Q. By going and passing, as rather she was the person it was said she was?

A. I went to see her about the day after the fact happened, at Mrs. Kay's, her residence, and went to see her the identical same person. I went there with my wife and daughter; there was a company present named Hart; the lady introduced me to Mrs. Kay as the person that came to the house in Fifteenth street.

Q. How often I passed that house daily? I saw the house each three or four times; perhaps; think I saw her face every time she visited the place; her face was uncovered by a veil at all the other times; except the time when she threw it up; when I was looking from my back window she was perhaps seventy feet from me; the window was open, and I saw her features distinctly; she appeared as if she was looking around to see whether any body was looking at her; she did not throw her glance at the window where I was. On the 24th, when I saw her going through the alley on K street, I was at my own back gate; think she observed me; think she made no effort to conceal her features; but went straight up to the door; she had no veil over her face; if I had met her walking on the avenue, think I would have recognized her immediately. I had seen her passing about the city prior to that, and was told she was Mrs. Sickles; when she came to the house I thought it was the same person. I am satisfied now that it was the same person. I am satisfied now that it was Mrs. Sickles; I went to her house and satisfied myself that it was she; I was told by hearsay that it was Mrs. S.; and to satisfy myself I went to the house to see her, and that fully satisfied me.

To Mr. Graham. The walking was very miry, and muddy on some occasions when she came to the house; the alley was very deep, marshy, muddy alley; so much so, that the carts with coal could hardly get in; the walking was worse on those occasions than it has been for years before.

Mr. Carlisle. You thought it an extraordinary place for any decent woman to go along?

Witness. I thought it an extraordinary place for anybody to go along; the time I visited Mrs. S.'s house was about a week after Key's death; I went with my wife and daughter, through curiosity.

Mrs. Sarah Ann Seeley, sworn—examined by Mr. Brady.—I am the wife of John M. Seeley; knew Key from a boy, when his father lived in Georgetown; saw Key and Mrs. Sickles three different times; on the 15th of February, the first time my attention was called to Mr. Key and Mrs. S.; they were passing the street, and the police had a warrant against him; saw Officer Ginnity there, who stopped them; saw them in the evening about half past nine; they were passing Fifteenth street, going home; the first time I saw him on Gray's premises he was carrying wood in his arms; the next time he was in the alley, with a small roll in his hand, twisted, which might be taper; I only saw him once with wood in his arms; I once saw her on K street; I saw her come through the alley on the Wednesday before Key was killed; this was about one o'clock; she remained; I don't know how long there; did not see her come out of the house; I never saw her enter there but once, and then she went along; she was dressed in black silk; the square in the silk dark brown, with narrow stripes somewhat darker; cannot say whether they were black or bottle green; she had on a large velvet shawl, with twisted silk fringe and bugle; black bonnet and feathers, and short black lace veil; the first day I saw her she wore a white and black silk and worsted dress, and always had on the same shawl; Key wore a steel-mixed coat; cannot say whether he wore an overcoat or shawl; he had a small cane and keys in his hand, which rattled; I found out it was Mrs. Sickles for certain, for more than a week after the decease of Key. I went to Mrs. Sickles', accompanied by my husband and daughter, and there identified her as the same; I was introduced to Mrs. S. by Mr. Hart; she recognized us immediately after we passed into the room.

Cross-examined by Mr. Ould.—When I recognized the rattling of the keys it was on L street; Mrs. Sickles was with him at the time; I could not see them go in; my house is on L street, and theirs was on 15th; I was in the back part of my house in the second story; she wore a short veil on that occasion; I could distinguish her features; she looked like a person badly frightened.

Q. How did she exhibit this?

A. I can't give the indications of fear; she looked as if she were severely frightened, judging from the manner she was walking and running after Mr. Key.

Q. That is your impression?

A. It is; they were on the pavement immediately beneath us; my daughter called my attention to them; I did not pay as much attention to Mr. Key as I did to Mrs. Sickles; I had seen them on the morning of the 16th of February, at about eleven in the forenoon; again between three and four in the afternoon, and still again in the dusk of the evening; this was the only day I saw them together.

To Mr. Brady. I did not know how long the house had been occupied; I only knew that it was occupied when I saw smoke coming from the chimney; did not see anybody else coming there after Mr. Key began to come there.

Cross-examined by Mr. Ould.—She always wore a splendid shawl, of black velvet, with silk fringe and bugle trimming; it was a large shawl; it came down low on her person; Mr. Hart received us, at Mrs. Sickles' door; I told him what we came for; I went to see her to be certain, knowing that when people are summoned to court they have to be particular.

The Court reminded the witness she must answer the questions first, and then if she had anything to explain she could do so.

The witness begged pardon. It was the first time, she said, she was ever in court. Please excuse me this time. [Laughter.]

Mr. Brady. No wonder you are frightened, seeing so many lawyers here.

Mr. Carlisle. The women can beat us in talking.

Mr. Ratcliffe. It is well they can beat us in something.

The witness continued.—Mr. Hart asked me whether Mrs. Sickles was the same person; I said I thought she was; Mrs Sickles was in her chamber; she first recognized my daughter; it was in the morning, perhaps between 9 and 10 o'clock; witness repeated that she saw Mr. Key pass in the back way; she also repeated the description of Mrs. Sickles' dress; she (Mrs. Seeley) asked my daughter whether she was not looking out of the window when she and Mr. Key passed our house; my daughter replied in the affirmative.

James Ginnity, was the next witness, and was examined by Mr. Brady.—I am a police officer; know Mr. Key; know him between five and seven years; know Mrs. Sickles.

Q. Did you observe Mr. Key and Mrs. Sickles together in this city? If so, when and where?

A. On the 15th of February I was standing at the northeast corner of Fourteenth and L streets; in company with several gentlemen; they remarked, "Here comes—"

The District Attorney. Never mind that.

The witness. A remark was made which attracted my attention to Mr. Key and the lady.

Q. Describe their manoeuvres.

A. They came down L street, on the north side, to Fourteenth street; they went to K street and up Fourteenth street; they came down L, stopped to look after them, and as I thought, they turned down L street; I looked after them, and Mr. Key looked from behind; he might have been a little store on the corner; he peeped out and drew in again; he came out and walked down the street, and I stepped up and spoke to him for one or two minutes on Fifteenth street, between L and M; the lady was standing with him; I took a second look at her, and went home; they went down Fifteenth street; I don't know where; he had a small key twisting in his fingers; it was a key like this (in the look of the door).

Q. Who were present beside you that day, looking at this proceeding and observing it?

A. There were a great number of people on the steps of the doors and at the windows and all along these streets.

Q. Engaged in observing them?

A. Yes; engaged in observing them.

Q. Did you at that time know it was Mrs. Sickles?

A. No, sir.

Q. When did you discover it was?

A. I think the following week, or week after; it was after the decease of Key; I was requested by one of the counsel for the defence to go and see if I could not recognise her; went to Mr. Sickles' house; Mr. Hart asked me up stairs, and I went; I saw Mr. Sickles, and recognized her as the lady I saw on Fifteenth street; I knew James Miller, Alexander T. Borland, David Welsh, Thos. Langley, Joseph Edwards, and Wm. Prentice; think all of them were present when I observed Key and Mrs. Sickles; the lady I identified is the same lady all these persons saw.

Q. Mr. Ratcliffe. The walking was very bad that day; there were several persons besides those I have named, both white and black, standing at the doors and windows, and watching Key and Mrs. Sickles.

Matilda Seeley—a bright, fair-haired girl of sixteen—examined by Mr. Brady.—I am the daughter of John M. Seeley; I knew Key and Mrs Sickles; I saw Mrs. S. go into John Gray's house two weeks before Key's death; she went in along by the alley; had seen her in company with Key in that neighborhood; saw her twice in one day; this was before I saw her go in; the first time was between 12 and 1 o'clock, and the second time between 3 and 4 o'clock; when I first saw her I was standing at the corner of Fifteenth and L street, and the second time at the second-floor front window; saw Key once go in the back way; afterwards saw Mrs. S. at her house, and she recognised me.

To Mr. Carlisle. Did not see either go into the house on that day; the day I saw her was not the day that I saw him go in.

John B. Haskin, M. C., recalled.—I remember a visit which I made to the house of Mr. Sickles; this was in April, 1858; Mr. Sickles had left this city the previous day for New York or Albany; I called at the request of Mr. Sickles to see if his wife wanted anything.

Q. Relate the circumstance

Witness. A few days after Mr. Key had called at my house to converse with me in regard to the correspondence; Mr. Sickles was called to New York on business; before going he came to my house to the House, and desired me, as having been familiar with himself and wife, to drop in occasionally to see his wife, and ascertain if she wanted anything; the day following I had occasion to go with my children and wife to Georgetown to get some shoes, and when we got opposite the President's house Mr. Sickles' request occurred to me; I drove up to his door, he peed my wife out in a hurry, rushed up stairs, opened the front door and the door of the little library; I followed Mrs. Sickles; on entering the little library I found Mrs. Sickles and Mr. Key seated at a round table, with a large bowl of salad on it; she was mixing it; there was a bottle of champagne and glasses on the table; [laughter, which was suppressed by the officers;] I excused myself for my abrupt entrance; Mrs. Sickles got up flushed, and invited us to take a glass of wine with her; after sitting there for a moment, I hastened away with my wife; on entering the carriage, or immediately after entering it, my wife said (an attempt to interrupt the witness being ineffectual) "that Mrs. Sickles is a bad woman."

Q. Did you have any conversation with Mr. Key at that time in that room?

A. Yes; he said he was there at Mrs. Sickles' request, introduced my wife to Mr. Key—

Q. Did your lady ever visit there afterwards?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you see Mr. Key and Mrs. Sickes at any time after that?

A. Yes;—

Q. Where?

A. Shortly after that, in riding through the cemetery near Mr. Corcoran's country residence, I met Mr. Key and Mrs. Sickles in the cemetery; saw them at the theatre once or twice; and once or twice on the avenue.

Q. You have alluded to this correspondence and its termination. Did you speak to Mr. Key about it?

A. Mr. Key came and talked to me about it.

Mr. Carlisle. That does not strike us as material.

Mr. Brady wanted to show how Mr. Key expressed himself towards Mrs. Sickles, but he would not insist on the question.

To Mr. Ould. This latter and last champagne interview was between 4 and 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Brady. I propose to ask how, after this correspondence between Mr. Sickles and himself, Key described Mrs. Sickles—how childlike she was and how innocent, and what paternal relations he occupied towards her; that she was a mere child, and that he looked on her as a father. Is there any objection to that?

Mr. Carlisle. Certainly. I had not the slightest objection that Mr. Haskin should pronounce his judgment of a virtuous matron, or the conduct of this woman in April, 1858 though not strictly in evidence, but I do not see what Mr. Key's description of Mrs. Sickles has to do with this case.

Mr. Brady. It is a difficult defence to conceive what line of remark or argument the prosecution pursue as to the relations between these parties. We know that when the relations of a man and woman are called in question suggestions are frequently made about the husband being too confiding, too indulgent, too kind, and that is sometimes turned into a pretext in extenuation of the act of the adulterer. "I desire to show that Mr. Key had communicated to Mr. Haskin, and intended Mr. Haskin to impress on the mind of Mr. Sickles, that Mr. Key claimed to regard Mrs. Sickles as a young person who stood toward him in the relation of a child, and that he was almost in the situation denominated in law *in loco parentis*; and that, to prevent any possible suspicions on the part of Mr. Sickles that he could have towards that girl anything but honorable intentions, he made this declaration to which I refer, and which was communicated to Mr. Sickles.

The Judge. It does not appear to me that anything Mr. Key said on the subject of his relations with Mrs. Sickles can be evidence in this trial.

Mr. Brady. Well. I have made the offer. It is understood, and I do not propose to argue it.

Mr. Graham. The court will note our exception to its exclusion.

Mr. Carlisle to the witness. You are not mistaken about the point of time? It is as long ago as April of last year that you found Mrs. Sickles entertaining Mr. Key in her own house, in the absence of her husband?

The witness. No, sir, I am not mistaken about the time.

Mr. Brady. Did you communicate to Mr. Sickles this fact which you have related on the stand?

Witness. Never, sir.

To Mr. Carlisle. She was mixing the salad for him; there was a large bowl containing salad with a large wooden thing to mix it; she was using the wooden thing; [laughter.]

Q. Anything particular about that?

A. Nothing particular.

Q. And the champagne was ordinary?

A. Yes, ordinary champagne.

Mr. Ould. How much of it had disappeared?

A. I think about half had disappeared.

Here the court adjourned till to-morrow.

The Press.

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1859.

FORNEY'S CALIFORNIA PRESS

Will be Ready

TO-DAY, at 2 o'clock P. M.

This paper is published expressly for

CALIFORNIA CIRCULATION,

and contains a complete summary of what has transpired in our City, State, and the Atlantic States, since the departure of the last steamer for California.

Price Six Cents per copy, in strong wrappers, and stamped, ready for mailing.

☞ The gentlemen composing the Democratic State Central Committee are requested to meet at the Logan House, Altoona, Blair county, on WEDNESDAY, THE FOURTH DAY OF MAY NEXT, at 2 o'clock P. M., to prepare for the campaign, according to the instructions of the Convention.

JOHN W. FORNEY,

Chairman.

Defeat of Lord Derby's Government. At an early hour on the morning of Friday, April 1, the debate, on the new Reform Bill, in the English House of Commons, which had commenced on Monday, March 21, was brought to a close—the last speaker being Mr. DISRAELI, Ministerial leader of the House, who had originally introduced the measure. Mr. DISRAELI, whose speech occupies over five columns in *The Times*, had to reply to all the assailants of himself, his colleagues, and his measure. He spoke with even more than his usual ability, and was particularly severe upon the shuffling course pursued by Lords JOHN RUSSELL and PALMERSTON on Reform. Those noble lords, he might have said, went on the dog-in-the-manger plan of not granting Reform themselves and of not allowing others to grant it. From *The Times* we take the following sketch of the division:

"It was now a quarter to 1 o'clock, and, the Speaker having put the question, the House proceeded to a division. The greatest excitement prevailed in all parts of the House. Upwards of six hundred members were present; a considerable number of distinguished persons occupied the seats assigned to visitors on either side of the entrance behind the bar and the gallery immediately over the clock; while both the 'speakers' and 'strangers' galleries were crowded with an excited audience. Upwards of twenty minutes were consumed in taking the division, and as the moment for announcing the result approached, the excitement rose to the highest pitch. The great bulk of the members, as usual, on returning from their division lobbies, resumed their places on either side of the chamber, but a large number of them had assembled in a dense crowd at the bar. At length the tellers made their appearance, and then there were cries of 'Order, order!' and 'Bar, bar!' As the tellers took their places, it was seen in an instant on which side the majority lay, and as they advanced to the table a conference ensued, in anticipation of the actual result, rose from the Opposition side.

"The numbers were—

For the second reading of the bill.....291
For Lord J. Russell's resolution.....330

Majority for the resolution.....39

"As the numbers were announced, the House again rang with a triumphant shout from the Opposition benches. It will be perceived by the division that 621 members were in attendance—a number unprecedented, except on an extraordinary occasion, such as this."

A subsequent vote negatived Mr. DISRAELI's motion for the second reading of the bill.

We have taken the trouble of looking back into the divisions on the last Reform Bill, to compare the attendance of members on former occasions and the present. Lord GREY's first Reform Bill was lost, April 18, 1831, on General GASCOYNE's motion, by 229 to 291—total members voting, 590. The second Reform Bill, on September 19, 1831, was carried in the Commons by 345 to 236—total, 581. The third Reform Bill was carried, March 23, 1832, by 355 to 239—total, 594. The unusual number of 621, out of 658 members voted on the occasion which we now are noticing. In February, 1835, when the great trial of strength between PEEL and the Liberals took place, on the election of Speaker, 612 members voted, and a few weeks after, when PEEL was ousted by a hostile vote, 618 members divided. In September, 1841, when Lord MELBOURNE's Ministry were outvoted, 629 members were present. In 1846, when PEEL carried Free Trade, 556 members voted. On one occasion, at least, the attendance was greater than on the recent division.

Defeated in this Debate, Lord DERBY has his choice of three courses: To carry on the Government, as if nothing extraordinary had occurred, in which case the Opposition could refuse to pass the money-votes, and might carry a vote of want of confidence in Ministers. To resign office, which is what the Opposition desire. Lastly, to dissolve Parliament, and bring an amended Reform Bill before the new House of Commons.

When the House adjourned, after the division, Mr. DISRAELI carried a proposition that he wished an adjournment until the following Monday. Lord DERBY, who met the House of Lords in the afternoon, stated that after the division he had consulted with his colleagues, and subsequently saw the Queen, but "had not received the sanction of her Majesty to any course he might advise." He postponed further public mention of the subject until the following Monday, when he hoped to lay before the House what advice, in a crisis of such importance, he and his colleagues had felt it their duty to lay before her Majesty, and the course which, *with her Majesty's sanction*, they proposed to adopt.

This seems to indicate that the Queen would support her Ministry. Indeed, Mr. DISRAELI, in his Speech before the Division, intimated that, on taking office, Lord DERBY told the Queen that, in consequence of the House of Commons having been elected in 1857, under the Ministerial auspices of Lord PALMERSTON, he (DERBY) could not count on the support of more than a third of the members, and that the Queen still pressed him to take office, which he did. The inference here, of course, must be, that her Majesty gave him the usual authority, if he were defeated in the Commons, to convene a new House, by a General Election. We believe that this course will be adopted, and we think it not improbable, so little out-door excitement is there on Reform, that the balance of such an election would be in favor of the Derby Ministry.

Suppose, however, that this Ministry think fit to resign, who shall become Premier? Certainly not PALMERSTON, for he is disliked at Court and is personally unpopular in England, in consequence of his truckling to Louis NAPOLEON in the Orsini affair. Scarcely Lord JOHN RUSSELL, whose incapacity as an official leader is notorious. More probably Lord CLARENDON. But it will be recollected, on this side of the Atlantic, that the Derby Ministry have been as friendly and conciliatory to the United States as CLARENDON, PALMERSTON, and Co. have been capriciously hostile.

The *Times* announces, as symptomatic of Lord DERBY's intended resignation, that he intends converting three country gentlemen of large territorial possessions into Peers. These are Sir CHARLES MORGAN, of Tredegan, Monmouth; Mr. TATTON EGERTON, of Tatton, in Cheshire; and Colonel WYNDHAM, of Petworth, in Sussex. The London *Herald*, which affects to be Lord DERBY's special organ, gives, as the report of the Clubs, that the following persons would be created Barenots: "The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. GLADSTONE, Mr. SOTHERON ESTCOURT, Colonel TAYLOR, Colonel FORRESTER, and Mr. WM. DEEDES. It is stated that the Earl of DERBY will nominate Mr. HENLEY for one of the baronetcies, notwithstanding his recent defection from the Government." The honor of a title may gratify Mr. DISRAELI, but we suspect that he would prefer remaining one little month more in office. He has been a Cabinet Minister, first and last, 23 months. Had he served two years he could claim a life-pension of $10,000 as an ex-official!

The Paraguay Peace.

We are sincerely rejoiced to be enabled to chronicle the triumph of American diplomacy. The successful settlement of the threatening difficulty with Paraguay is not only confirmed, but confirmed in the most acceptable manner. We have read with some pleasure the inspiring correspondence between the American Commissioner, Hon. J. B. BOWLIN, and the mediator, General URQUIZA, President of the Argentine Confederation. It would be impossible to conceive a more sublime expression of fraternities. As models of composition, the letters will of course be preserved, but it is as examples of diplomatic genius that they should be specially embalmed in the recollections of civilization. Mr. BOWLIN is first addressed by the President of the Argentine Confederation, General URQUIZA, who proceeds to inform him that LOPEZ, the Dictator of Paraguay, is an exceedingly good fellow indeed, that he is "an illustrious ruler, with whom he (URQUIZA) enjoys an intimate friendship;" that he (U.) is resolved not to let his friend LOPEZ get into a row with the United States, especially as the Argentines are specially fond of the United States, &c. It appears that URQUIZA came to Asuncion, the capital of Paraguay, on the express consent of Mr. BOWLIN, and that his letter to BOWLIN was the first after his arrival at that point. To this letter Mr. BOWLIN responds, in part, as follows:

"The acknowledgment your Excellency makes of the encouragement and friendly spirit always shown by my Government towards its younger sisters of the South, cannot fail to quicken our desire and to fortify our determination of seeking and fomenting the development of kindred institutions and the aggrandizement of nations destined one day, no doubt, to serve as examples to all the world of free industry and intelligent happiness, as well as of material prosperity.

"I can scarcely say with how much ardor I will second your Excellency's expressed wish for a prompt, honorable, and friendly settlement of the painful questions which require my presence at this place. Demanding nothing that we do not believe to be just, and are not prepared to maintain, we are moved to hope that we shall not be disappointed in respect to the reasonable and pacific dispositions attributed by your Excellency to the President of Paraguay. Finally, whatever may be the issue of the pending negotiation, (and I renew my assurance that I have extended the olive branch, and will continue to do so,) I beg your Excellency to believe that I shall ever treasure up the memory of your good-will among the most precious recollections of my life. The close resemblance which exists between the institutions of the Confederation and those of the United States entitles us to consider the country of your Excellency in the light of an adopted one, who may invoke in vain the counsel and support of his foster father. If your Excellency takes pleasure in manifesting the friendly partiality which I am proud to have inspired, and congratulates my Government on the choice of my poor talent for the settlement of the very serious complications that exist between these republics and ourselves, we should be ought to employ in felicitating the Argentine Confederation on its good fortune in having raised to power a chief who unites to the daring courage of the warrior the prudent wisdom of the statesman? Trusting that your Excellency's long absence in obedience to such sacred and humane motives will but endear your Excellency more warmly to your fellow-citizens,

"I am, with grateful respect, your Excellency's obliged and humble friend and servant,

"JAMES B. BOWLIN."

To which URQUIZA responds in the following:

"ASUNCION, Feb. 1, 1859.

"*To his Excellency J. B. Bowlin, &c., &c.:*

"MOST EXCELLENT SIR, AND MY ILLUSTRIOUS FRIEND: My hopes have been fulfilled. The President of Paraguay and your Excellency have suffered me to be present at that happy settlement of the questions pending between the United States and Paraguay, which was this day concluded. The conference, which has been opened with a perfect result, has confirmed all that, in my previous letter, I had said to your Excellency, and especially all that referred to the elevated qualities of your Excellency. Envoys like your Excellency are truly messengers of peace and friendship. Happy will this country be if, in the choice of foreign States always ready to fall upon personages so upright and so noble; and never could any reason arise for misunderstandings between the great Powers and these Republics, which so much need the support of their friendly influence to assist their industrial and commercial progress. I am the best possible witness that your Excellency has spared no efforts *to secure a worthy* and honorable settlement; and that without so much zeal, prudence, and wisdom it would have been hard to do this. I cannot resign so cherished a glory as the part I attribute to myself in this happy result, but even for this I have to thank you for the opportunities so delicately offered by your Excellency. For the little that it may be worth, I feel it my duty to bear my testimony before my great friend, the President of the United States, to the lofty conduct of your Excellency, and to the gratitude I owe for the same to the great American nation and to its Government. I owe your Excellency the warmest expressions of congratulation and friendship, and let me be permitted to say that I count upon your Excellency's doing me the honor to visit me at San José, there, on the birthday of the immortal Washington, to celebrate the peace between the United States and Paraguay, for all that it is in itself, and for its bearing upon the future of American Republics, which will value this proof of the justice and nobility of the great nation, as contributing to the strength of those bonds which become their reciprocal interests and their common prosperity. In all that concerns my country, in my official position, and as a friend who longs to return the marks of consideration and esteem he has received, I am your Excellency's most obedient and faithful friend,

"JUSTO JOSE DE URQUIZA."

The last scene in this superb drama is described in the letter of Mr. BOWLIN himself, as copied from the Washington papers to-day. There is a vast amount of sack and very little bread.

WE have not allowed ourselves to be drawn into a comparison between the character of the meeting at Harrisburg on the 16th of March and that great Convention which assembled there on the 13th of April. Suffice it, that all who were present at these two bodies, or who have read their respective proceedings, can draw their own conclusions. A word may not be out of place, however, as to the peculiar composition of the first. With very few exceptions, it was a genuine representation of an official constituency. The delegates from Philadelphia no more represented the Democratic party of Philadelphia than they did the Opposition party. They were chosen by a very few people, in the midst of universal indifference, and were nearly all men dependent upon the patronage of Washington city for a living. The editor of the Warren (Pa.) *Ledger*, a Democratic paper of great influence, gives a graphic account of the kind of men who acted as delegates from that region in the Convention of the 10th of March, in the following extract:

"If we may judge the balance of the State by this sample, we have no hesitation in declaring that the delegates *mis*-represented the people. We will commence with this Senatorial district. Charles Lyman acted as the delegate. Mr L. is the mail agent on the Corning and Blossburg Railroad, and has resided at Corning, in the State of New York, for *five years past*. He never was chosen Senatorial delegate by the Democrats of this district, and living in New York he did not 'represent the people.'

"Murray Whallon appeared as a delegate from Erie county. Mr. W. is a Government official—has not resided in Erie county for *some time*—he was not chosen a delegate, neither was he substituted by any one who was chosen. The *people* of Erie county were unanimously in favor of the Sunbury and Erie bill, yet Mr. W. voted to censure Governor Packer because he was favorable to that bill. Did Mr. Whallon represent the people? Mr. W. was the man who was 'weak in the knees,' in 1856, and it was announced that he had 'come out' for Fremont.

"Again, the people of Elk county are as a unit in favor of the Sunbury and Erie—their interests and future prosperity are intimately connected with the success of that road; yet James L. Gillis appeared as a delegate from Elk county and voted against Gov. Packer. Did he represent the people? No! We did not expect he would, for he never did; and it was because of this faculty of his, of always acting adverse to the wishes of his constituents, that they repudiated *him* last fall. He seems now to be contented solely by a spirit of revenge. He is now determined to do all he can to retard the prosperity of 'the people.' Luckily, he is shorn of all power, and his career for doing harm is nearly ended. If there ever was a case of a person 'coming out of the little end of the horn,' Jim Gillis is the chap.

"Now, we will give a couple of instances where delegates were regularly chosen:

"Judge Ives, of Potter county, was selected as a delegate by the Democrats of that county. He went to Harrisburg and voted to sustain Governor Packer. Rasselas Brown, Esq., was the regularly chosen delegate from this county. He voted to sustain Governor Packer, and he fully represented the people.' Neither Judge Ives nor Mr. Brown 'are Government officials—consequently, they were not obliged to misrepresent 'the people,' as did Lyman Whallon and Gillis."

BY MIDNIGHT MAIL.

Letter from "Occasional."

[Correspondence of The Press.]

WASHINGTON, April 18, 1859.

The Richmond *Enquirer* gives the key-note to the Democracy of the country in an article dated April 14th, in which it declares "that the ascendancy of the Democratic party is seriously threatened, not only in Pennsylvania and in New York, but in the Federal Government in all its departments, by prevailing dissensions," and also, "that in more than half the Congressional districts of the South, where vacancies are to be supplied for the next Congress, issues have arisen full of peril to Democratic success." These are grave omens of such a time. But the past speaks for itself. Let us look to the future. How is harmony to be brought out of this discord? I will tell you. By falling back upon principle, and by rejecting the new leaders and new counsels which have been forced upon us. The Northern States never can submit to the dogma, asserted by the Administration, under the whip and spur of disunion threat, that slavery is entitled to a protection not accorded to other property, and that all the powers of the Government are to be perverted to the protection of slavery alone. The cry of "peace," so long as this dogma is insisted upon, is the advice of men who desire to see this pestilent heresy successful. But there is a deeper philosophy in these things than appears at first sight. The Southern extremists see that the popular will in the Territories is bound to prevail; and now, in order to save themselves, insist on rushing the country upon the dangerous alternative of Congressional intervention, and, as a consequence, upon the assistance of the bayonets of the United States troops, for the protection of their peculiar institution. Not that they expect to win; that is not their design *but that they may unite the Southern people in a disunion movement*. This is Mr. Yancey's purpose, and John Mitchell, who publishes a disunion paper in this city, openly avows it to be his; and there are hundreds of others ready to make it their cause the moment the opportunity presents itself. They will so inflame the public mind of the South, by telling them that slavery has no chance in the Territories, and that neither the courts nor Congress can protect it against the popular will, that the people of that quarter may at last go pell-mell into disunion as the only alternative from the imaginary dangers pictured before their eyes by ambitious leaders. Your movement in Pennsylvania may arrest this, or it may not. One effect will result from it certainly—to put you upon a solid platform, from which you can resist both extremes; protecting the South in all its just rights, and holding back the disunionists alike of that quarter and of the North. Had you stood still you would have seen your National Convention captured by the office-holders and the Southern secessionists. I assert, upon the best authority, that up to within two weeks it was the settled purpose of these influences to capture the Charleston Convention, and to compel that body to adopt a doctrine ignoring the popular will in the Territories. Those having charge of this scheme expect aid from certain dependants of power in New England, particularly in Maine, Vermont, and Massachusetts, and also from Tammany Hall in New York. With these votes, and such others as they might purchase in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New Jersey, they expect to go to Charleston, and dispose of matters to please themselves. The resolute and defiant attitude of your Democracy on the 13th has, I know, terrified these schemers, and they now begin to talk about concession and harmony. Be not dismayed. Proceed in the good work you have begun. Hold up the principle of popular sovereignty in the Territories, and in the course of a few months you will find thousands of men of all parties clustering around your standard.

The Republican leaders themselves (especially those who are sagacious enough to read the signs of the times) find that their favorite idea of Congressional intervention against slavery is bound to share the same fate with that of the South. A very large portion of the Opposition party is resolved against *all* intervention, and I will not be at all surprised if the most strenuous efforts are made to adopt popular sovereignty in the Republican party as the only way to save that party from overthrow. There are some exciting events quickening in the womb of the future.

The Paraguay expedition turns out to have been a sort of Cleopatra regatta, after all. It was a pleasant excursion, full of excitement to the marines and old sailors, and especially to Mr. *James* B. Bowlin, the commissioner appointed to adjust that most formidable difficulty. It has been more costly, too, than that of the Egyptian queen, for although there were no pearls melted in the wine of the squadron, yet the love passages between the Paraguay Dictator, Lopez, the President of the Argentine Confederation, General Urquiza, and Commissioner Bowlin, will be found to have cost our treasury many more thousands than the lascivious amours between Antony and Cleopatra extracted from the Roman treasury. Lopez, the Dictator of Paraguay, has acted the part to all this farce of a theatrical warrior, who backs his enemies from pasteboard hills and wooden battles, only to run away as they approach him. The correspondence between Urquiza and Bowlin, amusing and high flown as it is, is only excelled by the lame and impotent conclusion in the shape of damages, and in the other details of the settlement of this ridiculous affair. You certainly ought to obtain a copy of it, and condense such portions of it as will give your readers an idea of this extraordinary passage of love between the two plenipotentiaries. Bowlin's letter to the President created quite a flutter at the White House on Saturday. It was the first victory of the Administration, and it was welcomed, though it cost a deal of money. OCCASIONAL.

Letter from "Touchstone." THE NEW "RAPE OF THE LOCK."

[Correspondence of The Press.]

WASHINGTON, April 17, 1859.

The "Rape of the Lock" belonging to the house at which Key was in the habit of meeting Mrs. Sickles was a point not calculated on by the prosecution. Messrs. Ould and Carlisle were rather startled at the bold attempt to obliterate evidence, and thus defeat the ends of justice It was conclusively proved that the lock was removed and another put in its stead by order of Key's brother-in-law, and some other friends, the object evidently being to destroy the evidence showing the connection between the key found on deceased and the lock on the door of the house where he used to take Mrs. Sickles.

But the success of these gentlemen has not been equal to their endeavors, and they stand in a position of a most unenviable defeat—to use the mildest term possible. The whole Rape of the Lock, and the manner in which it was accomplished, has been admitted in evidence. The locksmith who removed it and replaced it by another, was discovered by Mr. T. J. Brown, and the original lock obtained. Its presentation in court, on the 16th, created a sensation. This morning the whole matter was disclosed. I learn that it is not the design of the counsel for the defence to follow up the discovery of the attempt to crush evidence by having the parties to it arrested. They are not actuated by any vindictive feeling. TOUCHSTONE.

Foreign American Enterprise.

[For The Press.]

Aware of the interest our people take in the extension of the field for American enterprise, I subjoin for you a synopsis of a recent letter from the Don Pedro II. R. R.

This contract was awarded to Americans at larger rates and over established English influence, to the significant appreciation of our property in "push." It is a limitation of five years. When one contemplates the amount and the difficulty of the work to be accomplished, and in a country where improved facilities are almost non-existent, it does not surprise, but it pleases us, to know that the Americans required five, whilst other bidders required four and ten years to complete so successfully and thoroughly a work destined at once to effect a marked change in the internal condition of a great but undeveloped empire, and to open a large and remunerative field for the exercise of our wonted genius and enterprise.

The Americans have met with many difficulties. The influences exerted against them in Brazil, extending to a tampering with laborers, and making current false impressions and statements, were not subdued without exertions of great patience and labor. In the opening of the work the operatives were not such as was desirable, consisting principally of adventurers with no fixed habits either of industry or morality. The transportation of material appears to have excited the ire of Neptune.

The major difficulty lay in the "start." The "start" is made, and a presentation of results before a recently called board of directors exhibits a much larger accomplishment than was anticipated. The contractors, sanguine and energetic, are now about making application of the "beginning." Labor has been exported from the United States, and *is* ample and reliable. The "Tunnelle Grande" is every day and night occupied by a large number of busy artificers, Americans, English, Welsh, Belgians, and Italians. At its eastern entrance the Brazilian and American flags are waving proudly in amity.

It may interest you to know that two of the enterprising contractors are of our city—Mr. Milner Roberts, an accomplished gentleman and a thorough engineer, and Mr. Harrah, a shipyard boy of Kensington, who, in South America, by the exercise of indomitable energy and fine talent, succeeded in placing himself financially and socially in a prominent position.

The prosecution of this work has caused a large ingress of Yankees into Rio, who are rapidly forming establishments. Previously there had existed but two or three American houses. McC.

MADAME BISCACCIANTI gives a Concert, at Musical Fund Hall, this evening. It is a long time since she last sang in Philadelphia, and, as she was a favorite then, she will probably have a good house on the present occasion.

VERY LARGE SALE THIS EVENING—VALUABLE REAL ESTATE, STOCKS, &c., by order of Orphans' Court, Executors, and others. See Thomas & Sons' pamphlet catalogue and advertisements.

RECOVERED.—Sarah Noble, aged 15 years, the young lady who was so severely injured by the Bengal tiger at the circus some two months since, left the Pennsylvania Hospital yesterday. Our readers will remember that her arm was so horribly lacerated by the tiger as to render amputation necessary. Her face was also shockingly bruised at the time, and is still disfigured.

The Settlement with Paraguay.

The official paper of Saturday contains the subjoined extracts from a private letter addressed to the President of the United States, by Mr. Commissioner Bowlin, giving an account of the settlement of our difficulties with the Republic of Paraguay. The letter will be found to be highly interesting:

PARAGUAY COMMISSION,
ASUNCION, FEBRUARY 11, 1859.

To his Excellency James Buchanan,
President of the United States:

SIR: I have the honor to inform you that this commission has been eminently successful, not merely in settling all our differences here in a peaceful and friendly manner, but in enlarging the sphere of our commercial privileges in these waters, and extending the time of the treaty, and in such a way as to enlist cordial sympathies and strengthen the bonds of friendship for the future. All this you would find in my despatches, protocols, and the treaties themselves, returned by me to the State Department; but, as that would impose a laborious research, I have thought proper to give you the important points through the brief medium of a private letter.

When I arrived on these waters things looked gloomy enough. When we reached Montevideo all seemed distant and reserved, indeed unkind. I determined to dissolve that icy reserve, and give them a better impression of us, as I knew every sentiment here was rapidly carried inland throughout the country. The Commodore and myself, after three days of delay, succeeded in procuring an interview with the President of Uruguay. It was stately and formal until I convinced him that our purpose was neither war, desolation, nor conquest. He then threw off his reserve, and, shaking my hand warmly, expressed great delight at hearing such sentiments from me. I observed in the crowd of officials around us that the Secretary for Foreign Affairs was not there. I therefore, on the same evening, called privately upon him at his house, and had a long interview with him, which resulted in completely disarming his hostile feeling. At the beginning he told me frankly he was the friend of President Lopez; at the conclusion he avowed himself our friend, and, with my permission, he would immediately advise his friend Lopez of our lofty and elevated sentiments and desire for peace

When I reached Parana, the capital of the Argentine Confederation, I met General Urquiza, the President, and had a long interview with him, the tenor of which is preserved by my secretary, Mr. Ward, and sent to the State Department. General Urquiza, who is every inch a soldier, and who in that interview, by his chivalrous frankness, had won rapidly upon my confidence, tendered me his mediation, which of course I was forced to decline, as I informed him, for two reasons—first, because my instructions had not anticipated such an event; and, second, because two out of the three points in my negotiations, that I would not yield my honor, and a nation, no more than an individual, could arbitrate its honor. But I assured him that, whilst I was compelled to decline his mediation as the bearer of the olive-branch, and knowing the views of the Administration, and its anxiety for an amicable but honorable adjustment of these unhappy difficulties, I should feel grateful to him for any kind offices he might employ in carrying out these peaceful views. As I closed these remarks, the General, with a kind of electric spontaneity, sprang from his seat, and, striking his breast fiercely with his hand, said: I am a soldier, but a man of peace; and, as a friend of peace and a friend of your Government, I accept your invitation, and will meet you at Asuncion.

I reached Asuncion on the 24th January, and Gen. Urquiza had anticipated me several days. Within an hour after our arrival, and before I left the vessel, Señor Amaral, the Brazilian minister, called upon me, and offered his mediation on behalf of his Empire. I declined it for the reasons above, and invited his friendly offices in like manner, assuring him of our desire for peace and friendship, if we could have them with honor. He warmly accepted my invitation for his friendly offices.

Our consul called directly after, and I came ashore with him. Everything looked cold and distant. The people seemed not to know how to behave towards me, and gazed at me as they would upon some evil thing cast amongst them.