

IMPORTANT DECISION.

THOMAS V. ROBERTS vs HENRY J. CANNON.

This was an action of DEBT, brought by the Plaintiff, to recover of the Defendant the penalty prescribed by law, (see 1 Rev. Stat Ch 52, Sec 20) for having voted at an election for members of the House of Commons, without being entitled to such vote. It was commenced by a warrant before a single Justice, and carried by successive appeals to the Superior Court, in which it was tried on the last Fall circuit, at Northampton, before his Honor, Judge Sargent. Upon the trial the facts were agreed and were as follows:

At the election in the County of Northampton in August 1833, the Defendant voted for members to represent that County in the House of Commons of the State, and an inhabitant of that county; had attained the full age of 21 years; had repeatedly paid public taxes and had resided in the State all his life; but he had not been an inhabitant of the county of Northampton, twelve months immediately preceding the day of election, having removed into that county, in the month of November 1837, from the County of Wake, where he had always theretofore resided. His Honor, upon these facts, was of opinion that the Plaintiff was entitled to recover and gave judgment accordingly, whereupon the Defendant appealed.

Battle for the Defendant.
B F Moore for the Plaintiff.
GASTON, Judge, after stating the facts of the case as above, proceeded as follows: The question of law arising upon these facts, is, whether the Defendant had the right to vote at the said election.

The 8th section of the Constitution, upon which the controversy arises, is in these words: "All freemen of the age of twenty-one years, who have been inhabitants of any county within this State twelve months immediately preceding the day of any election and shall have paid public taxes, shall be entitled to vote for members of the House of Commons for the county in which he resides." The Plaintiff insists that this section confines the right of voting, to those who have been inhabitants of the particular county in which they reside at the day of election, for twelve months immediately preceding that day; while the Defendant contends that a residence within the State for twelve months preceding the day of election—no matter in what county or counties of the State—is sufficient to entitle one, otherwise qualified, to vote for members of the House of Commons for the county in which he resides at the day of election. There is a very striking grammatical inaccuracy in the language of this section, for which it is difficult to account—unless it be that the section does not retain its original form, but passing through the Congress received some amendments which were so inserted as not to fit exactly with its general structure. "All freemen" are entitled to vote for members of the county "in which he resides." It is evident also that whichever of the constructions contended for shall be adopted, the intent of the framers of the Constitution will be found not to have been expressed in the most precise terms. These considerations but impress upon us more deeply the propriety of observing the leading rule in the exposition of laws, of assigning to words their popular signification without indulging in critical refinements.

By the Plaintiff, it is assumed that the obvious sense of the words "any county" is some one county. We do not think so—and no better evidence can be asked to establish the reverse of this proposition than by recurring to other parts of the same instrument where "any" is annexed to nouns in the singular number. By the 16th section of the Constitution, each member of the Council of State is authorized to have his dissent recorded to "any" part of the proceedings of the body. Can it be doubted but that, under this section, he may have his dissent recorded to as many parts of the proceedings as he may disapprove of? In the 16th section, the Governor is declared to have power, by the advice of the Council of State, to prohibit the exportation of "any" commodity. In the 23d section, Officers offending against the State by a violation of "any" part of the Constitution, are declared liable to impeachment. By the 25th, persons who have been Receivers of the Public money are rendered ineligible to "any" office until they shall have accounted for and paid into the Treasury the sums thus received. In the 27th, it is declared that "any" member of the Senate, House of Commons or Council of State, accepting a certain office, shall thereby vacate his seat. It is needless to multiply instances. In all of them, it is manifest that "any" is used in its largest sense, as synonymous with "whoever" or "whatever," and as embracing one or more as the case may be.

It is further urged on the part of the Plaintiff, that if a residence of twelve months within the State, be the qualification intended by this section, the words "in any county" are superfluous, and may be rejected as unmeaning.—Without denying all force to this objection, it may, nevertheless, be observed, that amid the infinite varieties of style which give character to the expression of thought, the most rare is that which compresses within the smallest compass of words, while it faithfully conveys, all that is intended to be communicated. Redundancy of language is so common, that it would be hazardous to draw any definite conclusion with much confidence, from the mere use of unnecessary words. On the other hand, it is insisted, that if the purpose of the section be to require a residence of twelve months within the county where the vote is tendered, the words at the end of the section "for the county in which he resides" are not only superfluous but inappropriate. They are superfluous, because the sense would be complete without them; and they are inappropriate for they hold out the idea that the county of residence on the day of election may be different from that in which the previous term of residence has been completed. Upon the whole, we to confine our attention altogether to words of this section, we should probably lean to the construction set up by the Defendant, because the other or more rigorous interpretation is not indicated with sufficient distinctness.

But however this might be, there are other considerations which tend very strongly to establish the interpretation which we are inclined to adopt upon the words of the section. In the immediately preceding section, prescribing the qualifications of voters for the other branch of the Legislature, the language is:—"All freemen of the age of twenty-one years, who have been inhabitants of any one county within the State twelve months immediately preceding the day of any election, and possessed of a freehold (with in the same county of fifty acres of land for six months, next before and at the day of election, shall be entitled to vote for a member of the Senate." If the residence required by the 8th section were the same with that required by the 7th, how are we to account for the marked change of phrase from "any one county" to "any county"?—Why is the emphatic and exclusive term "one" used in the 7th section, discarded in the 8th? Again: In the 7th section where "county" is twice mentioned, when it occurs the second time, it is described as the "same county." Now, it is exceedingly improbable that in the

8th section where county is also twice mentioned, the same form of expression would not have been used when the word occurs the second time if the same county were in this section also intended. This striking change of phraseology indicates a change of purpose. It indicates, we think, that for the exercise of the limited franchise of voting for a Senator, the Constitution required not only a freehold but a residence of twelve months in the county of the freehold; while it gives the more general right of voting for the popular branch of the Assembly to all freemen who have attained full age, and have paid a public tax, and have resided 12 months in the State immediately preceding the election; and it provides that this right shall be exercised in the counties respectively, whereof they may be actually inhabitants at the time when their suffrages are given.

Besides, if the rigorous construction be adopted, every citizen who shall have removed from one county to another within twelve months before the election of members of the General Assembly, is in that election, altogether deprived of a vote. He cannot vote in the county to which he has removed, because he has not been an inhabitant of that county for twelve months immediately preceding the day of election; nor can he vote in the county from which he has removed, because he is not residing there at the day of election. Now, when we take into consideration, that when the Constitution was framed, elections were annual, it can scarcely be believed that this penalty of temporary disfranchisement, consequent upon every removal, was designed to be imposed. In the first place the genius of the Constitution, is favorable to the extended right of suffrage, which makes representation go hand in hand with taxation. No removal exempts the citizen from the obligation to pay his tax—and the right of being heard in the disposition of the revenue, to which he has contributed, will not lightly be supposed to be suspended by a change of residence from one side to the other of a county line. Still less should we be disposed to yield to this supposition, when we contemplate the known state of things when the Constitution was formed. Population was flowing in a regular and constant tide from the seaboard into the interior; every day new settlements were formed farther & farther towards the West; and new Counties were springing up, almost every year, as the Indians retired, and the white men advanced into the more distant recesses of the forest.

The requisition of the previous residence of any duration in the county where the suffrage should be exercised, was wholly unknown under the Colonial Government. The oath which the freeholder (for none but freeholders could then vote) was required to take, if his qualifications were disputed, is given in Davis's Revised page 249. "You shall swear that you have been six months an inhabitant of this Province; and that you have been possessed of a freehold of fifty acres of land for three months past in your own right, in the county of and that such land hath not been granted to you fraudulently, on purpose to qualify you to give your vote; and that the place of your abode is in the county of and that you have not voted in this election." A previous residence of six months, within the province, provided the person offering to vote had the requisite freehold qualification, entitled him to vote in the county which was the place of his abode on the day of election. The Constitution hath very clearly substituted the payment of a public tax for the freehold qualification, and required a residence of twelve, instead of a residence of six months—but that it has introduced an entirely new qualification, a previous residence exclusive within the county in which the voter has his abode on the day of election, ought distinctly to appear, before we can presume it to have been intended.

Certain considerations of public policy have been suggested in the argument of the Plaintiff's counsel as having probably operated on the minds of the framers of the Constitution so as to induce them to require, and which should influence the judgment of the expounders of the Constitution in construing it, to require this exclusive and continued residence as one of the voter. It has been said that, without it, the voter cannot be supposed to have acquired that knowledge of the peculiar interests of the county, or that acquaintance with the character, talents and political views of the candidates for his suffrage, as to enable him to aid in selecting a fit representative of the county. Arguments of this kind, though undoubtedly admissible, are to be listened to with much caution. The interpreters of a law have not the right to judge of its policy, and when they undertake to find out the policy contemplated by the makers of the law, there is great danger of misunderstanding their own opinion on that subject, for the opinions of those who had alone the right to judge of matters of policy.

Now what is there, upon which we can ground any thing like a confident belief, that the considerations now urged upon us had the weight with the framers of the Constitution supposed in this argument? Whether strong or weak, they are obvious considerations, and could scarcely have escaped notice. Is it absurd to suppose that when, thus presented to notice, they were met by other considerations of policy which, in their judgment, outweighed them? Might not the Congress have thought that in a State, almost exclusively Agricultural, where the occupations in one county were the occupations in all the counties, a residence of twelve months within the State was sufficient to give the citizen that knowledge of its general interest, to excite that sympathy for the common weal, and to afford that acquaintance with the principles and talents of the candidates for popular favour, as to render it unwise to stifle altogether the voice of him who had divided his residence between two or more counties? Such beyond question was the opinion which had been generally entertained up to the time of framing the Constitution; and without some evidence, we are not to presume that the opinion was then abandoned. But in truth, the evidence, if any, is all the other way. Before the Revolution, there had been conferred on certain Towns a distinct right of representation in the legislative body, and this privilege, to a certain extent, was preserved and secured by the Constitution.—The avowed purpose for granting this special franchise was for that the inhabitants of these towns, because of their peculiar pursuits, were supposed to have important interests distinct from those of the great body of the community, which required the protection of representatives selected exclusively by them. Now when the Constitution defines the qualifications of a voter in one of these Towns, it explicitly declares that he shall either have a freehold in, and be a resident thereof at the day of election, or "shall have been an inhabitant of such

town twelve months next before and at the day of election," thereby unequivocally manifesting that, in regard to these municipalities, having peculiar interests, it was designed that the voter should have that connection and sympathy with these interests as would induce him to prefer a fit representative of them. Thus we see, that when the framers of this instrument deemed an exclusive residence of a determinate duration within the limits of a particular Town an essential qualification for a voter in that Town, they declared this purpose in express terms; and the inference is almost irresistible, that such purpose would have been as plainly declared; with respect to the voters in a county if, in regard to county representation, that purpose had been entertained. *Expressio unius est exclusio alterius.*

It may not be amiss to remark that by a residence in the county, the Constitution intends a *domicil* in that county. This requisition is not satisfied by a visit to the county, whether for a longer or a shorter time, if the stay there be for a temporary purpose and with the design of leaving the county when that purpose is accomplished. It must be a fixed abode therein, constituting in the place of his home. This residence or domicil is a fact not more difficult of ascertainment, when required as the qualification of a voter, which is so important in regulating the disposition and management of his estate after death.

It has been urged that there is more room for the commission of frauds, if the liberal construction insisted on by the Defendant be adopted, than there would be if the rigorous construction contended for by the Plaintiff were established. The correctness of this remark is admitted. There is not the same facility in feigning with success a continued residence of twelve months in a county, as in falsely pretending a residence on the day of election—nay, it may be, when a general election throughout the State takes place in neighboring counties, on different days, that, by a change or a pretended change of residence, between these different days, the fraud may be practised of voting twice at the same election. But the remark is of little weight, as an argument, to show what is the qualification *actually* required by the Constitution. It proves only, that the more the elective franchise is fettered by restrictions, the more difficult becomes the usurpation of it by those not entitled—but it neither proves, nor tends to prove, that because of such difficulty, the franchise is to be restrained by construction where it is not clearly restrained by the Constitution. The sole enquiry is, what are the limits there imposed upon it—and it is the proper business of legislation to prevent those abuses of fraud or violence, to which all that is valuable here below is necessarily exposed. In the discharge of this duty, the Legislature has provided that every person tendering a vote, at any election, may be required to swear that he has not previously voted in that election, and that he possesses the qualifications required of a voter by the Constitution; and is has also imposed penalties on those who may vote contrary to law. If these provisions, and those securing impartial judges of election, should prove ineffectual, it is not to be doubted but that other and more efficacious provisions will be devised to meet the mischiefs disclosed by experience.

We believe that in truth, frauds in elections are not often committed with us. There has been, we understand, some difference of opinion in a few of the counties in relation to the question now under consideration, which has produced an unsteadiness of practice, which in moments of strife and excitement is too readily ascribed to corrupt motives. The general opinion and the general practice have, undoubtedly however, been in conformity with what we understand to be the true meaning of the Constitution. That meaning, once fully settled and generally known, there is great cause to hope that neither fraud nor mistake in relation to this subject will prevail to any very injurious extent. It is the opinion of this Court, that the judgment of the Superior Court ought to be reversed with costs.

PER CURIAM—Judgment reversed.

MORUS MULTICAULIS.

The mulberry Market is "very lively" as the Stock dealers say. In Baltimore, a gentleman has just sold his crop of fifteen acres for \$32,500. The Norristown (Penn.) Herald states, that some sales of Trees at 25 cents, each, have been made in that neighborhood, but growers now refuse to sell at that price. A thousand Trees were sold in Caroline County, Md, on Monday last, at 42 cents per Tree.

A lot of 243 Morus Multicaulis Trees was lately sold in Cheraw, S C. for one dollar each to be delivered in November. They are from cuttings planted last Spring, and now average from three to four feet in height. They were produced from four Trees purchased fifteen months ago for one dollar. The grower still retains these four Trees, which will probably yield three or four hundred buds each next winter.

In reference to this subject, Mr. Morris, of the "Silk Farmer," published in Philadelphia, says:—"The sale of the Multicaulis Trees has been very active during the present week. Purchasers are ready to take any quantity at 25 to 35 cents. On the 9th and 10th inst. the Editor sold 150,000 Trees at 30 cents each, half Cash, and the balance satisfactorily secured at three & four months from delivery. These Trees are grown by us near Camden, and promise to be very fine. They are part of a lot containing about 200,000, the balance of which are held at 40 cents."

There will be a large number of trees for sale in this City and vicinity, and dealers would do well to turn their attention this way.—*Raleigh Register.*

To the Cotton Planters, Merchants, Factors, and Presidents and Directors of the several Banks of the Southern States.

CIRCULAR.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—Interested like yourselves, in the cultivation and disposal of the great staple of American agriculture and commerce, we have accidentally met in this city, in the midst of a crisis which discloses some strikingly momentous features in the history of this most important branch of the trade of our country.

When the Cotton Crop of the United States was a mere item in its trade, and did not reach a production exceeding five hundred thousand bales, it was perhaps safe to consider it as one among many articles of barter and exchange, which, left entirely to the fortuitous circumstances of commerce, would find its level under the influence of the ordinary laws of trade, without the necessity of resorting to any means of precautionary protection.

Times, however, have changed. Cotton has passed from the condition of a mere article of commerce, to the performance of the mighty function of being in a great degree the regulator of the exchanges, and the standard of value of our country. If the nature of this material forbids its entering into our circulation, it is scarcely less the basis of our currency, than the precious metals; for the fluctuations in its price are felt with a sensibility equally as acute and searching, as any of those variations which belong to the demand and supply of these sensitive and mysterious tokens of national value.

The production of this staple, has now become so immense, that it behooves those who produce it by a large investment of capital at a high rate of incidental cost, and in a climate perilous to human health, to consider well whether there are not some material circumstances in reference to the mode in which this product of their labor is shipped from this country, and is brought to market at the point of its final sale and consumption, which demand the application of a prompt and effective remedy. In one word, is not the important fact disclosed, that such is the unwieldy amount of this great staple of Southern industry, that it cannot be sent forward and disposed of at fair remunerating prices, through the ordinary medium of the mercantile establishments of this country and in Europe, without the direct co-operation of our banking institutions? If we have become satisfied of this fact, ought we not to organize a system, which shall give perfect security to this great interest in the commerce and finances of our country? The unwise and ruinous system of sending the crop forward to houses of circumscribed means, on the other side of the water, who are incapable of holding their consignments an hour beyond the maturity of the bills drawn against such shipments, subject in fact, nearly the whole amount of American interest to foreign combination, which might act, not only with entire concert, but with a perfect knowledge of the period, when from the maturity of the acceptances in question, property to a stupendous amount belonging to this country, may be ready for sacrifice.

The great and vital change which must be operated, is to sustain American interests, by American credit. To realize at home, the resources necessary for the protection of our property abroad, without the necessity of large and inconvenient drafts on the capital and means of our great customer. In other words, the commercial reform we desire, is to send our great staple to market, without the period being determined by the date of a bill of Exchange, when it is to be brought forward for absolute and unnecessary sacrifices. We believe that the steadiness in price, which would result from a portion, at least, of the Cotton crop being exempt from the disastrous fluctuations arising from compulsory sales, would in the end, be scarcely less valuable to the spinner and consumer in England, than to the grower and shipper here. A fact, which we think demonstrable from the following postulates, which we consider altogether self-evident:

1. The natural price of Cotton is the effect of the fair and natural influence of supply and demand.
2. The price cannot be steady, and the article cannot be current, so as to admit of safe calculations on the part of the planters, the manufacturer and the merchant, unless the price be natural. It is consequently the interest of these three classes, that the article should be protected, on the one hand from any great and undue speculative action, which might inflate prices above the natural rate—and on the other from any derangement in the money market, or any other accidental cause, which might depress it below that rate. The effect of great and undue speculation being to derange the money market, and to produce reaction, with an undue depression of prices.
3. The state of the currency mainly depends on the means which the country possesses, to pay its foreign debt, by shipments of its produce or manufacture falls short of that object, exports of specie may be induced, the effect of which must be a reduction of the circulation, with depreciation of property and general distress.
4. Cotton, in this country, being by far the most important produce, and affording the great means of paying its foreign debt, it is the interest of the community, and particularly of the monied institutions, that the price of it in England, (the great market,) should be steady, and that the article should be of current sale, so as to be the means of large and effective remittance. It follows, that the interest of the banking institutions here, are the same as those of the three classes first mentioned, namely, that the price should be natural, that it may be steady, and of easy realization.
5. The interest of the British Government, of the Bank of England, and of the banks of that country in respect to this article, are the same as the interests of the

banks here. The importation there being immense, and the employment of a most numerous body of the laboring classes, depending on the steadiness of prices. When they are not steady—the foreign demand for manufactured cotton is reduced greatly, the operatives are thrown out of employment and the great means of setting the balance of trade, without the exportation of the precious metals are, withdrawn. Manufactured cottons affording by far, the most important branch of their export trade.

6. Consequently, any arrangement that could be formed, by which the article would be protected from the effects of undue speculation; and from depression in the money market, and by which steadiness of price, with currency of sale, would be promoted—would save some of the greatest and best interests in both countries.

7. It is therefore proposed to form a system, with the commencement of the new crop, advances on Cotton shall be made with the capital or credit of Banks here, thereby relieving the consignee in Europe from all care or consideration, except the advantageous sale of his stock, which would promote all these interests, and afford general satisfaction on both sides of the water, provided it were not made the means directly or indirectly, of undue speculation or monopoly.

Having thus indicated the principles on which the proposed system must find its justification and basis, we will now as succinctly as possible, detail the means of carrying it into effect.

We are far from imputing any premeditated hostility of the Bank of England to American interests; on the contrary, it is one of the benevolent influences of commercial intercourse to promote peace and good will among nations and men. Hence this great engine of the commercial grandeur and opulence of Great Britain, acting under an enlightened instinct, must rather desire that its best customer should at all times be in a condition to meet her engagements with entire punctuality and success.

But there are epochs in the commerce of England, whether from insufficient harvests, a languid demand for her manufactures, or political combinations, when the bank may from an urgent policy limit her discounts and increase her rate of interest. This event can never occur, without it having a blighting influence on any surplus of our great staple which might be unsold in England. Surely if the Bank of England can exercise unavoidably an influence thus prejudicial, we may resort to our own American Banks, as a means of security and protection, without the invidious clamor of combination and monopoly. It is time that the absurd and senseless cry on the subject of banks making advances on cotton should be understood, and finally put down. The truth is that by the mere purchase of the foreign exchanges of the country, they advance on nearly every bale of Cotton subject to foreign export, and thus without the security of the bill of lading and policy of insurance, on the mere personal responsibility of the drawers and endorsers of the bill. Hence these losses are comprehensive and disastrous after every commercial crisis and revulsion.

Now we propose giving to the banks in all cases the higher protection of these securities, and that early next autumn, one or more banks in each of the great commercial cotton markets of the South should commence making advances on the crop, according to a scale to be graduated by what will be a safe calculation of its probable amount, assuming 12½ cents at home to be about the fair natural average and remunerating price of this staple, on a product of sixteen hundred thousand bales, which is but as large a return as the actual labor of the country now engaged in this branch of industry is capable of harvesting. The embarrassments of the Southwestern States having prevented the planters in these States from making any purchases of slaves from the Atlantic States, during the last two years, whilst not less than ten per cent of the slave labor of the South has been abstracted in the same period from the cultivation of cotton, and applied to the raising of provisions, and to the construction of those extensive railroads now in progress throughout that portion of the Union.

For these advances we propose that the banks should issue to the planters, merchants, and factors of the country, on the production of the bill of lading, and the assignment of the policy of insurance, post notes of such description, and payable at such periods as a convention hereafter contemplated may suggest, notes which may be made to answer both the purposes of currency and exchange, the details of which we refer to that body. By this arrangement, however, we feel satisfied the credits can be so distributed that from the day of the shipment of our cotton it may probably be held at least six months in Europe, without the foreign consignee being under an advance of one farthing, and we think it quite easy to confer on the houses which the shipments are confided, sufficient strength to enable them to hold over for even a longer period, should safe remunerating prices not be obtained on the maturity of the bills.

With the view of securing this strength, it is indispensably necessary, that the consignments should not be too much diffused, but confined to a limited number of houses in Liverpool and Havre, who, acting as the agents of all those who will come into this conservative system, will feel a common interest, and will naturally aid and assist each other under all and every contingency.

This fellow citizens, is but the brief outline of a great scheme, for the protection of our commerce, finance, and exchanges, the details of which, must be left for profound deliberation, and concerted action. To accomplish this object, we hereby invite the planters, factors and cotton merchants of each district or county in the Southern States, and Territory of Florida, together with the banks, in each of the said States and Territory, to send delegates to meet us in convention at Macon, Georgia,

on the fourth Tuesday which will be on the month, that we may discuss important matters of the whole scheme, for the benefit of the southern interest, and the commerce of the country.

Let it at least be investigated, and enlightened of this plan one third of the country can be the possibility of sacrifice, to the residue, not by the guards of a special by holding it in that of the just relations of always in the long run in the trade of a given nation, not to be perhaps inexorable but is not to be found have a right to hold of means of the credit then we fearlessly attempt it, in desperate ever eager and imploring.

We have seen in 1,350,000 bales, an nearly resulting in acceptance of the same incident to one of 1,800 not to rest our security of the crop, which is the will and disposition which has already from an intense dread the ravages of the its growth and maturity beyond the era of the last year, and an apparently the coming season, nominal wisdom being all times, and there is a homely aphorism, that take care of themselves, take care of others; permit this call and invite earnest hope, that you co-operate with us in we believe the highest common country are invited.

Your obedient servant,
NATH'L A. WALKER,
JOHN G. GAMBLE,
THOMAS E. FRANKLIN,
W. H. TARTT,
D. P. HILLHOUSE,
J. J. HUGHES,
NATHAN MCGEE,
GEO. M. DUFFIE,
D. K. DODGE,
J. L. HUNTER,
JAMES HAMILTON,
A. B. DAVIS, Genl.
H. W. HILLIARD,
JOHN BRANCH,
New York, July 5th, 1838.

P. S. All the Southern signers of the above, at an insertion in the

RALEIGH AND GASTON. We are indebted to the third annual report of the Rail Road Company. President it will be seen difficulties, the negotiate a loan in England, circumstances causing them to exist, it is believed favorable terms can be obtained. The President, while on favorable terms, for a sufficient to complete only between the Rail road company which of the last contracts, the President:—*Per. In.*

"At the last meeting of the Board" contracted with for carrying of the Rail Road, but as they were the Petersburg Rail Road, similar one being made. As the Post Master General, the Petersburg Rail Road, believed that a due regard to the department, was distinctly informed of, was addressed to him, and that it would not be with the contract, and the company also contracted by the mail, as it could be Company would put on purpose of carrying the Gaston Rail Road. founded construction, communication, and what regarded as an act of justice, been construed by the evidence of a combination.

The great mail difficulties between the and the Rail Road referred to the Wilmington, however, been made by to Columbia."

The report of the cheering report of the understanding the difficulties has been. Fifty completed and put in that the whole will be the year. On the subject, concerning which been felt, the Engineers into operation, caused prevented you from the public as would ensure transportation; and yet what any one anticipated can now doubt that the road will fully equal most sanguine among us.