

MESSRS. CALDWELL AND BARRINGER.

Mr. Henderson—Will you do me a favor to give this communication a place in your paper this week. In order that it may appear in company with the correspondence you are now publishing between Mr. Barringer and myself. I should not have said one word in relation to this matter, but for the conduct of Mr. Barringer in connection with its publication.

Now, I wish it to be distinctly understood, that I do not complain of the publication of the correspondence, for that, in itself, was right, and he was so advised by my friends as well as by myself. Of what I complain, is this: In the publication of the correspondence, he (Mr. Barringer) inserted a letter from his friend Dr. Henderson, and also appended to the article signed "A Voter," a reference to my vote, as proof that the charge of bribery, which he had preferred against me in that very article was true, although he had made over his own signature in his letter of apology, a clear and unqualified withdrawal of every word of it. His true, that in his publishing Dr. Henderson's letter and statement, he refrains from making any comment, but it is equally true, that by the publication he endorsed it and made it his own. Why its publication? Did he not know that it was improper to publish anything outside of the correspondence unless by agreement? Does he think that the opinions of his friend Dr. Henderson and his other three friends, can qualify or alter in the slightest degree, the settlement between him and myself? Where was the use then of the publication of Dr. Henderson's statement? For on the very week before the publication of the correspondence, there appeared in the "Hornet's Nest," the friend of Mr. Barringer, and certainly not without his approbation, a notice that the difficulty between Mr. Barringer and myself had been honorably and amicably adjusted.

To say that it was published to correct reports prejudicial to him will not do, because the simple publication of the correspondence would correct all misrepresentations as to the terms of the adjustment. The settlement stands upon its own basis, and it is too late now to attempt to vary it by anything that was said before or after.

What then was its object? The letter and statement shows it. The first, that he went to the Catawba Springs (not to the field) prepared to fight; and secondly, which was its main object, to explain why it was he did not accept a direct invitation to the field, as it was construed by him to be, instead of having Dr. Henderson address me a note which opened the door for a reconciliation.

Here then is the true reason for the publication of Dr. Henderson's statement, and unfortunately in doing so contradicts his letter to me and the whole correspondence. Look at it. Dr. Henderson says in his statement that when called upon to act as Mr. Barringer's friend, he at once pronounced my letter a direct invitation to the field, and such also was the opinion of Mr. Barringer. Let us see then how this statement agrees with the correspondence.

The first letter I received when we met at the Catawba Springs on the 27th ult. was from Dr. H. Mr. D's friend, as follows: Your note of the 17th inst. was handed to me at Morganton on Tuesday evening of the 21st. Its contents are now under consideration but at the suggestion of my friend Dr. H., final action thereon is postponed for reasons which he will give." Now mark Mr. H's reasons.

Your communication dated August 17th, directed to my friend Mr. R. Barringer by the hand of E. C. Davidson, is now before me. I confess it places me as the friend of Mr. Barringer in an awkward position, for it may be understood as either a peremptory invitation to the field, or a demand for explanation."

The above letter of Dr. H. contains the reasons assigned by Mr. Barringer for a postponement of final action on my letter. Now I defy the most perfect critic to show, if he can, one word in the whole correspondence, that will sustain him in the statement that in consequence of what was learned at the Springs, Mr. Barringer's acceptance was declined being delivered.

Does Dr. H. say in the same letter, that his position had been changed in consequence of any thing he had heard? On the contrary does he not say that his position was awkward on account of not knowing whether it was a peremptory invitation to the field, or a demand for explanation. Can language be more explicit? If Mr. Barringer or his friend Dr. Henderson, believed my letter to be a challenge, why was it not boldly avowed in the correspondence? For certainly no source, however reliable, should have influenced them to avow a different opinion, when my letter was before them and unquestionably the highest authority. Again, my note was delivered to Mr. Barringer at Morganton on the 21st inst. and we did not meet at the Catawba Springs till the 27th, although he had six days to consider my letter, during which time, according to his own statement, he had consulted several gentlemen—yet he arrived at the Springs still in doubt, whether my note was a challenge or not, and postpones final action thereon until I would tell him what it meant. I did frankly disclose its import, which was received by him, under which the settlement was made. To make, then, a statement 13 days after, the tendency of which is to change the complexion of the compromise, for the benefit of one of the parties, without the consent or knowledge of the other, is most extraordinary, and without excuse or palliation.

But suppose my first note was a challenge?—what is the second? Was I asked to withdraw? No. Did I withdraw it? No. What then did I do? I said it was not intended as an invitation to the field, but a demand for satisfaction;—reiterating the very words of the first, which he said constituted a challenge.

What then did I mean by a demand for satisfaction? Why, simply, that Mr. Barringer had to withdraw (not to explain, hence I did not use that term) the charge of corruption which he had made against me, or fight. He withdrew the charge and there the matter ended.

The next ground of complaint is, that Mr. Barringer in publishing the correspondence, added to the article signed "A Voter," which was not attached to the original, a reference to my vote in Congress, thereby in substance reiterating the charge, which was the foundation of the difficulty; the whole of which he had withdrawn as his own letter shows.

This in connection with an extract from his letter to Mr. Henderson, acknowledging the authorship of "A Voter," proves how deliberate his unfeigned malignity. He uses the following language in giving his name. "I neither write or publish any thing against any man, unless I have some good reason for doing so, and what I then either write or publish, I am ready to repeat to his face and stand up to."

The cause of the difficulty, grow out of this article signed "A Voter," which he said he would repeat to my face and stand up to.

No comment necessary. I will merely ask the community to look at his letter to me of the 27th August, and compare it with his language in giving up his name.

G. W. CALDWELL.
September 19, 1849.

From the Hornet's Nest.
TO THE PUBLIC.

The communication of Capt. G. W. Caldwell in the last Charlotte Journal, has given me no concern, nor even "turned me from the career of my humor." I look upon it as the mere ebullition of an excited imagination. The utter groundlessness of its complaints and its gross inconsistencies will prove its own death-warrant without song or ceremony.

One complaint "solitary and alone," stands recorded against myself. I appended to the recent publication a note of three lines referring to the authority for a certain vote of his (while in Congress) which is spoken of throughout the publication.—Does Capt. C. pretend to deny that he gave such a vote? Then if it be a truth, why complain?—Why not refer the Public to the time when, and the place where? The mere allusion to a fact, on the records of the country, can harm no man, and constitutes neither high treason nor grand larceny. In all sincerity I thought it my duty in a publication designed to be full, to give all the lights in my power, that the whole subject might be "judged of fairly and fully." That I withdrew the simple fact that he gave such a vote is perfectly absurd. So far from this, if the Captain looks again, he will find it distinctly "repeated" in my letter that he did give the vote for the "peculiar measure" of Mr. Tyler? This is, indeed, a small matter over which to raise "a tempest in a tea-pot."

But the Captain is in great trouble about the "statement" of Dr. A. M. Henderson, as to how the adjustment was got on foot? What Dr. H. states; are they facts or are they not? Does Capt. C. deny that they are? Not at all! Not at all! He first pretends not to see the "use" of this "statement," but, mark you, sets right off with all his might to prove its inconsistency! Really I did not think the "facts" could do harm to any one, and I am sure such a gentleman as Dr. H. could intend none. But if Capt. C. will pardon me, I will state to him its object, which is extremely simple. It was to account for Dr. H. ever doubting (as he did in his note of the 27th of August to Capt. C.) that the first note of Capt. C. to me was a challenge.—Capt. C. himself states that the "note itself" was unquestionably the highest authority; and in fact it could be my only authority, my only guide, my only rule of action. So thought Dr. H. myself and my "three other friends" to whom I had occasion, to divulge the subject; and we made our preparations accordingly; for who—what human being but Capt. C. himself—could pretend that the latter ever would say under his own hand that it was not a challenge? Now all this difficulty Dr. H. explains by saying that at the Catawba Springs on the 27th (when and where it was agreed my answer should be delivered,) he "learned from a source" which he felt it "his imperative duty" to respect (so "entirely reliable" was it) that no challenge, or "invitation to the field was intended."

Then he is bound—obliged, to doubt. Having some intimation from this "reliable" source alluded to, of the nature of the answer he would receive, he addresses a grave note of enquiry to Capt. C. and sure enough the Capt. replies "it was not intended as an invitation to the field." This only proves that the "note itself" was not "the highest authority," but that the Captain himself turned out to be the "highest."

But Capt. C. most gravely, yes gravely asks, why Dr. H. and myself "did not boldly avow in the correspondence" our opinion, "that we believed it to be a challenge," and fight whether it was so intended or not? Fight for the pure love of it! We are no such heroes! We are neither fire-eaters nor the children of Mars. Nor was this our war.

Capt. C. next assumes the offensive. The following is his style of reasoning: "But suppose my first note was a challenge, pray what is the second? Was I asked to withdraw it? No. Did I withdraw it? No."

Now the gentleman has appeared "in print." He has taken his positions and what are they?—Whether it was a challenge, or whether it was not, is the real question? Which does he now say? The above extract winks at the idea that the first was a challenge, and that the latter was no better. The notes will speak for themselves. Here is the first, (17th of August.)

"Now, Sir both of these communications (especially the latter) consider a gross and unprovoked attack upon my character, for which I demand of you satisfaction."

"This note will be handed to you by Mr. E. C. Davidson, who will act as my friend in this matter."

Here is the second (27th of August.) "It (the first note) was not intended as an invitation to the field, but a demand for satisfaction for the communications signed C. and A. Voter, especially the latter the whole of which I thought personally offensive."

If they both mean the same, why the qualification, "it was not intended as an invitation to the field?" The one is a wasp with a sting—the other a wasp with the sting pulled out.

Again, he says in *his* *verba* that I was forced to "withdraw" or "fight." How does this comport with his declaration just above given—with which he led off before I broke the seal of silence, that "an invitation to the field was not intended?"—That made it no challenge. How fight without a challenge? No challenge: no fight: *ex nihilo* *nil* *fit*.

But still again, Capt. C. in speaking of the Tyler affair, asserts that I had not only taken back the "whole" but in another place avers that I made a clear and unqualified withdrawal of every word of

it. In my letter he will discover, if he has never taken the pains to read it before; that the facts that he gave the vote as charged, and accepted of office under Mr. Tyler, are distinctly recited. Why? Because they were facts which I could not, and would not, and did not retract. This will do for taking back the "whole!" Now for the "unqualified withdrawal." What do I withdraw? The imputation that he had given the vote from "interested motives." Is that imputation withdrawn absolutely?—*unqualifiedly*?

Let us read my language. This is it: "But if in this I have done you individually a wrong &c." Is there any sort of admission that I had done him a wrong? That I had made a charge without any foundation whatever? That I had made a charge which was utterly false? No such thing. And why do I carefully use terms which are conditional and hypothetical? Because I could not, would not, and did not admit, that the charge was absolutely without foundation. And I did not therefore, make an "unqualified" withdrawal. When the Captain, however, extracted the poison from his arrow, I was disposed to blunt the point of mine.—But my consistency is entirely preserved as every body else but Capt. Caldwell may plainly see: hence the ground for the remark of the ill-natured wag, who said, the explanation was no better than the original charge. I hope the gentleman is happy in the sweet delusion under which he labors.—I would not break the spell. I would only suggest, that it was not exactly justice to me, to publish to the world that I made an "unqualified withdrawal" of the charge, when every one who can read English language can plainly perceive, that it is a delusion—that it was not just to me to publish this mistake of his as the truth of the matter. But I do not complain.

Nor will I ever complain of his charge against me of "deliberate unfeigned malignity." Were I disposed to do so, I might well reply—the father of the feelings is his own heart and that he himself entered upon this matter with "predetermined hostility." When I wrote my articles, the political charge I alluded to, had become public property by the tacit acquiescence and silence of Capt. Caldwell himself. I thought I was sporting with a political wit, which had been handled against him publicly and privately through near seven years; and strange to say is used against him in the very strongest sort of terms in an editorial in the same number of the paper in which my article "C." appeared; and never before was regarded as "a gross and unprovoked attack upon his character."

Why, then, single me out from a thousand as guilty as myself? Why begin the attack by, at once, dashing in my face the "bloody code," with all its technicalities, and a flaming parade of its small artillery? Let the public "judge between us."

These are specimens of his attacks on Dr. Henderson and myself. They rather amuse than harm. I have stuck to his record, and he cannot complain. My object is to re-appear and not assail; nor would I deign to appear as the advocate of my own conduct in an affair of this kind. That I leave to others, who say that my conduct "throughout was most unexceptionable." There I rest it.

The strife is over and the battle is recorded, like those of Milton in Paradise Lost—"without a list of killed or wounded." At this the people will laugh and talk (as they have a right to), ten times more than had it been otherwise. Capt. C. and myself should laugh too, that we have furnished the food for fun. I am disposed to laugh—the Captain seems to be out of sorts. But there is no use of keeping up the sport any longer. On my part the curtain now falls, "sine die" (as the meetings have it,) and I will not willingly appear again.

RUFUS BARRINGER.
Concord, Sept. 24th 1849.

"It was not intended as an invitation to the field."—Green W. Caldwell.

"Sport, which wrinkled care derides, And Laughter, holding both his sides." In my recent reply to the attacks of Capt. Caldwell on Dr. Henderson and myself, I promised the public I would "not willingly appear again." But the indomitable Captain is not yet "satisfied." The event has happened, which myself and friends partially anticipated, when I wrote that reply. The certain, therefore, is raised once more, and I now come with the closing scenes in the history of his cowardice and infamy. I handle him this time with gloves off.

On the 3d inst. I received another cartel from the Hon. gentleman, in which he demands "personal satisfaction" for the general bearing and tone of my last communication, published in the Hornet's Nest, and its reiteration of the charge of corruption against him.

It will be seen, he has at last worked himself up to the sticking point. He is in earnest now and will not *crave-fish* this time! While certainly in this humor, it would afford me a great deal of pleasure to give him a pop; but my anger, like his courage on the 27th of August last, has all evaporated; or rather, like Bob Acre's patriotism is oozing out at the fingers.

The Captain's present position is pitiable indeed. At one time he seems to struggle like a fallen hero: "Foiled, bleeding, breathless, furious to the last!"

At another, his mournful complaints, wailings and lamentations, accompanied with certain desperate, death-like efforts to save himself, give rise to an opposite feeling, which finds expression in the following effusion:

"On a log sat a frog
Crying for his daughter;
Tears he shed till his eyes were red,
And then jumped into the water—
And drowned himself!"

In order not to treat him with disrespect while in the agony of his *duelling fever*, I beg leave to sit at him through the public press the following "paper bullets of the brain," which he can chew the balance of his life as a cure for the disease:

"Hon. G. W. CALDWELL:
Sir:—It seems that you learned after the late Congressional election, that the trumpeting of your mock military fame did not give your name the potency you anticipated. You very justly reflected that your heroism was not quite complete; you must shoot somebody! You resolved too, by a grand flourish of your small artillery, to hush up the mouths of all whigs for the future, in regard to the famous John Tyler affair. This out of your way,

the Governorship or any thing else you might desire, would be within your reach.

Amongst a thousand others, I chanced to have committed the "unpardonable sin," against the sanctity of your immanent name. You pass over all the rest and select me as "the felon worthy of your steel."

The communication you first send, (the Aug. 17th 1848,) after referring to the alleged offensive publication, is in the following formal pointed and dictatorial style:

"Now, sir, both of these communications especially the latter) consider a gross and unprovoked attack upon my character, for which I demand of you satisfaction."

"This note will be handed to you by Mr. E. C. Davidson who will act as my friend in this matter."

In your own language, sir, this was a communication under which I was compelled to "withdraw" or "fight." It was delivered to me at Morganton on the 21st of August. I at once determined to treat it as a challenge; for under such a "demand" I never could and never would open my lips.

In the course of my preparations, I had occasion to show it to such gentlemen as H. W. Guion, A. H. Caldwell and B. S. Guion Esqs., and to Dr. A. M. Henderson; they all concurred with me, [as Dr. H. has stated,] that it was "a direct invitation to the field." Your own conduct proves in what light you at first regarded it. Why all your parade, precaution and preparations? Why send your military friend over to Concord at the hour of *mid-night*? Why post him off in such hot haste 80 miles in your pursuit to Morganton? Why did you yourself leave Charlotte and go up to your mother's in Gaston? Why carry with you "the instruments?" Why your daily practice? The note speaks for itself a language which no gentleman could mistake. Your own conduct condemns you. The world will pronounce it a challenge—a peremptory challenge. And yet, sir, on the 27th of August, at the Catawba Springs, before I broke the seal of silence and without one intimation I ever would do so, you sit down, and in the very face of all your own parade and preparations, and with a full knowledge that I was there ready [as Dr. H. states] to deliver an acceptance and arrange the preliminaries for an immediate meeting in the field,—you sit down and say under your hand,

"IT WAS NOT INTENDED AS AN INVITATION TO THE FIELD."

Yes sir! You have done all this! I forced you to "withdraw" or "fight." You choose the former, and did it in a notable way! I care not what you intended—it was a deliberate, cowardly backout in every shape and form. But, sir, I well know at this time, that if I had been base and cowardly enough to have explained, with that paper in my pocket, your determination to publish it to the country as a challenge enclosing my withdrawal. If you intended a "fight," I made you begin the work of "withdrawing" yourself, and take back your challenge. If you intended a "bluff," I "out-bluffed" you, and made you swallow your own words. I beat you at your own game. On my side a "bluff" was as good as "bet." Yes, sir, you showed the white feather and *vamosed*!

After this I could well afford to explain. I really meant nothing personal. I, therefore, said so. But when I came to the bribery and corruption, the following was the best I could do:

"I merely intended charging you with political inconsistencies, particularly in voting while in Congress, for one of the peculiar measures of Mr. Tyler's administration; and I considered that in afterwards accepting office from Mr. Tyler, you laid yourself open to the imputation of having been more or less influenced by interested motives in giving that vote; but if in this I have done you individually a wrong, I have no hesitation in making you ample reparation."

I sent you this, and you returned it with the request that I would strike out all about the Tyler affair—from the words "political inconsistencies" down. I agreed to modify—but *utterly refused* to strike out what now remains. I determined to stick to my consistency. You had to accept it as it stands above! Mark you, the word "withdraw" (about which you prated so much,) was not in it at all. But next morning after the adjustment, you put on the garb of friendship and ask me to walk to the spring, and then solicit me, in order to render the meaning more explicit to common minds, to add the words "by withdrawing all expressions conveying any such imputation."

And yet, sir, with these facts fresh in your mind; with a full knowledge that they were known to Dr. Henderson and Mr. Davidson, and appear from the original letter itself, (in my possession,) you return to Mecklenburg, give your understampers the cue, and forthwith it is circulated over the whole country that I had backed out—had *withdrawn* every thing! Not only so, you afterwards begin a war of words against Dr. H. and myself, and assert with unshaking frontony, that you had forced me to "withdraw" or "fight," and that I had made "a clear and unqualified withdrawal of every word of" the Tyler charge! Can any conduct be more cowardly, more dastardly, more black and villainous? These things I have kept back expressly for this occasion?

The pretence which you now set up, sir for challenging me again, is silly, ridiculous, base and infamous enough! A miserable evasion and falsehood! I have gone over the whole history of this affair, to show you that *per-se* (as your friend Capt. Tyler used to say,) your cowardice and rascality have been such as to sink you forever beneath the notice of any honorable man. And on this distinct ground alone, I might refuse to receive your note at all. But what right have you to challenge me for the same matter, which has once been adjusted, and for which you have accepted satisfaction? You profess to be a student of the "code." I refer you to your books. The satisfaction you accepted, you must be content with. Your month is closed. But, sir, if I reiterated the charge in my last publication, you have also said that I "in substance, reiterated it" in my first. Why did you not then repeat, in substance, your challenge? Why sleep on it three weeks?

No, sir, this is a note of your hypocrisy. It is the black guilt of self-conviction that is troubling you. You get a trap for me, and caught yourself. The publication of the correspondence overwhelmed you with disgrace. Public opinion is the incu-

ble that presses upon you. You have seen the remark of a public print, that "I get" the gallant Caldwell; and "that the hero of the rebellion of 1847 has been made to haul in his horns." These are the things that sting you. They are gall and wormwood to your craven spirit. You first tried to "write" out the stain upon your character by defiling mine! You now want to try to "fight" it out. And after "it" is; after all that has passed between us; after once meeting you fairly and backing you out; then lashing you with contempt, sneer and ridicule; you again coolly ask me to accompany you to the field! You should remember that it is my boy's play first to run, and then bribe you and renew the battle. A meeting on the field would be a pretty affair, indeed, after the paper warfare which you lately began.

You have once before accepted satisfaction on paper, and discussed its merits "in print." I now prefer that you shall accept the same sort again; but on a more extensive scale. Neither my conscience, my honor, or my courage require that I should hereafter notice anything that may come from you or your friends in connection with this subject, in any shape or form. I shall continue to treat you with contempt and ridicule. You and they may one and all challenge as often as you please; may post, publish and picture me; may apply to me the whole vocabulary of Fish Market and Billingsgate; may descend to the dogs, and call me "puppy, whelp and hound;" but you cannot drive me from my propriety. "I will laugh at your calamities." Every effort to extricate yourself but plunges you deeper in the mire. You can neither live out, nor wash away the stain. You may fight, as Jackson said of Pakenham, like a "brave fool," but the dye will continue to stick. Through life, the awful words will continue to resound in your ears—"It was not intended as an invitation to the field."

I am now done with you. I am a man of peace, but I warn you not to try my "science of self-defence." Take my advice and doff the military; attend to the business of life; and, above all, "Never thirst for gore again!"

RUFUS BARRINGER.
Concord, Oct. 4, 1849.

P. S. I told Capt. Hoke, (Capt. C's new friend!) I would return an answer at the Tuskegee Ford on the 5th. I will get the Stage Driver to scatter the "Nest" and "Journal" all along the Road. I hope Capt. C. will not think himself "headed" in this move. I confess I rather "burst up" the technicalities of the code. But in resisting military combinations, I think a *surprise* decidedly the most effectual mode of warfare.

R. B.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1849.

TEMPERANCE CELEBRATION.
The Grand Division of the Order of the Sons of Temperance, now in session in this City, held a public Celebration on Wednesday evening last, at the Presbyterian Church, which was very imposing and interesting in its character, besides being attended by a very large and brilliant auditory of our citizens. The Procession was formed in front of Temperance Hall, at about 7 o'clock, consisting of the Cadets, members of Phoenix and Concord Divisions, Visiting Brethren, and the members of the Grand Division, in their splendid Regalia, all bearing lantern transparencies—preceded by a Band of Music, and attended by a large concourse of spectators, the long line of some 250 "Sons" filed through the streets to the Church. We have never seen a more beautiful sight—the City of Raleigh was completely taken up—and when we reflect, that among their ranks, could be found men, high in station, lofty in character, and of the most brilliant talents of which our State can boast, our readers will agree with us, in the estimate we place upon this imposing display.

The exercises in the Church were very interesting. After the brethren had sung their Opening Ode, the Throne of Grace was addressed by the Rev. Chaplain, L. K. WYLER; after which, followed an eloquent and able speech from the Rev. BENNETT T. BLAKE; at the conclusion of which, a rich and beautiful Banner, prepared by the Young Ladies of the Select School of this City, was presented to Phoenix Division—the presentation address being delivered in a graceful manner, by Miss COOK, one of the fair donors.—The Banner was received, on the part of the Division by J. J. LITCHFORD, Esq., their Worthy Patriarch, whose address in reply was handsome and appropriate. S. W. WHITING, Esq., then arose, and delivered a speech of some half hour in length, which we regard as one of the most finished productions we have ever listened to on that subject, and which received, as it well deserved, the most marked attention from the vast assemblage. The Closing Ode was then sung, the audience dismissed with the Benediction from the Rev. Chaplain, and the Procession re-formed, which marched through several of the principal streets, and after saluting the Young Ladies of the Select School, returned to their Hall, when the lights were extinguished and the whole crowd quietly dispersed. The utmost good order and propriety prevailed throughout; and we cannot doubt that the impression produced upon our community was of a deep and salutary character.

The Grand Division, we learn, is pretty fully attended; and as their business is important, connected with the unparalleled spread of the Order in the State, within the last twelve months, it is probable their session will continue through the week.

MR. CALHOUN.
The Columbia (S. C.) Telegraph of the 8th inst., in publishing the statement emanating from the Philadelphia American and Gazette, that Mr. Calhoun contemplated resigning his seat in the Senate, says:

"A rumor has been going the rounds of the press to the effect that Mr. Calhoun contemplated resigning his seat in the Senate at an early day."

"We have it in our power to state on good authority that no such intention has been either expressed or entertained by Mr. Calhoun, and that the rumor is entirely without foundation."

FRANKLIN SUPERIOR COURTS.
We learn that the trial of Alexander S. Moore, charged with aiding and abetting Whitfield, in the murder of a negro belonging to Mr. Weldon E. Person, came off on Wednesday week at Lenoirburg—Judge BARTON presiding. The Attorney General having, for personal reasons satisfactory to the Judge, and all parties, declined to manage the prosecution, Messrs. G. W. Hayward and Busbee appeared for the State, and Messrs. Badger, Gilliam, Miller and Thomas, for the prisoner. A deep and absorbing interest was felt in the trial, and after a long and patient investigation by the Court, the jury being out no more than half an hour, returned a verdict of *Acquittal*.

The new Court House is nearly completed.—The Commissioners and workmen deserve credit for the progress they have made. It will be a handsome building, and how much more comfortable and secure than the old office! There will be safety to the records of the Courts and title deeds of the people to their property. Well done people of old Franklin!

The Richmond Whig concludes an article upon "the Elections in Maryland," as follows: "In the meantime upon the issue of majority, will devolve the responsibility of defeating or sustaining the Wilnot Proviso, as applied to California; and as there cannot be a doubt, judging from the Oregon case, of the manner in which this will be done, we congratulate the people of Maryland and North Carolina upon the last wisdom by which their course in the late elections was directed."

This sneer at these two Whig States comes with a peculiar good grace from Virginia—that State which has never voted for a Whig President—and which really lost the House of Representatives to the Whigs, while getting the "lion's share" of the honors and patronage of the Government! For who does not see that, in losing almost the whole of the Congressional delegation at the last election, Virginia is the State really culpable. North Carolina held her own—we stand as we did before—but Virginia lost us some four or five members.

The Editors of the Whig are gallant and able champions of our cause, for whom we have much respect and admiration. But if they could drop a little of that Virginia pride, and Virginia prejudice against North Carolina, we should like them much better. At any rate, until the Whigs of this State fall or fail in their duty, it is rather hard, not to say ungenerous, to be twitted with the loss of the House of Representatives—especially from that quarter.

The "Hornet's Nest" has become quite a pet with the Opposition presses in North Carolina; and accordingly they pat its Editor on the back, in a very loving and patronising manner. They copy his articles with a gusto they cannot conceal, and a sly laugh in the sleeve, at the good service rendered them. If they can only get the Whig party of the State divided, by whatever means, their success is the more probable. Hence we see the consummate Locofoes of the Lincoln Republican climbing in, and prating about the influence of the Raleigh Clique; and commending the course of the Hornet's Nest in this wise: "It was bold in the Democratic platform," &c. How very flattering! Bold, eh! We shall see how his *courage* holds out.

THE AURORA.
We are gratified to learn from Mr. Toole, that the number of subscribers already received to the Aurora is sufficient to justify his enterprise. He requests those holding subscription lists to send him the names received by the 1st of November, the date of the issue of the first number. His address is Wilmington, N. C.
North Carolina papers generally are requested to copy.
We published, last week, an extract from the Alabama Beacon, revealing a mode of cleaning clothes without washing. Of course we were not aware that this was a Patent invention—for one or two other papers in the State had published it before we did. We learn, however, that Maurice Q. Waddill, Esq. of Pittsboro, owns the Patent right for North Carolina, it being Tibbitt's method of washing and cleaning clothes, from whom he purchased.
We believe, from the slight trial made in our family, that the Patent for washing clothes is really expedient, an effectual method, and very valuable to housekeepers. Mr. W. has published a Card, making known his rights in the matter—and of course, our readers who wish to use the mode, will know where to apply for the right.

NATIONAL MONUMENT.
We observe that the Grand Lodge of Odd Fellows, at their recent meeting, instructed a committee of that body to select and have prepared a block of marble, to be placed in the National Monument to the memory of Washington, now in the course of erection in Washington. This is to be done on behalf of the Odd Fellows of the United States, as a testimony of the regard they entertain for the memory of him, who was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."
This is a most excellent idea; and we trust to see it followed up by other similar Institutions of the country. We belong to but one Order—that of the Sons of Temperance. We hope the Grand Divisions of each State will take this matter up, and provide each a block, to be placed in this monument, on behalf of the constituency they represent. The Grand Division in this State is now in session here—and we mention this matter in the hope it may attract the attention of its members.