REVIEW OF THE VETO MESSAGE.

From the National Intelligencer.

Before we enter upon the argument of the Message of the President of the United States, returning to the House of Representatives the Maysville and Lexington Road bill, we meet at the threshold of it a passage which strikes us as being exceptionable, though it may be only inadvertently made so. We refer to that part of it in which, after having just before admitted the right of "diversity of sentiment among public functionaries," the House of Representatives is reminded that, in his message at the opening of the Session, the President had exhibited *his* views of the subject of Internal Improvement; and that the returned act had, therefore, been passed with a knowledge of *his* views of this question. In the first place, we doubt the propriety of the Executive's undertaking to declare to Congress, beforehand, what in his opinion is permitted or interdicted by the Constitution.—The Senators and Representatives are *sworn to support the Constitution*; they cannot be guided, in their action, therefore, by the construction which it may please the President to put upon that instrument, unless it concurs entirely with their own. And in the next place, a declaration, by the President of the United States, that he will not sanction, by his approbation, any particular measure, is to say to Congress, in effect, "you need not deliberate on this question, tho' you are sent here by the people for the express purpose of deliberating upon that with other great interests of theirs." This anticipation of the deliberations of Congress, we know, is not without precedent; but it is a precedent to be avoided. Still less would precedent, any more than propriety, approve of any thing like a reproof to Congress, for having, with a knowledge of his views, refused to concur with them. The two Houses of Congress, surely, have as much right to their opinion as the President to his; and the intimation of their contumacy is, we think, rather a rough rebuke from a Republican President to the Representatives of the People. It is such as an autocrat might use with his serfs, but would hardly venture upon with his nobles. It may be said that this passage of the Message was simply intended to present a fact, and not to imply a censure. If such was the intention, we can only say that it has been very unluckily made to assume a different aspect; and that no independent Member of Congress could read it without feeling that his privilege was invaded, and his freedom of action reproached.

We proceed now to a consideration of the argument of the Message.

Recurring to the language employed in the communication of the Executive to Congress, at the commencement of the late session, and repeating that language, the Message says, in reference to the power of Internal Improvement by the General Government, "all feel that it has been employed at the expense of harmony in the Legislative Councils;" and this is now stated as a reason, independently of constitutional considerations, against employing the surplus revenue upon objects of that description.—We should like to know what power exercised by the Government is not open to the very same objection? Upon what question of public policy has public sentiment ever been unanimous?—Take the Navy, for example. Do we not all, who are old enough, remember what bitter contests there used to be in Congress, in the infancy of the Navy, whether it should be strangled or fostered? Its friends prevailed in its favor; but what sort of harmony existed in the Legislative Councils, when the Navy was saved by majorities of one, two, five, or ten? Federalist, Tory, Monarchist, were epithets not too bad, at one period, to be bestowed on all who dared to support it. The same may be observed of questions concerning the augmentation of the Army. Much more strongly may it be predicated of the Tariff question, the Bank question, the Direct Tax, and the Public Lands. That there are questions which, because of their irritating nature, ought not to be touched in Congress, except under imperious circumstances, we admit; such as the integrity of the Union, or the loyalty of any member of it; and in a matter interesting to particular States, the condition of slavery. But we cannot recognize the validity of such an objection to any particular measure, as that it benefits one division of our country more than another. What measure does not? In the nature of things it must be so. Will any one pretend that the bill for the removal of the Indians, which passed but the day before this message was sent to Congress, was an exercise of power less "at the expense of harmony in the Legislative Councils" than the Internal Improvement Bills? Surely not; for, while that bill passed the House of Representatives, after a desperate struggle, by a majority of only five votes, one of the bills rejected by the President passed by a majority of *two to one*—a larger majority than can ever be calculated upon in Congress upon any question that is at all contested. Did the President, because it had been so closely contested, reject the Indian Bill? Far from it. It was his pleasure that it should pass; and it was no objection to that bill, that it was more "at the expence of harmony in the Legislative Councils," than perhaps any measure since the long embargo. With this practical demonstration of its unsoundness, we feel ourselves authorized to put entirely out of view *this* objection to Internal Improvement. It can have no influence whatever as a justification of the rejection of the Road Bills.

The message goes on to say, that "to avoid these evils," one of which we have shewn is not an evil, but an inseparable incident to legislation, (the other being the constitutional scruple of the minority of Congress and of the People) "it appears to me that the most safe, just, and federal disposition which could be made of the surplus revenue, would be its apportionment among the several States, according to their ratio of representation."

This measure, if practicable, is liable to objections, which we will here allude to, rather than attempt to illustrate. In the first place, it would disarm the general government of the means of doing general good, for the purpose of having things, good in themselves, done so partially (by the States) as to produce evil instead of good, by exciting great and just discontent among the States. For instance: Internal Improvements, Canals, and Public Highways are most wanted, for the benefit of the whole Union, whether for national defence, for commerce or for post-roads where there is the greatest extent of fertile country with the fewest natural or established facilities of that description. Where is that country? Is it New-York or Pennsylvania, or is it Missouri, Indiana, or Illinois? Is it the populous region on the Atlantic border, or is it the vast Western region? The latter certainly. But this distribution system proposes to allow the surplus revenue, instead of employing them in National works, to the States respectively, in a ratio the direct inverse of the rule of expediency: that is to say, for every thirty-four thousand dollars distributed to the State of New-York, the States of Missouri and Illinois are to receive one thousand, and the State of Indiana (greatly favored) three thousand. Will the States—*can* the States submit to Legislation so unequal and so inequitable? For what reason are the States *equally* represented in the Senate of the United States but to guard against the smaller States being thus ground down to insignificance by the larger? Another rooted objection to this project is, that it is, in effect, a proposition to vest in the Federal Government the power of collecting and distributing *the revenue of a State*. Certainly, if there be any one power which is reserved to the States, it is the power to lay and collect their own revenue, at their own pleasure, for their own purposes; and the General Government has no rightful authority to collect a revenue beyond the amount necessary to enable it to exercise efficiently its own proper functions. It would hardly be less obnoxious to carry out the idea of distributive justice further, so as to distribute the surplus revenue to *each individual* instead of each State in the Union, in equal proportion; when we should have at once the levelling system—the superfluity of the rich being taken from them to be *distributed* to the poor. However abhorrent the policy of Internal Improvement may be to some of our statesmen, we rather think that they would be the first to hold up their hands against the substitute which the President has been advised to recommend, a second time, for the serious consideration of the Legislature. We refrain from pressing the objections to this part of the Message further; because in the next sentence there is an intimation that even this measure, although preferred to the employment of the revenue in Internal Improvement, requires an amendment of the Constitution to authorize it.

The next several paragraphs of the Message contain reasoning, the force of which, we think, no one can dispute. It is shewn very clearly what has been the uniform action of the Government, in opposition to mere theorizing, in regard to the power of appropriation, and it is wisely and well said that "the public good and the nature of our political institutions *require* that individual differences *should yield to a well settled acquiescence* of the people and Confederated Authorities, in particular constructions of the Constitution, on doubtful points. Not to concede this much to the spirit of our institutions, would impair their stability, and *defeat the objects of the Constitution itself.*"

In this doctrine we heartily concur, and we are glad to find it where it is, not only on account of its applicability to the appropriation of money for objects of Internal Improvement, but also to other questions on which it has been apprehended, from prior indications, that the mind of the President was fixedly made up. The power of appropriating money for any object not embraced in the specific grants has been *doubted* at an early period of the Government, from "deservedly high authority:" it has been doubted in latter times also: but whatever doubts have rested upon it, the point is conceded, in this Message, to have been settled in practice, and especially by the purchase of Louisiana and the construction of the Cumberland Road, both measures of Mr. JEFFERSON's Administration.—From this reasoning, we are glad to arrive at the conclusion that the President, when he was advised to suggest a plan of a National Government Bank to substitute for the People's Bank of the United States, giving, as one reason for this recommendation, that the constitutionality of the Bank of the United States had been "well doubted," did not mean to declare that the existing Bank is not constitutional, or that it may not be constitutionally re-chartered. We canot but infer, from the passage just quoted from the late Message, that, though others had doubted, he did not doubt the constitutionality of the Bank of the United States, after the "well settled acquiescence of the People and Confederated Authorities" in regard to that matter. If this doctrine of "well settled acquiescence" be as we agree that it is, applicable to the purchase of Louisiana and the Cumberland Road, *a fortiori* it is conclusive as to the Bank question, which was decided by Congress a dozen years before those two questions, and has been uniformly sustained by the judicial tribunals and acquiesced in by the People, to this day.

Admitting, however, in terms, the power to appropriate money in the manner & for the purposes proposed by the rejected bills, the Message declares the Maysville Road not to be of a character so National as to authorize his signing the bill concerning it; and, by assigning the same grounds for the rejection of the Rockville and Frederick Road, he places that road on the same "local" ground.

We do not feel much interest in examining the question of the *nationality* of the Roads, it being made clear, in the sequel of the Message, that the want of nationality was not the influential cause of the rejection of these bills. And yet we must say, after much consideration of that point, that we think the objection to the nationality of either of these Roads is insufficient, upon the Cabinet's own ground, to justify their advising the President to put his *veto* upon them. What constitutes a *National* Road? Must it traverse the whole Union or what proportion of it? Is it not sufficient, to make it generally and nationally beneficial (the definition quoted by the Message from Mr. MONROE's Exposition) that a Road is an important link in the line of communication in which the country at large is deeply interested? With regard to the road between Maysville and Lexington, the U. S. Engineers, Col. LONG and Major TRIMBLE in their report to Congress 1827—8, remark, that that Road is more travelled than any other of the same extent in Kentucky; and the great Mail between the Atlantic States and Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama and other Western States, passes over it, for the transportation of which over this route the Postmaster General actually pays more than eighty dollars a mile. From an accurate register of the travelling over it, kept for thirty days, during the last year at a point near Maysville, it appeared that within that period there passed over this Road, besides pleasure carriages and droves of cattle, &c. not counted, 9,400 persons, 12,800 horses, 1570 waggons and carts, giving an average of 317 persons, 427 horses, and 52 wagons and carts per day. Surely such a link in a great post road, so much travelled besides, is sufficiently important to make its improvement nationally beneficial. If that be not sufficiently national, however, beyond question the Rockville Road is; being a gap of only 25 or 26 miles in the whole chain of communication with the Western wilds and waters, which is in certain seasons of the year almost impassable, and not susceptible of profitable improvement by individual means. By the condition of this road, the People of the West are, at certain seasons of the year almost cut off from the Capital of the Union; and, if Gen. JACKSON had travelled over it at the proper season for judging of it, instead of the delightful season of June, we opine he would have returned to the Palace with a much clearer perception of its nationality than he entertained when he returned to the Senate the bill appropriating money for its improvement.

Will any argue with us that the appropriations proposed by those bills are less national in their character than a number which have at the late session of Congress received the President's unhesitating approbation? Is the appropriation of 25,688 for the improvement of the navigation of Cape Fear River in North Carolina, more national than the Maysville Road? Or that of 8,000 and odd dollars for removing sand bars at or near the mouth of Black River, in Ohio?—Or that of 6,000 and odd dollars for improving the navigation of *Conneaut Creek*, in Ohio? Or that of 5,000 and odd dollars for removing obstructions at the mouth of Big Sodus Bay, in the State of New York? These and many others were approved before the Executive took a *new departure* in a direction hostile to this wise, beneficent, and truly useful policy of improving our ways and water courses. The reasoning and the conclusion of the Message are at right angles to the whole previous demonstration of the intentions of the President.

But, not to go back so far in the session as the date of these bills, let us compare them, on the ground of nationality and locality, with the Indian Bill, the approbation and signature of which *followed* the rejection of one of these bills, and preceded the rejection of the other. [Let it be recollected that the Message places the rejection of the bills ostensibly on the ground of their being not nationally beneficial.] How is it with the Indian Bill? If that mode of reasoning is permitted, of what importance to Pennsylvania or to New Hampshire, for example, is the removal of the Choctaws from Alabama and Mississippi? Are not the advantages to flow from this measure to redound to the benefit of these respective States only? Or, if national in any sense, is this appropriation of 500,000 dollars (to begin with) more so than would be the appropriation of a like sum for draining the Dismal Swamp, or removing obstructions from lands in any State, that these *reclaimed* lands might be *settled and improved* by *white men* and citizens? And, since we have compared these measures in one view, let us compare them in another. If the two Road Bills are so objectionable on account of their liberality or latitudinarianism—for these, after all, are the only tangible grounds of exception to them—what shall we say of this Indian law which encountered no misgivings in the Executive mind? Each of the first mentioned bills proposed the appropriation of a specific sum for the definite purpose. The Indian law gives *unlimited* power to the President to *give* and *guaranty*, to the Indians removing West, any part, or the *whole*, of the Public Lands West of the Mississippi, (and not in any State or Territory:) and in this donation, to be made by the President, be it more or less, there is no ingredient benefit to the U. States *nationally*, because the President will give to the Indians at least as large and valuable a tract of land West, as that which they now occupy East of the Mississippi: that is, he will do so, if he acts, as it is to be presumed that he will, in the spirit of the law and of humanity. And this enormous power the President may exercise *without asking the advice of the Senate* as formerly. In addition, moreover, to the five hundred thousand dollars in money, already appropriated, he may *pledge* the United States to any amount, and then may call on Congress *to redeem the pledge*.—What was there, in the principle of the Rockville Road Bill, in which, besides the general interest of the whole Union, about one half of all the States are specially interested, so far as the communication with the Seat of Government is of any interest to them, that was less national than the Indian law? What is there in either of the Road Bills that involves any thing like the same sweeping powers? The main distinction that we perceive between them is that the Road bills involve *definite*, and Indian bill *indefinite*, expenditure; that the Road bills proposed the exercise of a limited power, the metes and bounds of which were prescribed in the bills themselves, whilst the power to be exercised under the Indian law is undefined and unlimited by any thing but the Executive discretion.—Grant that this discretion has been properly given, and will be wisely exerted: still it is difficult to understand why it is that a bill vesting in the Executive *almost unlimited discretionary power*, received the prompt sanction of the President whilst bills, of much narrower scope, expressing the *precise intention* and *positive will* of the Legislature, and leaving nothing to discretion, received their death-blow at his hands!—How shall we account for their different fates?

It has become very apparent, we think, in the course of this brief examination, that the objection, which proved fatal to the Road Bills, was not their want of nationality. Let us see whether a further examination throws any additional light upon their sad destiny.

The prospect which is presented, in the paragraphs which next occur in the Message, of a nation of twelve millions of happy people, after fifty-four years of existence, free from debt, is a captivating one to the mind's eye. Will it ever be realized? We know not; but this we know, that under the administration of JEFFERSON, that same object (a cardinal point in his creed) was not considered a sufficient obstacle to the purchase of Louisiana, or to the commencement of the Cumberland Road; that it did not prevent under the administration of MADISON, the undertaking of a war to vindicate the national honor; that under the administration of MONROE, it did not stand in the way of the pensioning the survivors of the revolutionary war, or the purchase of the Floridas; that, under the administration of ADAMS, it did not prevent the subscriptions to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, to the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, to the Dismal Swamp Canal, to the Louisville and Portland Canal, nor the commencement of the Breakwater at the mouth of the Delaware;* and that, during all four of these administrations, and the two last especially, extensive and expensive fortifications, planned and begun under the administration of Mr. MONROE, have been erected, and the amount of our naval force quadrupled. Nor did the beatific vision of a paid-off debt prevent the appropriation of money, at the last session of Congress for various objects of expenditure, not belonging either to the civil list, foreign intercourse, or the army or navy. It did not prevent the appropriation of half a million of dollars, the prelude to the appropriation of several millions more, to relieve the States of Mississippi and Alabama from their Indian population; & it ought not to have prevented the appropriation of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars in aid of the Maysville Road, or of some 90,000 dollars towards the Rockville and Frederick Road. For objects of expenditure, which the Representatives of the States and People consider laudable, it is the province *of Congress* to provide the ways and means; and it ought not, in our opinion, to be for a moment presumed, that, if the Executive sanctioned them, the Representatives of the People, whose peculiar duty it is, under the constitution, would fail in their duty of providing revenue to meet expenditures, which they themselves had originated.

To the argument against these bills, drawn from the amount of appropriations proposed by bills pending in Congress, we object altogther. Those inchoate bills constituted no proper ground of action for the Executive. The introduction of such a topic into a Presidential Message, is itself a novelty and an anomaly. Besides, as we have already shown, the President, directly after rejecting the Maysville Bill, signed one of those very bills which he had brought up in array against it, involving an immediate expenditure twice as great as proposed by the Road Bills, and a contingent expenditure of almost incalculable amount.

Not finding in the objections already examined, any arguments against these bills which are not either neutralized by one another, or nullified by the prior or posterior acts of the Executive, we are necessarily impelled to further search for the motive. "When an *honest observance of constitutional compacts* cannot be obtained from communities like ours," says the Messsge, "it need not be anticipated elsewhere."

Whereafter, we meet with the following passage:

"If it be the wish of the People that the construction of roads and canals should be conducted by the Federal Government, it is not only highly expedient, but INDISPENSABLY necessary, that a *previous* amendment of the Constitution, delegating the necessary power, and also defining and restricting its exercise with reference to the sovereignty of the States, should be made.—Without it, nothing extensively useful can be effected."

In this broad declaration, the power to get on with the Cumberland Road, or to construct a canal, or road, any where, or under any circumstances, seems to be flatly denied. If our construction of it be correct, the *fact* of the Executive thus abrogates a power which has been exercised for twenty years, and for the last ten years steadily maintained by large majorities in both Houses of Congress. Seven tenths of all the people of the United States have as steadily approved it. Amongst them the President himself has individually repeatedly sanctioned it by his vote. Those who supported his election, for the most part, expected him to sustain it.—As far as he was bound by his own previous acts and by the known will of the People, at whose hands he accepted the trust of Chief Magistrate, he was under an obligation not to set himself against it. We can conceive of no reasons of state strong enough to justify his acting against his own settled convictions of what was right, as exhibited in the uniform tenor of his public life and declarations.

But the Message further says:

"If it be the desire of the people that the agency of the Federal Government should be confined to the appropriation of money in aid of such undertakings, in virtue of State authorities, then the *occasion*, the *manner*, and the *extent* of the appropriations *should be made the subject of constitutional regulation*. This is the more necessary," &c. &c.

This passage appears to us to close the door upon the friends of Internal Improvement—to preclude at least any further appeal to the Executive on the subject. If the People are in favor of the appropriation of money *in aid* of such improvements, why, then, the *occasion* the *manner*, and the *extent* of the appropriations must be settled by an amendment of the Constitution! Thus end all the hopes encouraged by the earlier passages of the message, which intimate that all doubts of the constitutional power of Congress to this extent must "yield to a well settled acquiescence of the people and confederated authorities" At the moment we supposed ourselves in port, at safe anchorage, waiting for a favorable wind, we find ourselves adrift on the broad ocean, without compass or land mark. The "settled acquiescence" is unsettled, and the Constitution itself, as previously expounded in the Message, has become unconstitutional.

If the first and the last Executive Messages of the last Session be taken together as comprising the System of the present Administration, its leading features are to be, first to put down the Bank of the United States and erect in its stead a great Government Bank, founded on the public credit and revenues; to put an end to all new expenditures for Internal Improvement, lest they should be an inducement to a continuance of the Tariff; to distribute the surplus revenue among the several States in proportion to their representation in Congress; and to withdraw protection from Manufactures lest it should produce a revenue which might induce a continuance of Internal Improvement—thus making the Tariff and Internal Improvement re-act upon each other

What a glorious System!

It would be to abuse the patience of the reader, were we, in conclusion, to prolong the article by comments on the use which has been made of the VETO in this case. This delicate power in the President has rarely, if ever, been exercised and should seldom be brought into action, upon grounds of expediency merely. If there is any one thing of which the Representatives of the States and the People are entitled peculiarly to judge, it is of the manner in which the public moneys should be expended. If a proposed expenditure involves no constitutional difficulty, which in this case the Message *sets out* by disclaiming, it seems to us that the President transcends the true line of his duty when he interposes his Veto. That he has the power to do it cannot be denied So he has the power to call Congress together: but would it be considered a proper exercise of that power to call them together to pass some measure which he had recommended and they had not passed upon? Is there any more reason in the President rejecting two or more bills because he had *not* recommended them? The Veto is a high prerogative of the Executive, as well as a delicate power. In the British Monarchy, where it is absolute in the sovereign, there has been no attempt to exercise it, we believe, for many years Indeed, by disuse, it may be said to have become obsolete. It considered as a power which may be ordinarily exercised, in this government, the first question hereafter will be, in reference to any proposed act of legislation, *What does the President say?* When we come to this (and we seem to be approaching it) our government will indeed have become, what a distinguished friend of the present Administration since pronounced it on the floor of Congress—an ELECTIVE MONARCHY. Far from imputing the *intention* to either the President or his advisers, we predict the consequence.

True Eloquence.—The following paragraphs close Mr. Sprague's Speech on the Indian Question, in the United States Senate:

It is said that their existence cannot be preserved; that it is the doom of Providence, that they must perish. So indeed, must we all; but let it be in the course of nature; not by the hand of violence. If in truth, they are now in the decrepitude of age; let us permit them to live out all their days, and die in peace; not bring down their grey hairs in blood, to a foreign grave.

I know, Sir to what I expose myself.—To feel any solicitude for the fate of the Indians may be ridiculed as false philanthropy and morbid sensibility. Others may boldly say, "their blood be upon us," and sneer at scruples, as a weakness, unbecoming the stern character of a politician. If, Sir, in order to become such, it be necessary to divest the mind of the principles of good faith and moral obligation, and harden the heart against humanity, I confess that I am not, and, by the blessing of Heaven, will never be a politician.

Sir, we cannot wholly silence the monitor within. It may not be heard amidst the clashings of the arena; in the tempest and convulsions of political contentions; but its "still small voice" will speak to us—when we meditate alone at eventide;—in the silent watches of the night;—when we lie down and when we rise up from a solitary pillow;—and, in that dreadful hour, when—"not what we have done for ourselves, but what we have done for others, will be our joy and our strength; when—to have secured even the poor and despised Indian, a spot of earth on which to rest his aching head,—to give to him but a cup of cold water, in charity; will be a greater treasure than to have been the conqueror of kingdoms, and lived in luxury upon their spoils.

---

* For this object the President approved a bill which passed at the last Session, appropriating, for the expenditure of this year, one hundred thousand dollars, and for the first quarter of the next year sixty-two thousand dollars, more: which acts of his we heartily commend, as well as the appropriation of forty odd thousand dollars for what is called a *military* road in Maine [We wish it had come into the head of Mr. HEMPHILL to baptize his road-bill by the name *Military*, in which case we suppose they too would have passed muster.] We advert to the fact incidentally only to shew what attenuated distinctions have been drawn by the Administration between different measures standing on precisely the same footing.

SALE OF THE WABASH & ERIE CANAL LANDS,

IN INDIANA,

ON A CREDIT OF SEVENTEEN YEARS.

BY authority of an act of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, approved January 28th, 1830, the undersigned will offer at Public Sale, to the highest bidder, in Tracts of 80 Acres, or in Fractional Sections, as the public lands are sold, on the *first Monday in October next*, at the Town of LOGANSPORT, in the county of Cass, a portion of the Lands granted to the State of Indiana, by the act of Congress of March 24, 1827, "to aid in constructing a Canal, to "connect, at navigable points, the waters of "the Wabash river with those of Lake Erie," and which have been designated and set apart for that purpose by Commissioners appointed on the part of the State of Indiana, by and with the consent of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and the approbation of the President of the United States.

The part which will be offered for sale, includes sections and fractional sections in the following townships and ranges, viz. Nos. 1, 3, 10 12, 13, 24, in Township No. 24, North of Range No. 3, West 2d principal Meridian, 1, 3, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 34, 36, T. 25, R. 3 W. 13, 24, 25, 36, T. 26, R. 3 W. 3, 8, T. 24, R. 2 W. 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 22, 24, 27, 32, T. 25, R. 2 W. 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, T. 26, R. 2 W. 25, 34, 36, T. 27, R. 2 W. 3, 5, 8, T. 25, R. 1 W. 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34 36, T. 26, R 1 W. 1, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, T. 27, R. 1 W 3, 5, 8, 10, 15, 17, 20, T. 26 R 1 East of the 2d principal Meridian, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20 22, 24, 25, 27, 32, T. 27, R. 1 E. 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, T. 27, R. 2 East. 1, 3, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, T. 27, R. 3 E. 34, 36, T. 28, R. 3 E. 3, 5, 8, 10, 15, 17, 20, 22, 27, 29, 32, T. 27, R. 4 E. 32, 34, T. 28, R. 4 E. 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 27, T. 27, R. 5 E. 25, 27, 32, 34, 36, T. 28, R. 5 E. 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 15, T. 27, R 6 E. 13, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, T. 28, R. 6 E. 1, 5, 10, 12, 13, 15, 22, 24, 27, T. 27, R. 7 E. 1, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27 29, 32, 34, 36, T. 28, R. 7 E. 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 29, 32, T. 28, R. 8, E. 25, 27, 32, 34, 36, T. 29, R. 8 E. 1, 3, 5, T. 27, R. 9 E. 1, 3, 5, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, T. 28, R 9 E. 13, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36 T. 29, R. 9 E. 13, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, T. 29, R. 9 E. 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 27, 29, 32, 34, T. 28, R. 10 E. 1, 3, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 27, 29, 32, 34, T. 29, R. 10 E. 10, 12, 13, 15, 22, 24, 25, 27, 34, T. 30, R 10 E. 1, 5, T. 29, R. 11 E. 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, T. 30, R 11 E. 24, 25, 34, 36, T. 31, R. 11 E 3, 5, 8, T. 29, R. 12 E. 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, T. 30, R. 12 E. 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, T. 31, R. 12 E. 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 34, 36, T. 30, R. 13 E 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, T. 31, R. 13 E. 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 17, 20, 22, 29, T. 30, R. 14 E. 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, T. 31, R. 14 E. 24, 25, 27, 34, 36, T 32, R. 14 E. 3, 5, 8, T. 30, R. 15 E. 3, 5, 8, 10, 15 17, 20, 22, 27, 32, 34, T. 31, R 15 E. 20, 29, 32, 34, T 32, R. 15 E. except a small portion of some of the sections which were sold by the General Government previous to the passage of the act of 2d of March, 1827, and also a few tracts selected for lock sites, stone quarries, &c. The sales will be continued from day to day, until all the tracts shall have been offered, and no sale made for a less price per acre than is required for Congress lands. The purchaser will have it at his option to make full payment, and receive a patent for the tract purchased; or, by payment of one fourth of the purchase money, at time of the sale, and the interest at six per cent. annually, in advance, a credit will be given by the State of seventeen years, from the first Monday in October next, for the residue.

The Erie and Wabash Canal, on or within five miles of which these lands are situated, is 128 miles in the State of Indiana, the vallies of the Wabash and Maumee rivers, which for fertility of soil, abundance of lime-stone, springs, good timber interspersed occasionally with small prairie, navigable rivers, and water privileges (independent of the Canal,) is decidedly amongst the finest portions of the Western country. The greatest part of the lands in the Canal Donation, is of the richest quality, in a healthy country, well adapted for agricultural, commercial and manufacturing purposes, and is daily increasing in value, from the rapidity of emigration to the lands adjoining, which is believed to be unprecedented, hitherto, in this State, and which must recommend this sale as particularly worthy the attention and interest of the Farmer, Mechanic, Merchant, and Capitalist.

D. BURR,
J. VIGUS,
SAM'L LEWIS, } Commissioners

Office of the Board of Commissioners of the Wabash & Erie Canal, Treaty Ground, Indiana, May 19th, 1830.

June 15. 87 law3m

TO GOLD MINERS.

THE Subscriber having obtained a Patent in the year 1827, for Mills for grinding and washing Ore of Gold and other metals, and his plan having been generally adopted, deems it necessrry to caution the public against using similar Mills without his consent. The subscriber thinks it unnecessary to give any description of his Mills, as they are in operation in various parts of the State. His Patents embrace Branch and Ridge Gold. Liberal terms will be conceded to all who make early application for Rights, and every information given on application.

WM. H. FOLGER.

Charlotte, N. C. 91 1m

State of North-Carolina,

Wake County.

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, May Term, 1830.

Joshua E. Lumsden vs. Jonathan O. Freeman. Original attachment levied on one mahogany bedstead and other articles.

IN this case, it appearing to the satisfaction of the Court that the defendant has removed himself beyond the limits of the State, or so conceals himself that the ordinary process of law cannot be served on him: It is therefore ordered that publication be made in the Raleigh Register for six weeks, that unless the defendant comes forward on or before the next Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions to be held for the county of Wake, at the Courthouse in Raleigh, on the 3d Monday of August next, then and there to replevy the property levied on, and plead to issue, judgment will be made final, and the property levied on be condemned subject to plaintiff's recovery.

91 B. S. KING, C.