

from the neighborhood of the mine, who was here a few days ago, encourages us to hope that a strong feeling has been excited in favor of the West, and that the people of the West generally will yet come forward liberally with subscription. It is very evident that their interests are deeply concerned in its success. They can be secured in the means of transporting their goods in wagons, unless they are building this road. From the contents of these articles, their weight and importance are not to be overlooked. It is a disproportion to their bulk, and transportation in wagons must be vast, and expensive than by rail roads. They are content to plod on as usual, and sacrifice the immense profits which the mere difference of transportation would give them? We think not.—Fay Obs.

A few weeks since we were the accidental drowning of a man in the Licking River, and the preservation of another, named by the heroic conduct of a Mrs. Jones, who plunged in the stream, and rescued him from the hands of his fellows. Mr. Jones, we are a young man of fortune and high position, and immediately after the event he made enquiries respecting the preservation of his life, and ascertained that she was a young widow, he offered her a handsome sum, which was accepted, and the parties were joined in wedlock the next Sunday—three days after their first meeting at the waters. Mr. Lee, now Mrs. Jones, can congratulate herself upon having "fished" a husband with the most entire success, and from the most laudible motives.—Lexington Intelligencer.

COMMUNICATION.

FOR THE STAR.

Mr. Editor: I have just finished reading the structure on the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, published in the number of a Review, edited by Messrs. C. C. Smith and J. W. Alderson, of Washington City. It is not for the first time that I have read a work of this kind, and I am glad to find that the authors have not been misled by the strong presumption and disconcerting tendency. Our lots are surely cast in many respects, for no opinion, however ancient or respectable the authority by which they are pronounced—no truth in morals or politics, however strong and lucid the reasons by which it is supported—is free from the vile touch of the feudal spirit, which is walking abroad on the earth, seeking what it can pollute or destroy; and, at every stride, upon some monument of virtue and order. Who the writers of these structures is we do not know; but the thing is certain, that had his language been courteous, and his arguments stamped with common sense and less poetic pedantry, he would have found more favor in the eyes of intelligent men. That man must be ignorant or maliciously wicked, who would attempt, even indirectly, to break down the only judicial tribunal which the Constitution of the United States has established to administer justice and expound its laws. We can assure ourselves that the writer of this article is not ignorant in jurisprudence, for he seems, at least, to have a pretty good acquaintance with men and things, and would presume from the flourish he makes, as he has been sitting in council with many lords both of law and of poetry. We must give it with the candor of the reader to say whether the other alternative is suited to him, or he applies to the Supreme Court, as formerly organized, the polite epithets, "a high judicial tribunal," "an institution reaching after universal dominion," "issuing opinions couched in grandiloquent language, of which the taste is as false as the law and logic," "arbitrarily reversing State decrees," "arrogating despotic discretion," "sending forth prolix and mediate political disquisitions." What very gentlemanly and courteous language! We would be really gratified to know who this new judge is, who is attempting to teach constitutional law to one of the ablest courts in the world, and who, no doubt, make Chief Justice Marshall "hide his diminished head," if the good old man could visit us again from his home. But rely upon it, all this is not done without an object. It is not prompted by mere vanity. The first paragraph stamps upon the resolution its true features. "The renovation of the Supreme Court by the creation of seven new members under the auspices of the Democratic ascendancy, may be regarded as the closing of an old and the opening of a new era in its history." And has it come to this, that political favoritism is to be incorporated into the judicial tribunals, and that party spirit is to be the test of legal ability and honest opinion? The paragraph betrays in bold relief, the intention of the writer. It can be nothing else but to excite a prejudice against the Court, and rather its former decisions, as its present members have been renovated; by enlisting political predilections. And why should this be? Their duties are not, directly or indirectly, connected with the politics of the day. Indeed it should be the object of every man who loves his country to keep them free from such influence. The great questions which they have to decide are based on truth—on foundations which are immutable, and high above all excitement. Should the persons who have to expound them be swayed by the low—contemptible motives which characterize the partizan? This writer would acknowledge that they should be above such influence, and argues the contrary as an objection to the old Supreme Court. Why then, should this very evil which he repudiates, be a recommendation—an indispensable recommendation? But this is not all. This wise adviser—this new light which shines through the medium of the "Washington Review," has discovered another great defect in the Supreme Court. It is not "responsible to public opinion," he says. And pray what would be the consequence of making it responsible to such an umpire? Is public opinion stable? What may be the opinion of the public to-day may be changed before to-morrow. Must the Court change with it? Must its decisions of yesterday be reversed to-morrow, because public opinion is not what it was? Is the Court sworn to follow or protect public opinion? Under such a state of things who can calculate on any stability in our national jurisprudence—in the laws by which property and life are to be protected? Can you expect independence in the Judges when answering to such a fluctuating, unstable supervision? They upon it, so soon as the Judiciary of a country becomes subservient to popular opinion, it is blown about by every blast of political party, that very moment will the safeguards of liberty and good order be overturned. In times of emergency they will forget that they are sworn to protect the Constitution and Laws, and fear

and ambition will both operate to plunge them into the current of popular excitement. Instead of resisting aggression they will participate in it. In court they will be the dupes of the passions of the people, and will undermine their institutions. We do not wish to be considered as endorsing that doctrine which should respect public opinion. By no means. It should induce them to look carefully at the duties before them—to examine well the ground of their opinions—to gather light, if possible, from its suggestions. But to make them dependent, is not less cruel than absolute despotism, but far more contemptible, because too timid to unmask itself. For our own part, we regard an independent Judiciary as one of the surest pillars of the Constitution, without which, we may anticipate those scenes that characterized the French Revolution—when the very foundations of society were broken up—when confusion and bloodshed usurped the places of virtue and good government, and the very soil, satiated with felicity, refused to drink in the blood which was shed in their violation.

But what, let us enquire, are the evidences of usurpation in the Supreme Court, in the estimation of this writer, who seems so very much struck with his own superior candor and legal acumen as to charge it with reaching after "universal dominion?" The decisions which mostly disturb his peace of mind and haunt his Jacobinical slumbers, are those establishing the doctrine contained in *Fletcher v. Peck* (6 Cranch's Rep. 87.) In this case the Court declared that "a repeal by one of the States of a law under which rights had vested did not divest those rights;"—that Georgia had no constitutional authority to revoke a grant of land previously made. The arguments urged in defence of the authority, are drawn from the supposed omnipotence of the Legislature—that that of one cannot bind a subsequent Legislature—that if it were binding, the action of succeeding Legislatures might be completely forestalled and annulled. There is an erroneous impression abroad, (particularly among those who have not the means of examining) in relation to this vital question. It may afford some apology for recurring to those reasons which would seem to strike at once the mind of every reflecting man. The Constitution of the United States declares in Article I, Section 10: "No State shall pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts." A contract, both in its legal and ordinary acceptance, means an agreement between two or more persons to do or not to do a certain thing, and is either executory or executed. It is an executed contract where its inducement or object has been performed, and executory when it is to be performed in future. Now the framers of the Constitution must certainly have had in view both these species of contract. The language is general, without qualification and free from ambiguity. That a State is able to make a contract when not forbidden by the Constitution will hardly be denied. Did not the grant of Georgia partake of all the qualities of a contract? The land was transferred for a valuable consideration. The title of the grantor was completely extinguished, and an agreement implied that he would not re-assert that title. Would no contract be violated—no obligation impaired by revoking it and retaking the land? It would be doing violence to the express language of the Constitution and impugning the wisdom of its framers, to suppose that a State under the prohibition "shall pass no law impairing the obligation of contracts," is bound to protect contracts between individuals, but may, at pleasure, weaken, impair and annul its own. The founders of our government knew the danger of party excitement, and were fully aware that in a moment of political ardor the Legislature might pass laws which would violate the rights of property. But who can fail to see the results of such a dissolution? How many persons in the community would hold their lands free from the caprice of the Legislature? It is only necessary that it should pass an act revoking grants, many of which were made half a century ago. If the right is conceded to impair one species of contracts and not another, who is to draw the distinction? Has the Constitution done it? The Legislature passes an act granting to B for a valuable consideration one of the public lots in the City of Raleigh. B improves it—builds upon it and in course of time it becomes a valuable piece of property. Can a subsequent Legislature revoke that grant and resume the lot? Again: The Legislature grants to a number of persons a charter to erect a Rail Road through a section of the State. Stock is subscribed—property vested—the road completed. Has the Legislature a right under the Constitution to revoke that charter, when there has been no misuser or non-user, and destroy the Road? Have not rights vested under it? Is it not a contract? If you grant it the right to take back the whole charter, you must likewise allow the power to resume a part. Suppose then there is a provision, that the company, in consideration of their keeping up the road for the convenience of the community, shall be entitled to the toll originating from the transportation of passengers and produce. Will any one contend that the Legislature can deprive them of the toll by requiring them to perform such transportation free of charge?

prime Court so gravely charged by the Washington City Reviewer?

But even supposing the Constitution of the United States had placed no such prohibition on the States as that of which we have been speaking—can the doctrine be defended on the ground of policy or good faith? Is not such violation of national honor repugnant to the spirit of our State Government? If Great Britain were (and the Parliament is as omnipotent as any legislative body on earth) to pass an act annulling the national debt and exonerating her obligations to her creditors, would any man be found to defend it? Could it be defended on any principle of law and justice? That she has the power is true; but would there not still remain the same moral and legal liability? Can our party—can nations, rescind, at will, their own contracts when they hold individuals bound whatever may be the result? If they can, then what security is there for the innumerable seminaries of learning—the benevolent associations—the immense schemes for internal improvement, and many other works which are so spread abroad and plenty over the land? Are they all to be liable to be swept away by the breath of the Legislature?

We have watched with painful anxiety the progress of such threatening errors. How dreadful in their consequences we may not know until it is too late to apply the remedy! We entreat the people therefore to look at these things—to see how near to destruction such doctrines are forcing their property and lives. There are many who are still making an attempt, a bold and reckless attempt, to break down the great landmarks of the Constitution and to erect in their places the disorganizing and cruel principles of Jacobinism! WILL THE PEOPLE APPROVE—WILL THE PEOPLE SUFFER IT?

THE STAR

RALEIGH, MAY 2, 1838.

Glorious Whig Triumph!

"The cry is still they come!"

BALTIMORE is redeemed! Mr. Kennedy, the Whig candidate has been elected by a majority of 800 votes over the Foco Foco candidate. The rout of the Loco Foco is complete. Never before were they so broken up and discomfited. They strained every nerve, resorted to every artifice, however base and grovelling; but they have signally failed. Well done Baltimore! Hurra for the land of Carroll! Whig majority in the city 620.

Little **RHODE ISLAND** has also enrolled her name upon the bright list of regenerated States. The elections which have just terminated there show a great whig gain. Governor Sprague (Whig) is elected by 400 majority, and the Senatorial whig majority is still larger. In the Legislature the whigs have a majority of 25 on joint ballot.

From **VIRGINIA** we learn that there is no doubt of the election of Mr. Slaughter, the whig candidate, over Mr. Linn Banks, the Van Buren, Sub-Treasury candidate, to fill the vacancy made by Mr. Patton's resignation. This is to be regarded as a clear development of public opinion in that district against the Sub-Treasury and the party, as Mr. Banks is a most popular gentleman, and extensively known for many years past as Speaker of the House of Delegates. This news at the present juncture from the Old Dominion is peculiarly gratifying, and augurs well for the success of the whigs in the late contest there.

With these victories pouring in upon us from all quarters—the most ancient and respectable members of the Confederacy re-asserting their rights with a spirit lofty and decisive as that which animated them in by-gone times—is it possible that North Carolina, once foremost in the career of freedom—is it possible, we ask in view of the position of her sister States, of what she has been, and what she may be, that she will falter now, or come but feebly to the rescue? We ardently hope not. The summer campaign is approaching. LET EVERY MAN DO HIS DUTY—else he is no son of North Carolina!

It will be perceived from the Congressional proceedings in another column, that Mr. Grundy's bill imposing a heavy penalty and imprisonment for the issue by the U. S. Bank of Pennsylvania of its own notes, has passed the Senate! We ask when and where will Federal aggression cease? Not content with destroying a valuable fiscal agent of the Government, the Democratic party, with a malignity scarcely paralleled in the barbarous ages, and wholly unworthy of a high-minded and free people, are yet pursuing the shadow of that institution, now chosen to represent the voice of the people it is vested in whom all political power is vested. This however does not make the Legislature omnipotent. In all regulated governments—in all governments where liberty and good order prevail there are Constitutions. By these Constitutions the people place restrictions on moral turpitude. The majority must indeed govern, but it can govern in no other way than it has promised by its own Constitution, previously recommended and approved. If any other doctrine were sanctioned such a supreme law as a Constitution would be a mere mockery. There would be no protection for the rights of the minority, and the Legislature claiming to represent the wish of the majority would violate every right sacred to man. Such a despotism would be worse than that of a Tiberius or Caligula—for who would not prefer a master to a thousand? Such an argument then would make our government in practice a despotism—without restriction, without limitation of power.

A corporation is an artificial being—existing in contemplation of law—and vested under its charter with certain rights and powers. Blackstone (2 Com. 37) defines it "a franchise for a number of persons to be incorporated and exist as a body politic, with power to maintain succession and do corporate acts, and each individual of such corporation is said to have a franchise or freedom." It must be apparent then that the parties to the grant or charter of a corporation are the Government or Legislature and the individual members of that corporation. The one the grantor and the others the grantees. Under it each has certain rights and is bound by certain obligations. Is one party privileged to violate the obligations which the other has assumed in respect to the performance of his? That can be certainly not law, and the common sense of any one will tell him that there is no justice in such a principle. The cases of *Ferret v. Taylor*, (9 Cranch Rep. 43), *Sturges v. Crowninshield* (4 Wheat 122), *Chambers v. Woodard* (16 518), contain lucid and forcible refutations of the doctrines here advanced but feebly to expose. Can such be evidence of usurpation in the Su-

Mr. Cambreleg, the Van leader, in the House, has reported a bill to create a species of permanent Government bank-notes, irredeemable, which the Secretary of the Treasury may put into circulation, whenever and as often as he pleases. These notes are not to benefit the people—no—they are to be issued for a different purpose—to pay the debts of the government. To whom? To the public creditors of course—the people! How long will they remain at par? One day? We think not. They must depreciate—and the people will be forced to become sufferers. **HOW LONG WILL THE PEOPLE SLEEP!**

The Southern democrats are clamorous against Mr. Clay's high tariff principles. Who voted for the Compromise act? John C. Calhoun. With the South—will a single true Southern man—Van Buren or otherwise condemn his course on that question. We believe not. Who voted with John C. Calhoun? HENRY CLAY. Who proposed this salutary measure of reconciliation between the high contending parties? HENRY CLAY. Who voted against this measure? MR. VAN BUREN'S NORTHERN FRIENDS. We can prove it. Who voted for the Abomination bill of '28? MARTIN VAN BUREN. Who sought recently to disturb the Compromise Act? VAN BUREN, WRIGHT, BENTON & Co. These are FACTS and we hope the people will weigh them and determine who are and who are not for us.

THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.

We are highly gratified to state that there is at last a prospect of settling the dispute between the United States and Mexico amicably. It appears from a message of the President presented in the House of Representatives on the 27th ult. that a direct proposition has been made by the Government of Mexico to refer the differences between that Republic and this to the arbitration of a third power, and that the offer has been accepted by the President of the United States.

BANK CONVENTION.

Some account of the proceedings of this body was given to our readers last week; since which we have learned, from an authentic source, the following additional interesting particulars:

The proposition recommending the 1st of October as the day of resumption, was carried in the committee by mere numerical strength, not by the amount of capital represented—the great controlling power over the currency, and which must, after all, be the final arbiter of this important question. Its influence was felt in the decision of the Convention. Various propositions were submitted, which were feebly and fully discussed; in which, it affords us pleasure to state, North Carolina took a firm and zealous stand in support of the earliest day in every instance, even cordially uniting with New York in favor of the 10th of this month; thereby giving the strongest evidence of the sincerity of the desire and confident ability of our banks to resume at any moment, when they can have the co-operation of their sister institutions, particularly those of Virginia, whose banks are responsible, and with which alone the banks of this State can resume and maintain specie payments. But by a recent act of the Virginia Legislature, her banks are protected in suspension until the 1st of January. It therefore became necessary, in order to an earlier resumption by our banks, to prevail on their neighbors to give up a portion of the immunity granted them by the act; and, in a highly commendable spirit, they consented to yield half, and support the proposition to resume on the 1st October. But it was all unavailing. A majority of the Convention resented every attempt to fix upon an earlier period than the 1st of January, 1839; and the vote on that question was as follows: *Yeas*—Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, District of Columbia, Virginia, North Carolina, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, *Nays*—New York, because bound by law to resume 10th May—Mississippi, because too soon for her. Maryland withdrew, because she was opposed to designating a day; and the following States were not represented at all: New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Georgia, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Michigan.

It is proper to remark that it is still doubtful when the work of resumption will actually take place. The resolution of the Convention is not imperative, (tho' North Carolina at least insisted on having it so), but commendatory. It may commence much earlier, or it may be delayed longer than the time mentioned. Such is the course of trade and consequent current of circulation, that there is a regular chain of connexion and dependency between the banks from the South to the North. Pennsylvania must therefore move before Maryland, Maryland before Virginia, and Virginia before North Carolina can resume.

Whenever, therefore, the banks of Pennsylvania shall lead the way, if to-morrow, the work of general resumption will commence, and not sooner.

"It is a fact worthy of remark, that the Bank of the State has in its vaults at least half as much specie as all the 26 Associated Banks of Boston.

It will be seen that the Duelling Committee has reported resolutions for the expulsion of Mr. Graves from the House, and for the severe sentence by the House of Messrs. Wise and Jones, the seconds.

The Bank of Cape Fear has declared a dividend, preparatory to admitting the new Stockholders, of 4 1-2 per cent, payable on this day. We understand that after making this dividend, and allowance for all bad debts, a surplus of about 2 per cent. was still left on hand. *Fay Obs.*

Important to Pensioners.—The Pension Department at Washington has given notice, that in accordance with an act of the present session of Con-

gress, all Pensioners who do not claim and receive their pensions within eight months after they are due, are required to apply to the Department itself, where only they will be paid.

It may be well to add, (since the fact of the Agent here being unable to pay pensioners for want of funds, has been noticed in a Western paper,) that funds have lately been supplied, and all who apply are now paid.

Mr. Patton, of Va., has issued an address to his former constituents, in which he animadverts very freely upon some of the measures of the late and present administration. We take the following paragraph from his address.

"If I may assume the privilege of admonition—which I hope you will excuse, in consideration of my sincere and zealous anxiety for the welfare of those who have so long and so generously confided in me—let me beg of you, never put your trust in the fillety or virtue of any politician; whose chief claim to your support is placed, not on the soundness of his principles, but on his professions of devotion to a party."

CHEROKEES.—There seems to be but little doubt now, but that the whites will have to encounter serious difficulties, when they attempt to enforce the late Treaty with the Cherokee tribe of Indians: a great deal of excitement already prevails among the settlers on the frontier, from the reluctance which the Indians have evinced to leave the country. A Correspondent writes from Waynesville, says: "From all I can learn, I do not believe that the Indians have the most distant idea of removing; I am informed that they are making more improvements and greater preparations for a crop, than they have ever done heretofore, though one cause of that may be, owing to the fact that the commissioners have been recently valuing their improvements which may have stimulated them to industry, with the expectation of being paid for their labor white men who have been among them, tell me, that the Indians say, that they never will leave the country; that they will die first, but at the same time disclaim all intention of fighting. I do not think that they will embody themselves and make general battle; they have no means of carrying on a war. They are almost entirely destitute of ammunition and means of obtaining it. It seems to be the general impression, that when they find that they are to be removed by force, they will retreat to the large mountains where they can effectually conceal themselves during the summer season. When they find that all their efforts to escape from the white man are ineffectual, that the Treaty must inevitably be enforced and they removed, then, and not till then, it is believed that they will fight; they will then become desperate, and sell their lives as dear as possible. It is thought that they have not resolved on any thing definitely as yet, nor will they until John Ross returns from Washington, who exercises absolute control over them." *Rutherford Gazette.*

Texas.—The New Orleans Bulletin of Thursday last, is much alarmed at the tenor of private advices from England, that the British government is about to acknowledge the Independence of Texas, and thus destroy all hope of its annexation to the United States.

Stocks have risen astonishingly in New York within a week or two. Some of them as much as ten per cent. United States Bank stock rose from 108 1-2 to 115.

THE SKIN CURRENCY.

Our readers no doubt recollect the old law of the "State of Franklin," lately cited by Mr. Webster, in his speech on the currency. That law (made before the country was afflicted with bank notes) was as follows:

"He is elected by the General Assembly of the State of Franklin, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, That from the first day of January, A. D. 1789, the salaries of the civil officers of this Commonwealth be as follows, to wit:

"His excellency the governor, per annum, one thousand deer skins; his honor, the chief justice, five hundred deer do.; the attorney general, five hundred deer do.; the secretary to his excellency the Governor, five hundred reason deer do.; the treasurer of the State, four hundred fifty deer do.; each county clerk, three hundred beaver do.; clerk of the house of commons, two hundred reason deer do.; members of assembly, per annum, three deer do.; justice's fee for signing a warrant, one muskrat do.; to the constable, for serving a warrant, one muskrat do."

Mr. Webster, we are told, commented with much humour on the appropriateness of paying the constables in Mink skins, by reason of the resemblance between them in character and pursuits. Upon this principle, should the skin currency come again into fashion, we suppose it would be distributed among the present officers of our government somewhat thus:

To His Excellency Martin Van Buren, President of the United States, per annum, twenty-five thousand fox skins.

To Amos Kendall, Postmaster General, six thousand hyena skins.

To the Secretary of State, six thousand goat skins.

To Levi Woodbury, Secretary of the Treasury, six thousand ass skins, of the largest size.

To Thomas H. Benton, Senator one bear skin.

To Gen. Jesup, Commander against the Indians, one squaw skin.

To R. M. Johnson, Vice President, one black sheep skin, with the wool and horns.

To Blair, Administration editor, one snake skin.

To Cralle, second Administration editor, for his services for and against "the hard money humbug," one chameleon skin.—*&c. &c. Col. Tel.*

MARRIED.

In this county, on the 5th inst. by William Laws, Mr. Thomas I. Roges to Miss Eliza A. Mangum, daughter of Col. James Mangum.

DIED.

In Newbern, on Monday last, Mr. Archer Tench, of this City.

In Kingston, on Sunday, the 24th of March, Mrs. Sarah C. Keavis consort of Turner Keavis, and youngest daughter of the late John Gatlin, Esq.

Master science, genius, and friendship! Weep with his disconsolate wife and three bereaved little children, for their own orna-

ment and friend, Doctor John Haywood, of Bertie, N. Carolina, is numbered with the dead. It is to record but half his worth, to say there lies the found husband, the tender parent, the faithful friend, the generous statesman, the skillful and accomplished Physician, the public spirited and excellent citizen, who died on the 18th inst. in W. Ingham, the theatre of his usefulness & the practice of his many virtues since A. D. 1826, of that fearful destroyer Pneumonia Typhoides, which quickly rent asunder the silver chord, and all the delicate ties which bound him to life, and in the midst of his usefulness and prom-

As a Graduate of the University of Pennsylvania in 1824, he highly honored his Alma Mater. His fine intellect, ripened by high culture, admirably guided his nice discriminating judgement, and stamped decision and energy upon his movements in the chamber of disease, and aided as he was by great amenity of manners and kindness of heart, give him a hold upon the public confidence and affection possessed by very few. Nor was he surpassed by any that in expansive benevolence which impelled him regardless of the perils to his own health, to fly, at the call, to the relief of suffering humanity; and to this the finest clarity of our nature, he finally fell a martyr, in the prime of life, in the vigor of manhood, and blest with all that earth could bestow, to cheer him on in his career of usefulness and disinterestedness.

The county of Bertie—in truth, the whole State, should mourn the loss of such a man, for his death is truly a public calamity.

It is however consoling indeed, amid the mournful circumstances of dying, to reflect, that Christianity, though unable to divert the stroke of death, yet extracts its sting, and casts a flood of glory, to light the departing spirit in its onward flight to its eternal rest. Farewell! dear shades! forgive the tear which friendship sheds to thy departed worth, who in years gone by, was long thy associate in business, and who, though now, far away, deeply sympathizes with thy bereaved family and friends.

Raleigh N. C. April 26, 1839.

Most awful Steamboat Accident.

The boilers of the Steamboat *Moselle*, with 200 passengers on board, exploded near Cincinnati on the 25th ult., and horrible to relate, tore the boat into atoms, and killed about 125 of the passengers! The accident is attributed to the imprudence of the captain, in attempting to show off the speed of his boat. He too lost his life.

AWFUL CONFLAGRATION.—Accounts from Charleston state that a destructive fire was raging there when the paper was put to press. It commenced in the morning, and as late as two o'clock was still progressing with great fury.

Virginia Elections. Things thus far are very cheering, and a Whig triumph is anticipated. Twelve counties, and three towns send 17 whigs, 1 Conservative, and only 3 Administration.

Valuable City Property.

FOR SALE.

Pursuant to a decree of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, I shall expose to public sale at the premises, on Friday, the 15th day of June next, the very desirable residence in the City of Raleigh, situated on the corner of Hillsboro' and McDowell Streets, formerly occupied by Miss P. Gedy, as a Boarding House.

The lot contains three-fourths of an acre, the Dwelling House is large and commodious, with 12 rooms, all necessary out-houses, and a fine garden, and, though sufficiently retired for a private family, is very convenient to the business part of the City. To residents of the lower country, desiring of securing a healthy and pleasant situation, the present affords a very favorable opportunity. Persons wishing to examine the premises before the day of sale, may do so, by applying to the Substretor, or Mr. Thomas Loring. Possession will be given on the first day of January next.

TERMS, which will be liberal, made known on day of sale.

G. W. MORDECAI, Commissioner.

Raleigh, April 27, 1838 19 7w

State of North Carolina, County of Franklin.

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, March Term, 1838.

Yarborough & Foster } Petition for Partition of Lots
John James Jones and }
William Willie Jones }

It appearing to the satisfaction of the Court that the defendants in this case reside beyond the limits of this State, so that the ordinary process of the law cannot reach them; it is ordered by the Court that publication be made in the Raleigh Star, for six successive weeks, that unless the said defendants appear at the next term of the said Court, to be held at the Court House in Louisburg, on the second Monday of June next, and then answer or demur to the said petition, the same will be taken pro confesso and partition made accordingly.

Attest S. PATTERSON, C. C. C.

Louisburg, April 24, 1838 19 6w

State of North Carolina, County of Franklin.

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, March Term, 1838.


Adolphus Reed } Petition for dower of
Jesse Pesson }
John Littleton Reed }
Elizabeth Ann Stark }
and Susan M. Reed }

It appearing to the satisfaction of the Court that the defendants John Littleton Reed, Elizabeth Ann Stark and Susan M. Reed, reside in the State of Virginia, and that the process of this Court cannot reach them; it is ordered that publication be made in the Raleigh Star, for six successive weeks, that unless the said defendants appear at the next term of the said Court to be held at the Court House in Louisburg, on the second Monday in June next, and then answer or demur to the said petition, it will be taken pro confesso and dower ordered accordingly.

Attest S. PATTERSON, C. C. C.

Louisburg, April 24, 1838 19 6w

STRAYED



From the subscriber, at Major Thomas Hester's, on the 10th March last, a Sorrel Mare, five years old this Spring, marked with a star in the forehead, left hind foot white above the fetlock quite wild (although ploughed last summer) she was heard of at Crowder Keyser's a few days after going off, 13 miles west of Louisburg. Any information will be thankfully received, and any reasonable sum paid for her delivery to me, 3 miles South of Louisburg.

LOUKARD H. AYFORD.

Franklin co., April 23, 1838. 19 4w