

in its execution from the benefit of another law, which will have been operated for months, after the period mentioned in the state of its repeal. All those who may have commenced the injurious steps towards taking the benefit of the bankrupt law, even up to the day of its passage, will have done so under the guarantee of the Government—they may be said to have a vested right to the benefits of the law. All their arrangements to months may have been tending to this; all their hopes and calculations of coming relief and future comfort, may have been built upon the pledges tendered by this Government in the passage of the law. Many may have been struggling with all their energy and strength to sustain their credit, in hopes of avoiding the necessity of resorting to the relief tendered by this law—since the 5th of December, they may have been compelled to yield to the pressing storm, and may have just commenced an arduous career for availing themselves of the benefits of the law. On the other hand, many an indigent creditor may have failed, up to the 5th of December, to have commenced impulsive process against their debtor, under the involuntary clause of the act, who, since then, or before the passage of the bill before the House, may have commenced process. Should these be deprived of the benefits of the bankrupt law merely because, from a feeling of humanity, they may have extended time and indulgence to their embarrassed debtors—relying in security upon the law of the land, as tendering its benefits whenever they might be disposed to resort to it?

The retrospective operation, or rather exclusion of this bill, will operate as a punishment to the most worthy—to those who, from industry and pride, may have failed to take advantage of the voluntary portion of the bankrupt law; and those who, from feelings of kindness and forbearance towards the unfortunate, may have postponed taking advantage of the involuntary clause. This retrospective legislation is calculated to destroy all confidence in the action of the Government, and to sow the seeds of distrust and alarm throughout the land. I cannot vote for the bill before the House, unless it is amended in this particular. I question its constitutionality—I am convinced of its injustice and partiality.

Neither can I vote for the amendment which has been offered, proposing to include corporations of the respective States within its operation. I am too much of a State-rights man for that. The respective States have established corporations within their limits, for various purposes, with various powers, and subject to various restrictions. The powers and existence of the State corporations emanate from "sovereign State authority"; they are responsible to the same authority, to a varied extent, according to the peculiar interests and pursuits of each. The General Government has no power to establish a corporation within the limits of any State, except as a necessary means of carrying into operation a granted power; and yet, will it be pretended, that it has power to destroy those created by the States, or, what is the same thing, establish rules and regulations fixing the conditions on which their existence shall continue? It is very evident, that the great anxiety for the passage of this amendment springs from a violent and furious hatred of the State banks of the country, and a pretended zeal for their destruction. And those who are most rabid in their hatred of banks, are the very men who generally make most pretensions about their State-rights republicanism. Let them recollect that these State banks exist by State authority; if they are not sufficiently restricted in their charters, it is by the choice or neglect of the State authorities that chartered them; if they have violated their charters, they are responsible to State laws and State tribunals; if they are guilty of abuses, fraud, and peculation, still they are subject to their own domestic legislative restraint, and to their own domestic public opinion.

Then, if the public opinion, the laws and the institutions of the respective States, will tolerate the abuses, the suspensions, the contractions and expansions of the State banks, about which gentlemen descend so much, why should this General Government attempt to bring them to punishment, and that, too, according to one uniform rule for every part of the country? The abuses of the State banks are felt most sensibly at home; there the evil is best understood, and there the remedy can best be applied. I warn gentlemen who make professions of devotion to State rights, to beware how they allow this General Government to bring within the scope of its control, the institutions of the States. If it can establish the conditions on which they shall cease to exist, it may next pass regulations how they shall exist. And as it is the nature of power to advance, we may next have, not only our banks, but our colleges, our manufacturing companies, our railroad and canal corporations, brought within the scope of Federal supremacy.

It has been said, by way of taunt, during this debate, that this bankrupt law is the last of the Whig measures of the extra session; and that all our labors at that eventful session. It is true that little will be left on the statute book; but that is not the fault of the Whigs, and history must say so.—They could not prevent the treachery of John Tyler and the secret of our disasters is, that the people of the country—the Whig majority—blame us for having passed such a man as John Tyler upon them. Yes, sir, the Whigs did commit a most grievous error in the election of John Tyler, and most grievously have they suffered for it.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Marshall) has spoken of this history of this Administration being written in a parenthesis. Not so. If there is any truth in the maxim of Shakespeare, that it is "the evil that men do lives after them," then it will create many a volume to portray the profligacy and corruption of this Administration.

And if the concluding part of the sentence be also true, that the "good is interred with their bones," then John Tyler's gravestone should bear this single inscription: "Here lies John Tyler."

I have, till very lately, indulged in the full faith that the Whig party was only undergoing a purification—that they were passing through an ordeal of trial, from which they would emerge "reduced, regenerated, and disenthralled," ready as ever to do battle in the cause of constitutional liberty, whether fortune frowned or smiled. And although I will yet have hope, still I confess I am not free from feelings of despondency. I witnessed a scene here but two days since, which I should have been glad to avoid seeing. A representative (Mr. Botts) rose in his place, and appealing to Heaven for the rectitude of his intentions, vowed his determination to discharge his duty to a violated Constitution, regardless of all personal consequences. He preferred charges against the acting President of the United States, involving the highest crimes and misdemeanors; staked his reputation upon their truth, and his ability to prove them; asked this House for the appointment of a committee, merely that he might have an opportunity of establishing his charges, and submit the result to the House. And what did we see? In a House containing a nominal Whig majority of at least thirty, the proposition failed by a majority of forty-four.

If I ever saw an instance of moral sublimity, it was when my friend (Mr. Botts) held aloft his articles of impeachment, and in strains of fervid eloquence called upon the assembled Representatives of the nation to come to the rescue. I can assure my friend, he needs no prouder monument to his fame—no richer legacy for his children.—I am aware that many voted against the proposition because, as they avowed, they would not bestow on John Tyler so much consideration and importance. This reminds me of the reply of Barrere in the national convention of France, to the accusation proposed by the virtuous Louvet, against the bloody Robespierre: "Let us," said Barrere, "cease to waste our time on men who will fill no place in history; let us not put pignions on pedestals; the civic crowns of Robespierre are mingled with cypress." The convention passed quietly on to "the orders of the day"—just as this House did on Tuesday—a fatal error, says the historian—"which France had cause to lament in tears of blood." The earnest and eloquent appeals of Louvet, Barbauld, and Lanjuinais, were unheeded; and the Girondists of that day, like the Whigs of this, reposed in listless security, whilst the Jacobins, to use the language of the historian, "were daily sharpening their pignions."

Much as the character of this debate ought to be regretted, for the credit of the House and the country, yet it has produced one result at which I feel pleased. It has clearly traced the lines of party demarcation in this Hall. It has proven, what I have long known, that there are but two parties in this House; and that the Tyler faction—for it never deserved the name of a party—has become merged in, and thoroughly identified with, the Locofoco party; and I do hope that amid the seething and boiling of the political caldron, of which the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Cushing) spoke, the Whig party will at last be thoroughly purified, and all the froth and scum will not only be thrown upward, but tossed over the brim. I have long felt sure that the bargain had been consummated in secret; at last it has been publicly ratified on this floor. To be sure, there has been some little coyness manifested in the interchanges of affection that have been passing across the Hall, but no more. I suppose that as usual on such occasions of endearment, and far less than I think decency required. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Cushing) threatened the already-forged thunderbolts of the veto power, unless his new Democratic allies would rally, under the Tyler standard. The member from Indiana (Mr. Kennedy) said, in response, he was opposed to the Democratic majority in the next Congress forcing any thing on Mr. Tyler, that was likely to meet with the veto. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Weller) pronounced a labored eulogy on Mr. Tyler, and it seems, felt authorized to act the part of counselor to him, and advised him to rid himself of Messrs. Webster and Spencer as soon as possible. The gentleman from New York (Mr. Bowen), who seems to be more catholic in his political feelings, declared his readiness to receive these two last, as repentant sinners, with open arms. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Pickens) welcomed the gentleman from Massachusetts into the Democratic ranks; and he had long seen that he (Mr. C.) had a leaning to his (Mr. P.'s) side, but that he was afraid of his colleague on the right, (Mr. Adams)—no very great compliment, by the way. And the gentleman from Indiana, (Mr. Profit), in order to prove his approbation of this offensive and defensive alliance, poured out a torrent of abuse against that man of whom he once said, on this floor that he "wished he could make President of the world." What a humiliating spectacle is here exhibited! A party elevated to power by the overwhelming voice of a long outraged people, with such sacrifices, such patriotic devotion, such honest enthusiasm, as never marked the progress of civil revolution before; and that too, with the show, the prayers, and the blessings of thousands who say in it the harbinger of hope, and the prospect of a brighter day—and scarcely had we commenced the great work of reform, entrusted to our hands, when he, whom we had imprudently placed in the line of promotion by which he became invested with the executive power, opened negotiations with our enemies; ungratefully and cruelly made us upon us; taunted us with our unfortunate condition; and, as though we were slaves with manacles on our hands, declared to us, through his confidential organs, that the great constitutional function, which we entrusted to him, would

be exercised for the benefit of those only who would worship at the shrine of his power. Never since the days of Judas Iscariot has there been an instance of such shameless and unblushing treason.

Mr. Speaker, although I have been amused, as every one here must have been, at the developments that have taken place during this debate, yet I cannot reflect on it seriously, without feeling the most intense pain and humiliation. The sentiments which were uttered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Cushing) fell on my ear as the forbidding of the evils that are fast clustering around the destinies of our country. When I have reflected on the probable fate which ultimately awaited our nation I have supposed that our Government—like all those that have preceded it—would in obedience to that principle of change and revolution with which the degree of fate seems to have stamped all human institutions have its day of degeneracy, decline, and ruin. But I have comforted myself with the hope that this period was in the far, far distant future; and that it would not come, till we and our children and our children's children had passed away and been forgotten. But the declarations of the gentleman from Massachusetts have aroused me to the conviction of the corrupted and vitiated state of the public mind. And can it be—must history record it—that in the very infancy of our Republic, in the fifty-fourth year of our existence, one who is recognised as possessing the especial of the Executive, boldly and recklessly came into this hall, and here, in the face of the assembled Representatives of the Nation, declared that the power and patronage of this Government would be wielded for the benefit of them who would sustain those in power! The open avowal of such sentiments afford alarming proof of their corruptions of the times—of the degeneracy of this age. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) has compared it to the sale of the empire by the Praetorian bands of Rome, it is worse than that. It was in the streets of Rome, amid the shouts and huzzas of the rabble, and not in the Senate house that the Praetorian cohorts sold the imperial purple to him who would bid highest for its honors. And whilst mercenary swords were clashing with power, the leaders of faction in the field of Mars, the flame of liberty still continued to burn in the councils of the Senate-house.—It was there that the principles of freedom had been most devoutly cherished—it was there that they last expired. It was there that the precepts of Fabius and Cincinnatus, and Cato, and the Scipios, were last quoted with reverence—it was there that their virtuous and heroic actions were last forgotten. But here in our Government—and in its infancy too—it is in the Representative Hall of the nation, that Executive power and patronage, and Executive influence in the appointment of a successor, are offered as the reward of party allegiance. And that to come from Massachusetts' tool. From the land of the Pilgrim Fathers, from the classic soil of Lexington and Bunker Hill!—The first to resist tyranny—and must he bear the reproach of being the first to offer through one of her sons, to barter away the rights for which she so gloriously suffered and bled?

These sentiments of the gentleman from Massachusetts are only the echo of what was heard a few months since in Faneuil Hall, from one whom that patriotic State so long looked on and cherished with pride and glory. How times must have changed—how the public mind must have degenerated! That one, whose fame and character belonged to the nation, should have uttered the detestable doctrine, that the fact of there being many Whigs yet retained in office, should be a reason why that party should not denounce what they in their hearts believe to be the corruptions of this Administration! That the consideration of place should hush them into silence, when they see public virtue decaying, and popular rights trampled into dust! And that, too, in walls consecrated to freedom—where the spirit-stirring tones of resistance to tyranny have so often aroused the free and the brave!—Would to God these sentiments could have originated with some one else than Daniel Webster.

Time once was when every patriotic American felt proud that Daniel Webster was his countryman. His gigantic and commanding talents and endeared him to every lover of his country's glory; his noble efforts in many a trying contest had equally endeared him to every lover of constitutional freedom.—What must have been the feelings of his friends—those friends who had cherished, sustained, and cheered him on in so many conflicts—when, on an occasion by which they sought to do him honor, instead of reviving their drooping spirits, and advising encouraging them in their approaching struggle, he met them with reproaches, revilings, and bitter taunts. Sir, he is gone—and let him go! He not only abandoned us in the hour of our triumph, but he is now doing service in the ranks of those, who have so often felt the force of his mighty arm. He may now, perhaps, console himself with the idea, that although he cannot save himself, yet, like Samson, he can bury beneath the ruins of our political edifice the object of his hatred. Still if he possesses the common sympathies and feelings of our nature, the day of retributive justice must come. Like the heroes, who tarnished the escutcheon of his fame, by negotiating with his fiercer enemies, he may perhaps receive his reward in some patrie order under his new allies; yet his declining years must be embittered with the recollection of the bright hopes he has withered, the afflicting evils he has brought upon his country.

What must be his reflections on contemplating the character and progress of this debate? His name, which was once so mighty, now become a byword, and an object of jest and ridicule in this Hall, which formerly echoed and re-echoed the sound of his voice? His name raised about him with jeers and reproaches!—One party mourning over his fall and his desertion, and the other rejecting his proffered alliance with scorn! Would to God, for the honor

of our country, that this cup could have passed as by.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Marshall) spoke of the "scorn and contempt," with which Mr. Webster must have treated the denunciations which have been uttered against him. I deny that he has been denounced and mathematically sound here. I call upon every one within the sound of my voice to say, if Mr. Webster has not been treated with the greatest forbearance and moderation. It is with pain and regret that his present position is alluded to here by the Whigs. It has, until lately, been in the language of apology for his course, and of hope that he would yet restore himself to the confidence of long-trying and faithful friends, that his conduct has been spoken of by the Whigs in this House. It is from this other party—from those whose cause he is now availing that he has received denunciation most heavy. But if he has been denounced by the Whigs, would not his denunciation be *prima facie* evidence that he deserved it! What interest could the Whig party in denouncing such a man? Would it not rather be their interest to preserve so strong an ally—to possess the aid and influence of his mighty mind? And after adhering to him so long, through so many eventful struggles, is it fair, is it reasonable, to suppose that his former Whig friends here should denounce him without sufficient cause? To suppose so, was to reason against all the natural springs and impulses of human action.

As to the "scorn and contempt," of which the gentleman from Kentucky spoke, that is too easy a way of answering a proposition, for one of his logical mind. Suppose we have indulged in complaints—or censures, if you please—still, can "scorn and contempt" answer the charge? Do they prove that our censures are not well founded? Can they make atonement for the wrongs we have endured? "Scorn and contempt are the cheapest of all mental impulses; they afford evidence neither of intellect of the head, nor feeling of the heart. They are the impulses with which selfishness always regards the "unfortunate sufferer; with which heartless tyranny always looks on the complaints of the oppressed. The unfeeling miser listens with "scorn and contempt" to the cries of suffering poverty; the cruel despot feels "scorn and contempt" from the complaints of injured innocence. Doubtless no doubt felt the same for the cries of the agonized Christians when torn to pieces by ravenous beasts; he felt "scorn and contempt" for the very prayers which, in the struggles of death, they offered to Heaven for his conversion.—(Here Mr. RAYNER'S hour expired, and he took his seat.)

VIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

After the endorsement given by the Official paper in this city to the "Aurora and Union," published in New York, we are obliged in courtesy to regard it as a true exponent of the views of the Administration. We copy therefore from that paper the following very clear definition of the "position" of the Administration, with a chart of "its future policy," which it is very proper should be understood by all the People of the United States.

From the "Aurora and Union" of Saturday.

"President Tyler and the Democratic Party.—Having just returned from a most agreeable and satisfactory visit to Washington, during which we had the most complete opportunity of informing ourselves of the views and sentiments of the members of the Administration regarding its present position and future policy, we have the pleasure of announcing to the Democratic party, in this city and throughout the country, that the Government will continue to be administered upon the strictest democratic principles, and that a thorough and perfect harmony of feeling and action with the great democratic interest of the country forms the basis upon which the Administration founds its claims to the confidence and support of the People. Whatever may be the clamors of interested and ambitious demagogues who control a few presses heretofore considered democratic, we distinctly aver that President Tyler and his Administration are one and indivisible with the great Democratic party of the country." "Already, both in profession and practice, has the President given the most unequivocal evidence of his democratic intentions; and we pledge ourselves that those evidences will, for the future, be neither few nor far between. In all his official acts he recognizes only the democratic people; and there is not at this moment a more efficient, active, and powerful enemy of the Whig intrigues and demagogues within the limits of the whole Union than John Tyler. This will be still more clearly and distinctly indicated in the communications of the President to the next Congress; and, before that Congress rises, we venture to predict that the Democratic party throughout the United States will to a man rally to the support of Mr. Tyler as the firm and uncompromising advocate of their principles, and the chief upon whom the hopes of the country are centered."

"A most absurd and ridiculous report is going the rounds of the newspapers that a personal conflict took place at a recent Cabinet meeting, between Secretaries Spencer and Upshur. We assure the public that there is not the slightest foundation for such a report. There was neither a fight nor even an angry or unpleasant word between these Secretaries on that or any other occasion. The whole story is a naked fabrication."

Madisonian.

MURDER.

A shocking murder was committed in the upper part of Robeson county on Thursday evening last; on the body of Neil Livingston, by a stage driver named Peter Gates. Both the parties had been drinking, when a quarrel arose, and Gates struck Livingston with a stick and a spade, from which blows he died on Friday morning. Gates made his escape South.

Fayetteville Observer.


SUDDEN DEATH.

A worthy elderly citizen of Robeson county, named John Lewis, suddenly fell dead in the Court yard at Lumberton, on the 28th inst. He had been complaining a little for a day or two, but was serving on the Grand Jury; he fell, and expired with a single gasp.

Fayetteville Observer.

It is said that Judge Storey, to be accompanied by Dr. Sewal, of Washington, intends to sail for Europe in a few days.

THE STAR.



Liberty et iustitia solum.

RALEIGH, APRIL 12, 1843.

FOR PRESIDENT,
HENRY CLAY.

OUR MARKET.

Never was our market more poorly supplied than it is at present; and there is consequently a great demand for almost all kinds of country produce. A friend, who has examined the state of the markets in other places, as quoted in the papers, has ascertained the remarkable fact, that Flour is higher in this city than in any other market known in the United States. A wagoner from up the country, but a short time ago, carried his load of Flour as low down as Tarborough, and brought a part of it back, and sold it in this city! Wholesale prices, \$4 50 a \$4 75 per barrel. Corn, very little of which is offered, commands \$2 50 per barrel; and Fodder, which is very scarce, is selling at the handsome price of \$1 a hundred.

SUPERIOR COURT.

The Superior Court for Wake County was in session here last week—his Honor Judge Manly presiding. Owing to the very crowded state of the civil, and indeed of the criminal docket also, it was determined by the Judge on Monday, upon the suggestion of Hon. Wm. H. Haywood and at the instance of a large majority of the gentlemen of the Bar, to take up the criminal docket on Tuesday, and to designate the third Monday in June next as the time for holding a special term of the Superior Court, for the purpose of despatching the litigated or disputed jury causes which might remain undecided.

On Tuesday, therefore, the criminal docket was taken up, when Lewis Chavers, a free man of color, was put upon his trial for an assault and battery upon Mr. Drury Kemp, a white man. Chavers was found guilty of the assault, which was of an aggravated nature, and fined one hundred dollars, and ordered to be sold for the payment of the fine. The Attorney General for the State and H. W. Miller and P. H. Busebe, Esqrs. for the defendant, they having been assigned by the Court as his Counsel.

On the same day, William Pulley, charged with having murdered Josiah Lewis, was arraigned, and pleaded not guilty. It appeared from the evidence, that the prisoner and the deceased met at a certain house in this county; that, previously to the fatal quarrel, no grudge seemed to exist between them; but that, on the contrary, they breakfasted together at the same table, on the footing, apparently, of friends.

It further appeared, in evidence, that after breakfast, they were out together in the road, near the house, and that a conversation arose between them with regard to the merits and demerits of a horse, the property of the deceased; that Pulley told the deceased that his horse had had the flint two or three times, or more than once; that thereupon the deceased became enraged, and told him it was a d—d lie; that Pulley gave back the d—d lie, and, approaching the deceased, who was standing with one of his hands upon his hip, took him by the collar; that the deceased then said he would give back to no man, and with one hand laid hold of the prisoner's collar; that the prisoner thereupon pushed the deceased backwards across the road, prostrated him, and fell partially upon him; that the deceased attempted to rise, and that the prisoner caught up a heavy pine stick which was close by, and struck the deceased a blow upon the forehead of the head; that the deceased thereupon dropped his head upon his bosom, and exclaimed, "Lord have mercy upon me!" that one of the witnesses, a female, then interposed, and begged the prisoner not to strike him again, but that he disregarded her request, struck round her, and felled the deceased to the earth. It was, moreover, in evidence that the prisoner was heard to say afterwards that he was sorry he had not "mended his licks;" that the deceased was sixty years of age, no match for Pulley, the prisoner, who is a young man; and that both of them had taken at least one dram that morning. Dr. Montague, a very intelligent physician, who was called in to attend the deceased, testified that he believed his death was caused solely by the blows inflicted by the prisoner. The State was ably represented by Spier Whitaker, Esq., the Attorney General; and the prisoner had exerted to the greatest extent in his behalf the strong forensic powers of Hon. R. M. Saunders and George W. Haywood, Esq. Under the charge of his Honor, which was clear and appropriate, the Jury retired to their room, and after an absence of a few hours, returned for a verdict that the prisoner was guilty of manslaughter. On Friday he was sentenced to be branded, which was forthwith done in the presence of the Court, and remanded to the common prison for the space of six months.

On Wednesday, negro boy George, the property of Mr. Joshua Rogers, of this county, was arraigned for the murder of Mr. Wilson, who had hired him by the year. To the charge, the prisoner pleaded not guilty, and put himself for trial upon "God and the country." It appeared from the evidence in the trial of this case, that George had been hired to Wilson by the year; that he was generally obedient to orders; that on the day the murder was committed, Wilson, one of the witnesses, and George were engaged in killing hogs; that about ten o'clock on that day, Anderson Wilson, the son of the deceased, went to where they were killing hogs, and desired his father to let George go with him to haul some slabs, offering at the same time to leave a hand in his place; that Anderson Wilson told the negro to make haste and go with him, for his father had said he must go; that George said he would go, if Mr. Wilson himself told him to do so; that Anderson Wilson then told George that if he did not mind he would give him thirty-nine lashes; that George said that if he (Anderson Wilson) fooled with him he would not go at all; that Anderson Wilson then appealed to his father, the deceased, and asked him if he intended to let George insult him in that way; that the deceased told George to hush; that George

said he would hush, but did not hush; that the deceased then exclaimed that he would make him hush, and advanced upon him with a weeding hoe; that the prisoner, after standing about ten feet from the deceased at the time, with nothing in his rear to prevent him from making his escape from the blow, but that he stood in his tracks, and as the blow of the deceased descended, inclined to the left, avoided it, and in so doing, caught up another hoe, struck under it the head of the deceased, and inflicted the fatal wound. This is the substance of the testimony of three of the witnesses—but the testimony of Anderson Wilson varied, in some respects, from it. He stated that George had the hoe in his hand all the time; that he feared to approach him, believing he would kill him; and that he had the hoe raised when the deceased advanced upon him, and struck at the same moment the deceased did. The case was argued for the State by the Attorney General with his accustomed force and ingenuity, and for the prisoner by the Hon. R. M. Saunders and George W. Haywood, Esq., with ability and zeal. The Judge was understood to charge the Jury that the master possessed over the slave unlimited power; and that the duty of the slave was unconditional submission to the master; that the master, for the purpose of ensuring the submission of the slave, had a right to judge both of the means and the measure of punishment; and that if the master, in thus punishing the slave, was slain by him, it would be murder. But that if the master advanced upon the slave with a deadly weapon, and in an attitude greatly to excite the slave's terror and resentment, and the slave slew him, it would constitute manslaughter. The charge was very able, and the above sketch embraces but a small portion of the substance of it.—The Jury, after hanging twenty-four hours, returned a verdict of guilty of murder.

On Thursday, Harriet Durham, (a free woman of color,) charged with the murder of Grace, a negro woman, the property of Mr. John Pennington, of this county, was put upon her trial, and pleaded not guilty. The evidence in this case was entirely circumstantial. It seemed, from the proofs, that the prisoner and the deceased slept together in the same log-cabin; that on the night the murder was committed several of the witnesses were in the cabin with the prisoner and the deceased, and that they observed no signs of ill will between them; that the witnesses left the cabin about midnight; that next morning, about sun-up, one of the witnesses discovered the deceased lying in the jam of the chimney outside the cabin, with her skull broken; that the prisoner was interrogated by the witnesses before the body was found, as to where the deceased was, and that the prisoner said she did not know, but that somebody had called upon the deceased that night in a low voice, and asked her to come out of the cabin and go to a certain place; that another witness, after the body was found, told the prisoner she might as well confess herself the murderer, for she would have it to do; that the prisoner was afterwards asked why she had killed Grace, and that she answered because Grace had threatened to kill her; that the prisoner admitted she had struck the deceased two blows with a very heavy iron pestle, which caused her death. It was further in evidence that there was no way of getting into the cabin but through the door, which was fastened inside every night with a strong pin; that the iron pestle, which had been rusty and out of use before, was found that morning bearing the marks of having been scored in the ashes; that blood was sprinkled upon the bed-clothing, on the floor, and upon the walls and loft of the cabin; that there was blood upon the door-sill, and evidences upon the ground outside the door of some one's having been dragged upon it; that part of the bed-clothing had been washed, and that the blood had dried upon them in circles; that they were scorched in some places, and a portion of an old rag, the property of the deceased, cut out and hid or destroyed. This was the substance of the evidence on the part of the State. The prisoner offered no evidence. The case was opened by Hugh McQueen, Esq., for the prisoner; he was replied to by the Attorney-General, and as the prisoner offered no testimony, was entitled to the concluding argument. This argument was more upon the facts than his opening speech, and was consequently extended to greater length; and we believe the opinion of all who heard it was that it eminently sustained his reputation for ability and ingenuity.

The verdict of the Jury was, Guilty.

On Friday morning, the prisoners, George and Harriet, were brought into court, and judgment was prayed by the Attorney General; whereupon Judge Saunders moved for a new trial in the case of George, which was refused. The Counsel for the prisoner Harriet also submitted some remarks with regard to her ignorance and imbecility of mind, and offered to produce testimony upon that head to the Court. But the Judge was understood to say that it was not necessary to do so, unless she had evinced signs of insanity since her trial. The Counsel then remarked that this was not the case; but that he had merely submitted to the sound discretion of the Court the observations with regard to her ignorance and imbecility, in order that the Court might see the propriety of a motion for a new trial, when, if granted, it was hoped such evidence might be adduced as would show her not to be a reasonable being. A new trial being refused in both cases, the Judge proceeded, with eloquence of manner and tenderness of feeling, to pronounce the sentence of the law. The following is believed to be the substance of

THE SENTENCE:

George and Harriet:

You have been fairly and impartially tried by a Jury of the country, and found guilty of the highest offence known to the law—the killing of a human being, without any reasonable excuse. The facts which led the Jury to this finding were so clear, so well connected, and so cogent, that the great ability and zeal exhibited in your defence could be of no avail; and the judgment of the law is, that you must die. Henceforth, therefore, you can be at liberty no more; henceforth you can no more engage in the pleasant pastimes of the world, but must be cast off in the prime and in the vigor of life, from the company of your friends and from the endearments of your kind-people, and consigned to the solemn chambers of the dead. It is no part of my duty to point out to you the peculiar mode in which you should seek to become reconciled to that God whose laws you have violated, and whose vengeance now, perhaps, impends over you. But I would warn you of your deplorable condition, and urge you to solicit the presence and instructions of some Minister of our holy