THE RALEIGH REGISTER.

"Ours' are the plans of fair, delightful peace;
Unwarped by party rage, to live like brothers."

RALEIGH, N. C.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, DEC. 29, 1852.

THE LONG AGONY OVER!

The LEGISLATURE adjourned, *sine die*, on Monday, at 8¼ o'clock, P. M., after the longest sessi[illegible] of that body ever held in North Carolina—[illegible]ing extended through *eighty-five* days! Whi[illegible] we are free to admit that much important [illegible]islation has been effected, we are still compelled to express our regret, that so many things have been imperfectly done, and that so many other things, which had paramount claims upon the attention of the Legislature, have been left *undone*.

No Legislature that ever assembled in the State had so fair an opportunity of building up for itself an enviable fame as the late locofoco Legislature. Had they passed the necessary bills for arranging the Senatorial and Congressional Districts in *proper time*, as they might easily have done, and elected a United States Senator, and gone home by the 1st of December, it would have been well for them and still better for the State. Even if they had done nothing to promote the interests of the people, they could at least have pleaded in extenuation, *that they had but lightly taxed the Treasury!*

Our readers will find, under the proper head, the most important items of legislation that have transpired since our last notice. As will be seen, the last week has been, emphatically, *the* working week of the session—the Senatorial and Congressional Districts, both, having been laid off, and a Judge of the Superior Court, a Council of State, &c., having been elected. Nor, among other items, should we neglect to call attention to the passage of the bill making an appropriation for a *survey* of the contemplated Eastern and Western extensions of the Central Railroad. True, the prospective subscription, upon the part of the State, has been stricken out; but, under the circumstances, it is a triumph to have accomplished even so much as has been effected, and augurs a favorable inclination towards the ultimate success of this gigantic and important enterprise.

The Senatorial Districts, as laid off for the next twenty years, stand thus:

Pasquotank and Perquimans; Camden and Currituck; Gates and Chowan; Washington and Martin; Northampton; Hertford; Bertie; Tyrrell and Hyde; Halifax; Edgecombe; Pitt; Beaufort; Craven; Carteret and Jones; Onslow; Greene and Lenoir; New Hanover; Duplin; Bladen, Brunswick and Columbus; Cumberland; Sampson; Wayne; Johnston; Wake; Nash; Franklin; Warren; Granville; Person; Orange; Randolph and Alamance; Chatham; Moore and Montgomery; Richmond and Robeson; Anson and Union; Guilford; Caswell; Rockingham; Mecklenburg; Stanly and Cabarrus; Rowan and Davie; Davidson; Stokes and Forsythe; Ashe, Surry and Yadkin; Wilkes, Iredell and Alexander; Burke, McDowell, Caldwell and Watauga; Lincoln, Gaston and Catawba; Rutherford and Cleveland; Buncombe, Henderson, Yancy and Madison; Haywood, Macon, Cherokee and Jackson.

The Congressional Districts have been thus arranged:

1st District.—Currituck, Camden, Perquimans, Pasquotank, Gates, Chowan, Hertford, Northampton, Halifax, Martin, Bertie, Washington and Tyrrell.

2d District.—Hyde, Beaufort, Pitt, Craven, Jones, Carteret, Lenoir, Wayne, Greene, Edgecombe, and Onslow.

3rd District.—New Hanover, Brunswick, Columbus, Bladen, Sampson, Cumberland, Robeson, Duplin and Richmond.

4th District.—Wake, Franklin, Warren, Granville, Orange, Nash, and Johnston.

5th District.—Person, Caswell, Alamance, Chatham, Randolph, Guilford, Moore and Montgomery.

6th District.—Stokes, Forsythe, Rockingham, Davidson, Davie, Yadkin, Surry, Iredell, Alexander and Ashe.

7th District.—Catawba, Gaston, Lincoln, Mecklenburg, Rowan, Cabarrus, Union, Anson, Stanly and Cleveland.

8th District.—Wilkes, Watauga, Caldwell, Burke, Rutherford, McDowell, Henderson, Buncombe, Yancy, Haywood, Macon, Cherokee, Jackson and Madison.

We congratulate all fair-minded citizens of the State upon the accomplishment of these plans, which, though they may, in some respects, give just cause for local dissatisfactions, nevertheless, do no violence to the political complexion of the State, and may be regarded, in so far as they reflect the popular voice, as altogether equitable and proper. It has been, with exceeding difficulty, however, that such an apportionment has been effected; and we, who have witnessed, especially in the Senate, most of the struggles which have taken place between a tyrannical and bigoted majority, on the one hand, and an undaunted few, contending for their *rights*, on the other, cannot omit this occasion to bear testimony to the ability, faithfulness, zeal, and resolution with which our Whig friends, in both Houses of the Legislature, have labored in this matter. Nothing but this determined course, upon their part, has secured the result which has taken place, as well as other equally important results throughout the session.

We shall not refer, now, to the incidents connected with the proceedings of Wednesday evening and Thursday morning last, in the House of Commons. We reserve such comment as we shall have to make thereon until our next. This much only we may say here: Men looking on from a distance, and unaffected by the influences which have pervaded the political atmosphere in the Legislature, for some days past, may find something to condemn in the extreme to which some of our friends announced their determination to go, rather than have their feelings outraged and their rights trampled upon, by the passage of the infamous apportionment with which they were threatened; but those who are familiar with the circumstances of the case, and have participated in the excitement of the occasion, cannot fail to look with admiration upon their stern resolve, if not with entire approval upon their course. Of those circumstances, and that excitement, however, we shall speak in full in our next.

The Hon. R. M. SAUNDERS, it will be seen, has been elected a Judge of the Superior Court, to supply the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of the Hon. W. H. BATTLE. Mr. S. was bitterly opposed by the leaders of his party generally.

It will further be perceived, that [illegible] fectual ballotings for United Sta[illegible] have been had since our last—th[illegible] generally, having dropped Mr. Dou[illegible] ported THOMAS L. CLINGMAN, there[illegible] what doubtless they intended to [illegible] future thorough identification of th[illegible] with their party. We wish them [illegible] acquisition.

The Legislature having adjourn[illegible] electing a Senator, and the Governor [illegible] ing the power, under the circumstan[illegible] point, there will consequently be a v[illegible] our Senatorial representation for the [illegible] years. The responsibility for this s[illegible] things rests entirely and exclusively upon [illegible] shoulders of the locofoco party in the L[illegible] lature. There has been no time, durin[illegible] late session, at which they coul[illegible] ted an election, but for the contending claims and conflicting aspirations of their own leaders for "the spoils." The people should hold them to a stringent accountability. But more anon.

FREE SUFFRAGE, AGAIN.

Last Friday evening, in the Senate, Mr. Berry, of Orange, moved to take up the Free Suffrage Bill, and make it the order of the day for Saturday, on its 2nd reading. This motion produced a "lively" discussion. Messrs. Gilmer, Woodfin, and others opposed it upon the ground that it would be a waste of time—they had agreed to adjourn on Monday—the Constitution required the bill to be read and passed three times on separate days in each branch of the Legislature—it would be impossible then to get it through the Commons, unless they postponed the day of adjournment, and there was business enough to employ the time of the Senate. But all this was of no avail. Messrs. Person, Berry, and others, wanted one more chance to give a parting kiss to their defeated bantling—and it must come. They desired to shew their abiding devotion to it during the expiring hours of the Session. But ah! there was the rub! "Why," asked Mr. Jones, of Perquimans, and other Whigs, "have the friends of the measure waited until this late hour to shew their devotion to this measure? Why did they permit the Bill to sleep so long on the table? Why postpone other business, which can be perfected, to take up this which can't be perfected? A strange way this of shewing devotion to Free Suffrage!" "Why," asked Mr. Gilmer, "have its friends refused to let the People know what Free Suffrage has already cost? Why did they suppress that information? Were they afraid of the light? Let the business of the People be done which could be done. They were to adjourn on Monday, and it was a farce to be considering the bill at that late hour. Why had not its friends called it up before? The People should know the truth about this business!" The Senator from Orange and others attempted to reply, but they saw what a farce they were playing, and they could hardly help *laughing right out!*

FREE SUFFRAGE—MR. EDWARDS.

The Raleigh Register, speaking of the defeat of the Free Suffrage bill in the Senate, makes the following declaration:

"It is well known that the Senator from Warren, (Mr. Edwards,) was elected on the ground of his opposition to this measure. He and his friends, no doubt as true "Democrats" as any in the State, made that the main issue in the campaign."

Now, with all deference to the opinion of the Register, we must say that in the above assertion he is mistaken. That the friends of Mr. Edwards who first started in the movement to solicit him to become a candidate for the Senate, did it because of his known opposition to Free Suffrage, we do not deny, but [illegible] not the [illegible] with all who supported him [illegible] election. Some weeks previous to the election, a letter was gotten up by anti-Free Suffrage Democrats *and Whigs*, soliciting Mr. Edwards to become a candidate for the Senate. This letter was circulated throughout the county, and *we know* that many persons signed it who are and always have been strongly in favor of Free Suffrage. Why they did it we cannot say; but it is so. After Gen. Hawkins became a candidate, (which he did upon strong solicitation and contrary to the expectation of a great many, there were those who, agreeing with him upon the question of Free Suffrage, would have voted for him, but considered themselves pledged to the support of Mr. Edwards, after having solicited him to become a candidate.

It is very certain that there was no direct and open issue made on the subject during the campaign; for Mr. Edwards was out of the County during the whole time, and consequently did not discuss the question before the people, and his friends, in urging his claims, certainly did not press his opposition to Free Suffrage as a reason for his election on *all* whom they approached. These things being so, we feel warranted in saying that Mr. Edwards was not elected "on the ground of his opposition to the measure," and hence the assertion we have made heretofore, that "Warren County—even the Freeholders of Warren County—are in favor of Free Suffrage."

We find the foregoing article, from the "Warrenton News," copied into the last "Standard," and are authorized by Mr. EDWARDS, to say, that it is a fabrication throughout. True, Mr. Edwards was "out of the County," during the whole campaign, last summer, but the "direct and open" issue was made in his absence, not only by his friends, but by *his competitor*, Gen. HAWKINS. Mr. EDWARDS, we repeat,—and we are confirmed in what we say by Mr. E. himself,—was elected, mainly, "on the ground of his opposition to Free Suffrage."

☞ Mr. John M. Botts has written a reply to the Whigs of Massachusetts who lately presented him with a silver Salver and Pitcher, in testimony of their acknowledgment of his services in the recent political campaign, in which he argues that the defeat of Gen. Scott, decisive as it was, "was no test of the strength of the two parties, or the *principles* of the two parties; and secondly, that it has been no fair test of the personal popularity of the two candidates; there has been no such want of confidence, either in the principles or ability of Gen. Scott, as the result would seem to indicate."

He thinks "we have been beaten by the Whigs themselves." He exhorts the Whigs to hold together, and says that "his voice is still for war, under the same banner that has twice led us to victory in the last twelve years. He concludes by urging the Whigs "to bury all past dissensions; to forget and forgive all past differences and wrongs; to lay aside all heartburnings and jealousies; for the sake of our common country, to harmonize, and restore confidence and good fellowship among themselves. Let Clay Whigs, and Taylor Whigs, Scott Whigs, Fillmore Whigs, Webster Whigs, and all other sorts of Whigs, stand together united, though quiet and inactive for the present, prepared to meet any collision with our adversaries, and at least be ready to prevent mischief and evil to the country, even if we cannot accomplish a positive good."

—that it gave the Whigs [illegible] but three,—*hinted* at combinations by wh[illegible] was to be "snowed under" by being put into a Whig District, whilst other leaders were provided for. This called up Messrs. Hoke, Caldwell and others, who indignantly repelled the charge or imputation of a combination or any thing like it. Explanations followed—but still it would not do—the Northampton Senator was in a Whig District, "the hands of the Philistines"—there would be no chance for his genius to grow and expand in such a blighted region—he would neither be coaxed nor driven into reconciliation! The storm was terrible, but the substitute passed, and the General had the pleasure of having the bitter pill which was to sicken and kill off his towering ambition "crammed down his throat," with nothing to remove the nausea of the dose! It was indeed a rich and racy scene. Oh! the harmonious Democracy! They have no love for the "spoils of office"—none whatever! What a pity that every aspirant amongst the "unterrified" for Congressional honors can't have a District carved out, just to suit the length and breath of his ambition!

☞ In the short notice in our last, in reference to the withdrawal of Mr. Rayner's name from the contest for Senator, there was an error (as we are now authoritatively informed,) in regard to the position assumed by that gentleman in the meeting of the Whig members, at which he requested to have his name withdrawn.

Not being present ourselves, we hastily penned the article in question, on hearsay. We stated that "Mr. Rayner took occasion to acknowledge (and with regret) his indifference in the late campaign," &c. We are authorised to state, by way of correction, that Mr. Rayner, instead of expressing "regret" for his "indifference in the recent campaign," gave reasons and explanations in justification of his not taking the stump in the late Presidential contest: "defied any one to point to any act in his political life, where he had failed to do his duty to the Whig party, where *principle* was involved—and insisted that any misgivings he might have in regard to *me*, constituted no test of devotion to the great principles of constitutional liberty, on which he had ever considered the Whig party to be organised: That he considered the Whigs of the South so situated in regard to Mr. Fillmore, who had sacrificed himself at home for us, that not only gratitude, but honor itself, required, that we should *never* abandon him. Mr. R. stated that while he had not felt called on to "take the stump" for General Scott, he had never failed either in public or private to defend him against the slanders of his enemies, and had voted for him with pleasure against Pierce. Mr. R. expressed his rea[illegible] to support for Senator any [illegible] so, by a sense of personal self-respect. Mr. R. did express his determination to again enter into political life; and if life and health permitted, to be in the next Legislature. He said that he did not intend to allow a few personal enemies to obtain so great a triumph over him, as to make him swerve from the support of principles to which he had been so long devoted: That the favor and confidence exhibited towards him by the great mass of the Whigs in the Legislature had imposed on him a lasting debt of gratitude; and of which it should be the labor of his life to prove himself worthy—whilst those who had hunted him with a personal malignity unparalleled, should yet *feel* him, if life lasted."

ILLNESS OF HON. W. R. KING.

The Vice President elect is represented to be in an exceedingly feeble state of health, and in consequence, has resigned his *present* station of President of the Senate.

The "New York Express," in reply to a question to that effect, comments upon the state of things that would ensue if Mr. King should die previously to the second Wednesday of February, when by law the votes will be counted and recorded at Washington, for President and Vice President for four years from the 4th of March next. The 12th article of the Constitution, 2d provision, declares that

"The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have a majority, *then from the two highest numbers on the list* THE SENATE SHALL CHOOSE THE VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice."

In case of Mr. King's death *before* the day named for counting the votes, the Senate would have to select "from the two highest numbers on the list" of persons voted for; and as only two numbers or persons were thus voted for by the people, (Wm. R. King and Wm. A. Graham) the Senate would have to declare Mr. Graham Vice President of the United States.

DREADFUL AFFAIR IN PETERSBURG, VA.—Benjamin Sadler, confined in jail at Petersburg, Va., on the charge of kidnapping, together with another prisoner, named Jones, made their escape on Sunday the 19th, about 10 o'clock, under the following circumstances:

Robert Taylor and George Williams, keepers of the jail, went into Sadler's cell to serve breakfast to the prisoners, when Sadler and Jones rushed out and locked them in. While on their way out, they were met by Joel Sturdivant, who ordered them to stop, when Sadler drew a revolver and shot him dead on the spot. A negro man, an attendant at the jail, attempted to arrest them, when he received the contents of one of the barrels in his chin, wounding him mortally, it is supposed.

Immediately after their escape had been made known, a large number of citizens started in pursuit of the fugitives. Jones was arrested about half a mile from the city. Sadler had proceeded about three miles when he was overtaken by Messrs. Ledbetter and Bottwell, who came upon him suddenly in an open field, making his way for the woods. When ordered to surrender he refused, and deliberately drew his revolver and shot himself dead. The tragedy created the greatest excitement.

CONGRESS.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 20.

Mr. King, President of the Senate, is worse to-day, and sent in his resignation as President of the Senate.

The SENATE then proceeded to the election of a President, to fill the vacancy, when Hon. David R. Atchison, of Missouri, was elected.

Mr. Broadhead introduced a bill in relation to Bounty Lands.

A number of petitions were presented.

In the HOUSE nothing of importance transpired.

In the Senate, on the 21st, the resolution authorizing the President to confer the rank of Lieutenant General by brevet, was taken up.

Mr. Shields said this was not a new question. Two years ago a similar proposition passed the Senate, and was lost in the House. He was in favor of it as an act of justice—military justice—to General Scott. The committee so considered it and reported it. The resolution does not confer the rank upon General Scott by name; Congress had no such power, but it was well understood that the creation of the rank was intended for him. Of all the officers who were engaged in the Mexican war, General Scott was the only one who had not received additional rank or additional pay for his services. His subordinates nearly all received brevets—some as many as two or three brevets.

But this rank was intended to be conferred on him as simple justice for his glorious services. This was a favorable opportunity for so doing. The majority could do so. Power ought to be generous, and there never was a victor more generous than Scott himself. The resolutions of the Peace Society had been presented to-day, in which they say there will be no more war. He hoped this would be the case, but saw little prospect of it. The country owed more to the army than to peace societies.

No army in the world was more deserving than ours. They were scattered upon a bleak frontier, extending law and civilization. The American army had carried the country successfully through three glorious wars—from Lexington to Mexico—and in all its history there was nothing more glorious than the march from Vera Cruz to Mexico. The history of that war had never yet been correctly written.

No military event had ever taken place equal to the capture of Ver[illegible] taking of Vera[illegible] ico. An army of [illegible] midst of a nation of seven millions of enemies, with an army of twenty thousand men in their front, successfully reduced a city of two hundred thousand souls. And to the honor of the leader of that victorious army, he it said, that life and property were better protected while the army was there than they had been since the downfall of Montezuma.

Mr. Cass followed in an elaborate argument in support of the resolution, and in vindication of the high character and patriotism of General Scott.

Mr. Chase opposed the resolution. He thought the consciousness of duty done, his present great reputation, was a reward for his services, not to be enhanced or enlarged by this empty title conferred upon General Scott.

Mr. Adams was opposed to the creation of the rank of Lieutenant General.

Mr. Hale followed in opposition to the resolution. He had voted against the resolutions of thanks to General Scott and Taylor, because he could not discriminate between justifying the war and thanking its victors. For this reason, if no other, he would vote against the resolution. He then went at length into the history of the late election, the platforms, the Cabinet of Gen. Pierce, Cuba, &c., and denounced as horrid and atrocious the Mexican war.

Mr. Clemens bore testimony to the high honor and patriotism of General Scott.

Mr. Adams replied to Mr. Hale, defending the Mexican war.

Mr. Pratt sustained the resolution, and replied to Mr. Hale.

Mr. Chase continued the debate.

The question was then taken, and the resolution passed—yeas 34, nays 12, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Brooke, Butler, Cass, Charlton, Clemens, Cooper, Davis, De Saussure, Dixon, Dodge, of Wis., Dodge, of Iowa, Fish, Geyer, Gwin, Hunter, James, Jones, of Tenn., Mason, Miller, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Seward, Shields, Smith, Soule, Spruance, Underwood, Upham, Wade—34.

Nays—Messrs. Adams, Bradbury, Bright, Cathcart, Chase, Felch, Hale, Hamlin, Norris, Sumner, Toucey, Walker—12.

After a short executive session the Senate adjourned.

In the House of Representatives, the resolutions to refer the various branches of the President's message to the appropriate committees, were discussed. The debate, in five minute speeches, involved the subject of the tariff. All amendments relating thereto were voted down. The resolutions were reported to the House, but not finally acted upon before the adjournment.

Mr. Clingman made a motion to admit Railroad iron free of duty, which was debated at some length.

It is reported that an effort will soon be made in the House to take some notice of the acquisition of Samana by the French, and also the annexation of Sonora.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 22.—In SENATE to-day, Mr. Gwinn introduced a bill for the construction of a Railroad to the Pacific, which was made the special order for the 10th January.

In the HOUSE, that part of the President's Message relating to commerce and River and Harbor improvements was referred to the Committee on Commerce. The bill fixing the compensation of Congressmen at $2,000 was then considered.

In a recent English paper we find the following bona fide advertisement:

"TO BE SOLD, the WISDOM TOOTH of the DUKE OF WELLINGTON price £10; and several Locks of his Hair, price £1 1s. each.—Apply &c. N. B. Likewise a small Grinder of Napoleon's for £5."

[illegible] invite th[illegible] hitherward.

No blame in the premises can be attach[illegible] ourselves. Our mails are regularly and compactly made up, and as regularly deposited in the City Post Office.

[illegible] to the [illegible] duce a princi[illegible] fixedness of constit[illegible]

When it was solemnly enacted [illegible] of 1835, that no Convention of the [illegible] be called by the General Assembly, [illegible] by two thirds of the members of each House, and that no part of the Constitution should be altered, unless, as initiatory steps, a bill should first be passed by three fifths of all the members of each House, and then at a subsequent session, by two thirds of all the members; when, I say, these rules were gravely determined, was it in the contemplation of these men, to submit alterations of the Constitutions to such high majorities, as matters of mere form? Or, did they intend to require and demand, that such majorities should really, truly, and actually exist? Sir, I demand of you, as a public journalist, a true answer to this question. Why was it that changes in the Constitution were not allowed to be made by a bare majority, in like manner as are made changes of the statute law of the land? In requiring a vote of three fifths, did they intend only to ascertain and secure a clear majority; or, really and truly to ascertain and secure three fifths? and, did they intend, that after the will of a majority was ascertained, the minority, whatever might be its number, whether more than two fifths or one third, should cease to stand on the letter of its rights and give way, under the principle, that a majority ought to rule?—*This is what you have contended for.*

You have denounced the minority, although more than two fifths or one third, for exercising its constitutional rights. You have labored to bring into odium, and so far prostrate, those safe-guards of the Constitution, which were introduced for the express purpose of fettering the will, and staying the march, of majorities. In a word, Sir, you have advocated the extinction of all orthodox principles in the affairs of government, except that of submission to the expressed will of a majority. This principle is not the breath by which the Constitution of 1835 became a living being; this is not the spirit of the bond you seek to alter, and, to that extent, therefore, to abolish it, by recommending and warmly espousing a suicide.

You, sir, advocate the doctrine, that, when once a majority of the people have expressed their desire to change the Constitution, it ought straightway to be done, and you denounce every man, who, thinking for himself, stands in the way, under the constitutional shelter of minority che[illegible] For this you reprehend the Whigs, *as fe*[illegible] and your democratic Speaker of the [illegible] Read, si[illegible] tion? You shall answer the Speaker, and you dare not *say, nay.*

Do you believe, that one who is elected upon an issue, and who receives his suffrages, because he espouses a particular side of the question, has the moral right to betray his constituency, who have, because of his opinion, placed him in trust? You shall answer the Speaker this question, and you shall answer, *nay.*

Now, sir, having answered this question to my satisfaction, I demand to know: First, whether, when a member of the Legislature is elected Speaker, his constituents are disfranchised, or justly liable to be misrepresented, more than if the member were still on the floor; or whether the position modifies or weakens the connection between the honored Speaker and his constituency? Sir, can any power in the State lessen the moral, direct responsibility of Speaker Edwards to his constituents? If he came to Raleigh with instructions—and whether they were given at the ballot-box or by written signatures, makes, with republicans, no difference—can he lay them aside, any more exclusively, when speaker, than when member? or, will you hold, that the higher a man rises in office, the less responsible he is to those who placed him there? or that, being speaker, the body, over which he presides, becomes his constituents? Sir, these are hard questions, but be once a man, and I answer them.

Now, sir, I propose to tell you plainly what you have advocated, by insisting that Speaker Edwards ought to have voted with the majority, and allowed an amendment of the Constitution.

First: That a member of the Senate has a right, and it is his duty, to disregard, and even oppose, the express will and desire of his own constituents, as they have been shown forth at the polls, if a majority of the people of the State shall be of a different opinion.

Secondly: That, if this right belong not to a mere member, yet as Speaker, a man may and ought to disregard the wishes of his constituents, when a majority of the whole people are opposed to them; in other words, that when a member is elected Speaker, his constituents have lost their representative. For, certainly, the representative is lost when the responsibility is gone. Now, sir, sound old federalism, and a truly defined republicanism, no less, will tell you, the representative cannot, by the acceptance of honors, so long as he occupies the place to which he is elected, put himself beyond responsibility to them. Nor can all the world whether by bribes of honor or places of trust, diminish one jot or tittle of the responsibility of the representative. And had Mr. Speaker Edwards voted otherwise than with the constituents who elected him at the polls in Warren, after the canvass, upon the very point, he had been neither an honest man nor a responsible representative, but a servile croucher to the majority—too timid to stand up for and by the side of those who were bold enough to stand up for and by the principles which he had personified.

Sir, your democracy is hollow, dictatorial in power, and submissive to majorities, though checked and annulled by the constitution. It lives in a shout, and dies in a shout. It is the worst of consolidation, because it is a consolidation at the expense of the honor and faithfulness of the representative.

Sir, you have advocated treachery in the organ and servant of the people. You have advised Mr. Edwards to disown the obligations, which he contracted with the voters, as they came up to the polls, and have told him, that he was absolved from this contract with his own constituents, not by their consent, but against it, and by the assent of others.

You, Sir, may do what the hour may devise, but there are many left, who will prefer to ful-

years, wife of T. J. Morisey, Esq. Beautiful, gifted, accomplished and beloved, her early and sudden death has spread desolation and gloom over a large circle of friends, and fallen with overwhelming force on her bereaved husband. She had been for several years a consistent member of the Presbyterian Church.—[COM.