitant of this State; It is therefore ordered by the Court, that publication be made for six weeks successively in the Fayetteville Observer, notifying said J. W. Sansbury of the filing of said petition, and that she appear at the next Term of said Superior Court in Montgomery to be held at the Court House in Troy, the last Monday of August next, and answer, plead or demur to the said petition or the same will be taken as part and judgment pro confesso entered against her.

Witness, Nathaniel Knight, Clerk of our said Court at Office in Troy, the last Monday in February, A. D. 1853.
NATHL. KNIGHT, C. CLK.
[Printer's fee \$4 00.]

\$25 REWARD.
AN AWAY FROM REWARD.—On the 1st day of June, his negro man, DANIEL, aged about 20 years. Said negro is about 5 feet 8 inches high, weight 160 or 170 lbs., is of dark complexion, and is being scarred on his back and arms, caused by former severe treatment. He was purchased two or three years ago by one from B. A. James, living near Bishopville, in the District of S. C., and may now be lurking in that part of the country.

I will give \$20 to any one who will confine him in any jail in North or South Carolina, so that I get him or \$25 if delivered to me at my residence at the mouth of Little River, in Richmond county, N. C.

Address the subscriber at Little's Mills, Richmond Co., N. C.
THOMAS W. STEELE.

MANETTIA CORDIFOLIA.
A FEW plants of this most beautiful and hardy climber are now ready for delivery, 25 cts. each. Also, roses in pots, 25 to 75 cts. each. Heliotropes very ornamental when planted in the garden, giving a profusion of delightfully scented flowers the whole summer, 20 cts. each.

July 6, 1853.
C. LUTHERLOE.

Notice to Turpentine Distillers.
I HAVE now on hand a number of Spirit Barrels made of the best seasoned material, and by good workmen. And an making about eighty barrels per week. Those wanting will do well to give me a call.

T. R. UNDELMAYER.
July 7, 1853.

Spirits Turpentine Wanted.
THE undersigned will pay cash for Spirits Turpentine (in good order), allowing only a fair margin to pay incidental expenses in sending to a general market.

When parties prefer to ship on their own account, the undersigned will make liberal cash advances (on the usual commission) on all Spirits and Rosin placed in their hands for shipment,—giving the owner liability the option to sell in Wilmington or ship to New York.

GEO. W. WILLIAMS & CO.
July 6, 1853.

CALL AND SETTLE.
THE Subscribers respectfully request all indebted to them, and all to whom they are indebted, to call and settle accounts during the present month.

July 1, 1853.
E. J. HALE & SON.

NOTICE.
PERSONS indebted to me by either note or account, from last Fall and Winter, are hereby notified that unless they pay by the first of next month, their accounts will be placed in the hands of an officer for collection.

GEO. BRANT.
Fayetteville, N. C., July 7, 1853.

TO THE PUBLIC.
In order to make a clean sale of my present stock of Spring and Summer Goods, I will offer them at reduced prices. Persons in want of Ready-made Clothing, Hats and Shoes, Straw Hats, and other articles of men's wear for the season, will find it worth while calling on me.

GEO. BRANT.
Between the Market House and Fayetteville Hotel, Fayetteville, July 7, 1853.

The Road to Health.
The progress of improvement has been commenced, the State has tasted its blessings, and you ought not, you cannot arrest it. Place this fund in your treasury, and if judiciously applied, it will surmount the obstacles of nature on the face of the country and under the surface of the earth; it will create more intimate relations between all parts of the State; it will bring the mountains and the seaboard together in daily communication, and cement the interests of the honest and free people of this glorious Old North State with stronger and undying social, political and commercial ties. Intelligence will circulate on the wings of the elements, and travel, tread upon its heels. It will

—Bid harbours open, public ways extend,
—Bid temples worthy of God ascend,
—Bid the broad arch the dangerous flood contain,
—Bid the mole projecting break the roaring main,
—Back to his bounds their subject sea command,
—And roll obedient rivers through the land."

Mr. Speaker, let gentlemen stand firm and bold, for when they shall have achieved this high object, they may rest assured that they will have bequeathed unto their posterity the grandest and the proudest and the richest legacy with which a kind Providence could bless them. They

may fall, but if devoted, they will fall undying. And still will
The meaneast rill, the mightiest river,
Roll mingling with their fame for ever.

The vote was then taken, and the Resolutions passed, Ayes 64—Nays 45.

STATEMENT of Public Lands sold, and otherwise disposed of, to the 30th September 1851; showing, also, the Lands remaining unsold and undispensed of at that time.

State and Territory.	No. of Acres.	Value.
Ohio	33,340	\$1,276,600.00
Indiana	32,340	\$1,182,000.00
Illinois	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Missouri	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Michigan	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Wisconsin	67,800	\$2,466,000.00
Minnesota	67,800	\$2,466,00