

# INDEPENDENT STANDARD.

A. A. EABLE, EDITOR.

FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1856.

C. M. PETTINGILL & Co., 10 State St., Boston, and 119 Nassau St., New York, are authorized agents for the Standard in both those places.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.	
One column, one year,	\$40
Half " " " "	25
One square, one year,	6
One square, six months,	4
One square, three weeks,	1
Twelve lines or less make a square.	

## Doings of Council of Censors.

This body has at length completed its labors, after having held three sessions, two at Montpelier and one at Middlebury. The results of its deliberations were published last week. Its recommendations, it will be perceived, are of a most sweeping kind; and if adopted, would give us what might be very properly called, a new Constitution. Biennial sessions of the Legislature; the election of all State and County officers for two years; the election in all cases by a plurality instead of a majority rule; the choice of Secretary of State, State Treasurer, State Auditor, Bank Commissioner and Registers of Probate by the people, and an entire alteration of the basis of representation in both Houses of the Legislature, are recommended, with other changes of less importance. The proposed changes are certainly of a very important character, and will, of course, attract the serious attention of the people. Some of them we are inclined to view favorably, and others with less favor. But until we have given them a more attentive consideration, we shall express no decided opinion for or against any portion of them. It is probable that some of our readers may be desirous of expressing their views in relation to them, through the columns of the Standard, and we hereby tender its columns for that purpose; and further, would especially invite communications upon the subject. The small towns, we apprehend, will not part with the representation they have always enjoyed, without a struggle to retain it. The Council of Censors have frequently recommended a change in the basis of representation in the House of Representatives, depriving such towns of a representative each, but this recommendation has always failed of adoption. The Conventions called by the Council of Censors to pass upon their proposed alterations of the Constitution, have hitherto been composed of one member from each town—the same representation that the towns enjoy in the House of Representatives, and the towns have very naturally refused to disfranchise themselves, and probably ever would so refuse. Now, to avoid the moral certainty of a defeat of the proposition to change the basis of representation in the House—if it were submitted to a Convention composed of one member from each town—the Council of Censors have called a Convention to be composed of only ninety members, and these to be elected by general ticket in each County, as Senators are now elected. Orleans County, for instance, would have but five members, instead of nineteen, as formerly. Now, by what authority did the Council of Censors make this apportionment? Were they competent to do it? This is a very important question, and we apprehend that it must be answered in the negative. The Constitution provides that "the said Council of Censors shall have power to call a Convention, to meet within two years after their sitting," &c.; but it does not, in direct terms, confer any power to fix the basis of representation in such Convention. May this power be considered incident to the general power granted to call a Convention? We think not. It never has been so considered by any former Council of Censors; and that body has hitherto been composed of much able men than those who compose it at present; and of men equally as anxious as are the present members, to take from the small towns their present representation in the House. All precedent, then, is against this innovation.

The Constitution was formed by the towns, each represented in Convention by one delegate. All the amendments ever made to it, were made by the towns, represented in like manner. As the Montpelier Watchman and Journal truly remarks, "the Convention which originated Vermont as a State, and declared it to be independent, consisted of the towns, represented by delegates of the towns, represented by delegates of their own election, or by letter." The very authority that created the Council of Censors, was the towns. Now can this body thus created, turn round and disfranchise the authority that created it? Shall the created destroy its creator? We are not now arguing against the policy of depriving the towns of their equal representation in the House of Representatives; but we are contending that they cannot be deprived of this right without their consent—that the Convention to act upon this proposition, must be a Convention of the towns, and not a body arbitrarily constituted by the Council of Censors. The towns are competent to give up the right of equal representation as towns, if they

see fit; but we cannot, we think, be taken from them without their consent.—We repeat, that the towns originated Vermont as a State—the towns formed our Constitution—the towns have from time to time amended this Constitution—and it has ever been considered the settled constitutional policy of the State, that our organic laws could only be altered by the authority that created and has from time to time amended them, viz: the towns, represented in Convention by delegates. They are the source of power, so far as the Constitution and amendments to it are concerned. They created the body known as the Council of Censors, and this body cannot slay its own parent.

If this view of the matter be correct, then the whole doings of the Council of Censors must fall to the ground, inasmuch as there can be no such Convention as they have provided for. What say the freemen of this County, in this matter? What say the towns to the proposition to take from them their present representation in the Legislature?

## Speech of John P. Hale.

We publish this week such portions of Mr. Hale's speech as we think will be most interesting to our readers. The speech is very lengthy, else we should give it entire. It is, we think, one of the most masterly efforts he has ever given the country. Mr. Hale is a strong man, and he uses strong arguments, because he deals in facts and nothing but facts. Had the North a few more such men as him, she would not long endure the deep disgrace which has fallen upon her, by the acts of her recreant representatives. From his first appearance in the Senate chamber, Mr. Hale has ever maintained his integrity and fought manfully for the right, no matter what the odds against him. He has his reward in the affections of his constituents—scattered over the whole North, and wherever freedom has a friend or oppression an opponent.

"THERE WAS A SOUND OF REVELRY BY NIGHT."—The Dancing School Public at Whipple's Hall, on the evening of the 14th inst., was very respectable as to numbers and appearance. Altogether, it was very creditable both to teacher and landlord. We took no part in the festivities of the occasion, because the talent that layeth in our heels is not so fully developed as in many of our neighbors.

LIQUOR LAW IN DERBY.—On Friday the 14th inst., Mr. Henry Field of Derby, was arraigned before Justice Carpenter on an indictment for selling intoxicating liquor as a beverage. He pleaded not guilty, when witnesses were introduced, proving two offences since the first of January. He was fined \$20 and costs, the whole amounting to \$36.

DROPPED DEAD.—By politeness of a friend in Groton, we learn that Mr. Lowell of that place dropped dead while in the woods, chopping, on the 25th ult.—He had been engaged in felling a tree, and as it seemed inclined to go a different way from what he wished to have it, he began to trim a small tree in order to get more purchase, and dropped in the act of trimming it. He was about 72 years of age.

A man named Joseph Chapman of Barton, was found dead in his bed on the morning of the 10th inst. He retired the night before in perfect health. Aged 72 years.

Spring is really coming, for already the weather is more milder, nor it was.

## A Terrible Disaster!

Ferry Boat on Fire—Thirty Dead and Missing.

PHILADELPHIA, March 15. About half-past nine o'clock to-night the ferry boat "New Jersey," while crossing the Delaware to Camden, took fire in the middle of the stream. There being a great deal of floating ice in the river, much difficulty was experienced in managing the vessel, and she was finally run upon the bar opposite Arch street. About one hundred passengers were on board, many of whom jumped into the river and were rescued by boats, and others saved themselves by clinging to floating ice. It is feared that a large number are drowned. The boat is now burned to the water's edge. Great confusion prevails, and it is impossible to gather authentic details. It is now asserted that not less than thirty lives have been lost.

THE LATEST.—Three bodies found altogether—John Little of Camden, F. Fitzpatrick of Philadelphia, and Abraham Jannie. The origin of the fire is unknown. It burst suddenly from the fire-room, and spread instantly. The pilot house fell in as the boat was nearing the wharf, rendering her unmanageable from disarrangement of the tiller-cables. Her head sheered from the wharf and the engine could not be stopped, because the engineer was driven from his post by the flames, and the boat carried the remaining passengers away from the land. Number dead and missing about thirty.

## SPEECH OF JOHN P. HALE.

### RESPONSIBILITY FOR SLAVERY.

Mr. President, it cannot have escaped your ear, it cannot have escaped the ear of any honorable Senator who is within the sound of my voice, that when the subject of slavery is introduced, gentlemen from those States in which it exists turn around and say, reproachfully, "We found the institution; we did not bring it here; it was entailed upon us by the cupidity of eastern merchants; it was entailed upon us by the British Crown; it was entailed upon us by those who had the control and agency long before we came upon the stage of being." Grant it. I am willing to give to gentlemen who are disposed to make such a plea, all that they can take by it; and what is the lesson that it teaches us? Sir, it teaches us, who in this our day occupy these seats, that if in the coming future it shall be so destined in the councils of Omnipotence that the Territory of Kansas shall groan under the blighting influence of the institution of slavery, those who feel its withering effects may not stand up and reproach our posterity by telling them, "Your fathers forced it on this soil." No, sir, we wish to stand clear of that reproach, which is so often and so freely cast on our fathers.

In the very debate which took place in the Senate on the Kansas bill, if I mistake not, in the speech of an honorable Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Badger)—not now a member of this body—that very reproach was hurled back on the inhabitants of the free States, and they were told that it was to their agency and their cupidity that the South owed the existence of the institution among them. I do not remember, sir, during the many years that I have been in this Capitol, to have met with more than three individuals who have not been willing to admit, and have not admitted, that if the question of slavery were a new one, for the first time introduced, and if the question was submitted to them as they were about to plant themselves on the virgin soil of their native State, and they had the control of it, they would not have slavery with them. If they would have it with them, if it were an original question in their own State, I ask them in the name of justice, in the name of humanity in the name of that Christianity which teaches us "to do unto others as we would they should do unto us," why should they seek now to fasten it upon another Territory? Sir, the position which I occupy, and which is occupied by those with whom I act, is that it may never be a reproach to us or to our posterity that, through our agency and through our want of fidelity to the principles which we profess, this institution which we condemn shall be fastened upon this Territory.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator allow me to give him a matter of statistics?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I knew the Senator would do it, because he is a ready man. At one time, sir, I thought it probable that I might have to go to Boston to perform a duty which my friend from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] has done so much better than I could; and with that view I prepared myself with some statistics on this subject, which I desire to present. I desire to state them now, for I know of no other way to getting them before a certain class unless through the speech of the Senator from New Hampshire.—He says that, so far from being tainted with the sin and agency of introducing slavery, the North would hold themselves bound by all obligations to which he has referred. With the view which I have mentioned I sent to the custom-house in Charleston to obtain certain information. Most of the registers were lost, but from those that remained I obtained some information which I will state.

When the slave trade was suppressed, it was suppressed by the common vote of the North and the South; and when it was restored, it was restored by the common vote of the North and the South; but after it was restored it was through northern merchants that slaves were taken from Africa. They were brought in northern vessels. Out of forty thousand—that was the number, for I recollect it expressly—two thirds were of the North. Five thousand were on account of one northern State, six thousand were on account of another, and but two thousand on account of South Carolina. So far as regards the sin of bringing them here, I do not think that we are to be responsible if we should attempt to throw it back on those who introduced them.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I am glad to have this piece of information. It was the very train of argument which I was pursuing. I said that you reproached our fathers, and justly, I have no doubt. I have no doubt the Senator is historically correct.

Mr. BUTLER. What I have stated is according to undoubted statistics.

Mr. HALE. I have not the slightest doubt of it, and I am glad I have got it; but what I mean, please God, is, that it shall not be true in the future. I mean

that if another land is to groan under the evil of slavery, no Senator from South Carolina, or from any other State, shall have a right to stand up in his place and point at New Hampshire, and say "You did it." I take all the blame which the Senator means to administer to the northern States. I have no doubt that the cupidity of commerce yielded much, very much, and that there is great blame. I have no doubt, further, that the same cupidity which induced northern merchants to take the course which the Senator from South Carolina brings to my mind, is still left in the country, and it would do the same thing again, unless restrained by law.

### THE POWER OF CONGRESS OVER SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.

Having gone thus far on this train of remark, I come now to another point of the case; and I propose to examine the question of the power of Congress over slavery in the Territories; and I shall do it, I think, to the apprehension of the popular and of the legal mind. The ground which I take is, that Congress has an undoubted constitutional power to prohibit slavery, from going into any of the Territories of the United States; and to that point I wish the attention of the Senate. In the first place I suppose, when you wish to settle a question as to whether the Congress of the United States has a certain power or not, the simplest, readiest, and easiest way of settling that question is to turn to the Constitution itself. The Constitution is a plain instrument, made by plain men. It is a universal law governing States and individuals; and being made by plain men, for the government of everybody within the country, States as well as individuals, one would naturally suppose that it would be written in a language which plain men might understand. Well, sir, by looking to the Constitution, what do you find? You find it there written, "the Congress shall have power"—to do what?—to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

Some have said that this cannot mean all rules, because there must be certain limits. Undoubtedly there are limits, but what are they? The limits are to be found in other parts of the Constitution; and if there are any restrictions on that grant, the grant is thus far restricted; but if there be no restriction, it is unlimited. The language of the Constitution is exceedingly plain. "The Congress shall have power to make"—how many rules?—"all needful rules." How do Congress make rules? By law. How do they make the rules and regulations concerning the Navy? By law. How do they make the rules and regulations concerning the Army? By law. How do Congress make any rules or regulations? By law; and in no other way. Then, how many regulations may they make in regard to territory? All. If the prohibition of slavery is a regulation coming within the comprehensive description of "all regulations," it is what Congress has a right to make; but if it be a regulation outside of "all," and not included in the adjective "all," we must go somewhere else to find it. What did the men who made the Constitution think? What did they understand? What did they suppose they had done? Why, sir, it appears, fortunately for the elucidation of this history, that in the convention which framed the Constitution there were twenty men who were also members of the first Congress under the Federal Constitution. There was John Langdon, of New Hampshire, a man of some note in his day—a man enjoying the confidence of the Democracy of this country, and who was nominated for the office of Vice President by that party when Jefferson was President—a nomination which he declined on account of his age. He was a member of both bodies. There were also in the Federal Convention and in the First Congress, Nicholas Gilman, of New Hampshire; Elbridge Gerry, Rufus King, and Caleb Strong, of Massachusetts; William S. Johnson, Roger Sherman, and Ellsworth, of Connecticut; William Paterson, of New Jersey; Robert Morris, John Clymer, and Thomas Fitzsimmons, of Pennsylvania; George Read and Richard Bassett, of Delaware; Daniel Carroll, of Maryland; James Madison, of Virginia; Hugh Williamson, of North Carolina; Pierce Butler, of South Carolina; and William Few and Abraham Baldwin, of Georgia. All these gentlemen whom I have named were members of the convention which formed the Federal Constitution, and also members of the First Congress under it. George Washington was the presiding officer of the convention, and he was the first President of the United States under the Constitution. Several of the gentlemen whom I have named were also members of the Congress which passed the ordinance of 1787, besides being members of the convention and of the First Congress under the Constitution.

### THE EARLY POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT ANTI-SLAVERY.

The first Congress met shortly after the formation of the Constitution. Prior to the adoption of that Constitution, the Congress of the old Confederation passed an ordinance by which slavery was excluded from every inch of territory then subject to Federal jurisdiction. When the First Congress met, what did they think? What did those twenty men, fresh from the formation of the Constitution, think of its powers? What did George Washington, the presiding officer of the convention, think? What did James Madison think? Why, sir, you can find their opinions in an act of Congress passed without division and signed by George Washington, and now in full force unless it has been repealed by being found to be inconsistent with the compromise of 1850. On the 7th of August, 1789, they passed an act in these words: "Whereas, in order that the ordinance of the United States in Congress assembled, for the government of the territory northwest of the Ohio, may continue to have full effect, it is requisite that certain provisions should be made, so as to adapt the same to the present Constitution of the United States."

And then they went on in two sections to make a few alterations which were necessary merely by a change of the officers provided for under the Confederation. In the opinion of those men, when they made those alterations, merely requiring a change of officers, they thought—perhaps in their weakness, perhaps in their folly—that they had done all that was necessary to adapt the ordinance of 1787 to the Constitution of the United States. George Washington affixed his signature to that act, and it stands on the statute book to-day; and no man can challenge the assertion, that it was the opinion of George Washington, (so far as his official acts are any indication of his opinion)—of James Madison, who did more to produce the adoption and ratification of the Federal Constitution, perhaps, than any other man, with the exception of Alexander Hamilton; of the opinion of John Langdon, of Rufus King, of Pierce Butler, of South Carolina, of Mr. Few and Mr. Baldwin of Georgia, and those other men whom I have named—that Congress had power under the Constitution to prohibit slavery in the Territories. They did it, and their act has remained, from that day to the present, unchallenged and unrepelled. Let me ask you, sir, if, in the history of this Government, from the time of the adoption of the Federal Constitution down to the present day, any President of the United States has suggested to Congress that the existence of that statute was not warranted by the Constitution, and ought therefore to be repealed? No, sir. And I do not believe that there is a man rash enough at the present day to venture his reputation upon such an onslaught as that would be on the judgment, the intelligence, and the patriotism of the Father of his Country who helped to form the Constitution, and who signed this very act.

Then, sir, look at the acts organizing territorial governments ever since; and you will find without exception, that Congress have taken jurisdiction on this subject, unchallenged—prohibiting slavery in some cases, regulating it in others. You will find that in laws organizing territorial governments for even Southern Territories of Louisiana and Mississippi, Congress did take cognizance of the subject of slavery, regulating and limiting it in those cases and restricting it in others. The country reposed in safety, peace, security and harmony under this construction, until these latter days, when in the new-light revelations of the present it has been discovered that Washington, Madison, Langdon, King, Ellsworth, Gerry, and all their compatriots who were engaged in making and administering the Constitution, died in happy ignorance of what its essential provisions were. I confess that, for one, I am willing to take my chance of being mistaken, with those dead fathers of the past, rather than run the doubtful chance of getting illumination from the new lights of to-day.

### WHAT ANTI-NEBRASKA MEN WANT.

Now, sir, what do we want? What do we ask? We ask that the country shall come back to the point from which it started. We enter upon no crusade against any Southern rights. We ask for no new doctrine, no new experiments, no rash, doubtful, or untried measures. We are satisfied with the wisdom of the past. We are satisfied with the inheritance and the legacy which the patriots of the Revolution have left us. We are willing to take the Constitution as they understood it, and the law as they framed and administered it. Is it arrogance for us to ask that you come with us there? We ask you to go no further: we merely ask you to come with us and take counsel of the departed patriotism of the fathers of the Revolution. We ask you to listen to their doings when the wounds of the revolution were not yet healed over, when the blood and dust of the battle were hardly wiped from their brows, and when their locks were hoary with the frosts which have fallen upon them as they stood sentinels round about the camps of liberty. That is what we ask, and we are willing to abide by it; and when we ask that, and when we demand it, how are we met? We are told that we are aggressive; and we are threatened that if our aggressions do not cease, if our tauntings do not come to an end, and if the spirit of Northern fanaticism,

which is continually making aggressions, does not cease, this Union cannot be maintained. Sir, I feel obliged to believe the sincerity of gentlemen when they get up and talk about Northern aggressions, but it is one of the hardest things I am bound to believe. Bound as I am to believe it on their word, I have never had the face to go home and tell my constituents so; because they would tell me that, however I might believe it, they know better. Sir, they have made as much progress as Mr. Everett had made on the Nebraska bill; they not only know it themselves, but they know that everybody else knows it; that there is not only no truth in it, but that the exact reverse is the truth of history, the truth of the past, the truth of the present and may God grant that it shall not be the truth of the future!

### WHAT WRONG HAS THE NORTH BEEN GUILTY OF?

I have now a word or two to say to the honorable Senator from Tennessee, [Mr. Jones.] and I shall speak to him more kindly than he did to me, but perhaps not so eloquently. The Senator from Tennessee represents his State ably, brilliantly—I say it in no Pickwickian sense. He came here with a very high reputation. I am a much humbler man, of more moderate powers, and vastly less pretensions, representing the small State of New Hampshire. Now, I will put it to the honorable Senator from Tennessee, as between our two States, what harm on earth have we ever done him? Have we ever injured the hair of a man's head in Tennessee? Have we the State of New Hampshire ever withholden our appreciation of a public man because he lived in the State of Tennessee? No, sir; twice in solid column have the unalterable Democracy, of whom I spoke to you, gone up in unbroken phalanx to the polls and recorded their votes for two citizens of Tennessee for the highest office in the gift of the Republic. I confess, that with my reading of history, I am at a loss to discover in the history of either or both States a single iota of evidence that could convict New Hampshire, or one man in it, of injuring, by word or deed, or even thought, the State of Tennessee, or a single citizen of that State.

The best way to examine all questions is to take them in detail—one from the mass, and examine it. So far as my humble State is concerned, might I not go through with every State of the Union and put the same question, and would not every man be at a loss to gainsey it? Certainly he would. Then, I would say, in the language of Brutus—though I am not going into the Roman oratory—"If we have offended any man let him speak." If there is any man who has suffered wrong or injustice at our hands, where is he? I do not know it. Why not look at this matter in the light of the truth of history? Why not lay aside these angry appeals, why not lay aside everything except the solid, substantial truth of history, and look it right in the face? When we do that, I am not at all afraid when we are tried before any tribunal in earth or heaven, but that the skirts of our garments will be found clean of any offence against any of our sister States.

Mr. President, I read some remarks which were made by the honorable Senator from South Carolina, [Mr. Butler.] when the Kansas bill was under consideration in the Senate two years ago. I am not able to give his exact words, because I cannot speak so eloquently as that Senator; but I remember that he said, speaking in regard to the South, that the South wanted her heart relieved more than any practical burden taken off. I may not have given his very language, but that, I think; is the idea; I remember it, for I read it last night in the Globe. Sir, I confess that when I read that remark, it thrilled my very heart. An appeal of that sort made to the North will never be made in vain; but such has not been the spirit in which gentlemen entertaining the opinions that I do have been accustomed to be addressed by gentlemen from the South. Let me tell you, sir, and I think I can speak in behalf of my own State, that when an appeal is made to them from the South, or the West, or anywhere else in that spirit, they would coin their very hearts to buy peace,—they would pour out their very heart's blood like water to wash out the least and the last offence.

### WHAT THE NORTH CANNOT YIELD.

But, sir, I appeal to the truth of history—I appeal to the convictions of every man who hears me, if we have ever been addressed in any spirit like that? No, sir, far, very far indeed from it. I shall not endeavor, however, to awake those angry passions which I am deprecating by a repetition of the course which had been heretofore pursued towards us. I am willing—and desire—that so far as past occasions of offence are concerned, they should be past. I am willing that the dead past should bury its dead; I desire to live in the present, in the language of the poet— "Heart within, and God's o'er head." mindful of all the obligations which the Constitution, or which our duty, or demands of justice make upon us. Thus

much we are willing to give. We will go far, very far, for peace; but let me say, I am not used to the language of menace; I am not used to the utterance of threats; but I tell you that on the subject of human slavery, we have convictions which we cannot sacrifice—we have opinions which it were treason to our moral nature to refrain from expressing on all suitable occasions. Up to that mark we must stand. We must say, as those of old have said, when we reach a point where duty, conscience, conviction must be surrendered, we cannot go. We cannot consent to surrender our opinions, convictions, or sentiments.—What then? Must this Union be dissolved? Sir, I do not believe it. I do not believe—gentlemen will pardon me if I say it, for it is an opinion—I do not believe that the popular opinion of the great masses of the people of this country is represented, when gentlemen talk so so pippantly as I have heard some talk about a dissolution of this Union. I believe to-day that ours is the strongest Government on the face of the earth. I believe that its foundations are the firmest, the most enduring. What are they? The popular judgment—the popular heart. There it is, sir; there is the solemn, the broad, and the everlasting basis upon which the institutions of this country rest. My own opinion is, that such never will be found to be the case whenever and wherever infatuation shall be led to try the experiment. I believe that if, listening to evil counsels, pushed on by the purposes of ambition or any other, a party, large or small, shall be so far forsaken of God and of good counsels as to venture on that rash experiment, the conservatism, the patriotism, the intelligence, and the humanity of this great people will teach such men a lesson which they nor their children, nor their children's children to the latest posterity will forget.

## The New Hampshire Election.

The defeat of the administration in New Hampshire was far more signal than we had at first reason to suppose. A large opposition loss was anticipated, and fears were entertained that owing to local issues the administration party might carry the State. They had the liquor law, the reorganization of the judiciary, and other prominent measures of the last Legislature of which to make party capital, and industriously did they use them. On the other hand the majority of the opposition last year was so large, and its elements were so incongruous, that a reaction might have been reasonably expected in the natural course of events. The friends of the administration had good reason for entertaining confident hopes of carrying the State, and their disappointment at the result is proportionally great.

Although the opposition has met with considerable losses, their majority is sufficiently decided for all practical purposes. They have really swept the State, and Democracy is as effectually prostrated as it was last year. The Concord Statesman has returns of the votes for Governor from all but nineteen small towns, which foot up as follows: Metcalf (American) 31,357; Wells (Dem.) 30,472; Goodwin (Whig) 2441. The same towns gave last year, Metcalf 31,041; Bale (Dem.) 25,313; Bell (Whig) 4532. It will be seen that the American vote has actually increased this year over last though not in proportion to the Democratic. Taking the aggregate opposition vote, there has been a loss of only 17,000 votes, which, considering the distracting issues introduced into the campaign, is really remarkable.

According to the returns of the Statesman the opposition have elected 165 Representatives against 130 Democrats. The American candidates for Senator have been elected in districts two, three, four, five, seven, nine, ten, and eleven—in eight Senators. The Democrats have elected in the remaining districts—in all four Senators. There being no choice for Governor by the people, the election will be made by the Legislature on joint ballots, and Metcalf will be chosen by a very decided majority.

The American candidates for the Council are probably chosen, taking the Governor vote for the basis of calculation, in the 1st, 3d, and 4th Districts. The Democrats seem in great doubt, and the Democrats succeed in the 5th.

The Statesman intimates that false reports of the election were industriously circulated from Concord for political effect in towns where the elections were not completed on Tuesday, and heard that at Exeter the gun and cartridge were kept in readiness for a salute in honor of the election of Mr. Wells by the people. At Nashua, the friends of Mr. Wells had a boisterous jubilation, in the belief that they had carried the State. Boston Journal.

A rich old spinster died at New Hampshire, lately, leaving \$28,000. She was all her life getting ready to be married, and had stored up 182 silver 63 coverlets, 50 blankets, 27 beds, 1120 pounds of feathers, 54 towels, 120 table covers and 45 handkerchiefs, which the whole amount of her wearing apparel did not exceed ten dollars value.