lost his right by *non-user*, and asked the House to consider that point. I am yet to learn that any one on the floor urged that his seat was vacant in consequence of non-ignition. The committee was instructed to inquire whether Mr. Stevens had forfeited his seat. And in their letter to that gentleman they stated their object to be such. The gentleman from Northumberland [Mr. Hepburn,] finding that the *democracy* of the House had assigned him the task, to use the words of the gentleman from Bedford [Mr. M'Elwee] "*of getting rid of Mr. Stevens in the easiest way*," after much patient investigation of the points alleged as grounds of the forfeiture in the debate, and being unable to sustain them but upon this notable expedient—the assertion that his seat had been vacated by his resignation.

The language of the constitution which declares that the House "may with the concurrence of two thirds expel a member, but not a second time for the same cause;" and the known maxim of law that which is directly prohibited cannot be done indirectly, presented a barrier which he did not adventure to overleap. I conceive that it was the duty of the committee to have reported to the House, the fact that Mr. Stevens had forfeited his seat, and if they desired to inquire into this ground, to have obtained the authority of the House for so doing. They chose, however, to go out of their jurisdiction, and we are informed for the first time, by the report of a fact, which I suppose, all would have known, had it an existence, that Mr Stevens had resigned. It cannot be said that the committee in taking this ground have not transcended the authority granted them by the House.—For a resignation is plainly not a forfeiture. Mr. Stevens could not forfeit that which he did not possess. This method of proceeding was highly unjust to the minority of the committee (Mr. Cunningham,) highly unjust to Mr. Stevens and to his constituents. Had it been made known to the gentleman from Mercer (Mr. Cunningham,) that the committee were to inquire whether Mr. Stevens had resigned. It is probable that he would have attended the meeting of the committee, as the House perhaps possess the right to institute such inquiry. It is manifest from his letter to the committee that the gentleman from Adams (Mr. Stevens,) never imagined the existence of this ground finally taken by the committee and the "*party*" as "the easiest mode of getting rid of him." It is not improbable, had their purpose not been concealed, that he would have appeared before them—his objection was that the committee had been charged with an inquiry which the House had no right to institute; that being admitted on the records of the House a "duly returned member," the Speaker could not refuse to administer to him the requisite oaths. What are the merits of this question thus sprung upon us? Has Mr. Stevens resigned?

The committee have produced as evidence of his resignation, the only evidence they have seen fit to furnish, a letter addressed by Mr. Stevens to his constituents. It contains the following passage upon which they rest their argument.

"I find no difficulty in choosing my own course—in selecting between an association with successful insurgents or withdrawing from office. Such voluntary association would sanctify or at least palliate their treason.—Preferring retirement to dishonor, I withdraw from the Legislature to mingle again with you, and await your decision on my conduct."

Every step in the process of reasoning by which they reach their conclusion is embarrassed by doubt. The whole chain of their argument does not contain a single admitted principle. I deny that this language is a resignation. I deny that there is any thing in the constitution and our laws, or the practice of the country, that warrants the assertion that a member may resign his seat to his constituents; I assert that were this a resignation, it was entirely competent for Mr. Stevens to withdraw it at any time before a writ had been issued for a new election.

A resignation is an entirely voluntary act. A member is clothed by virtue of his election with certain powers; and the obligation to perform those powers he cannot abandon without the consent of the people, and not wrong the electors. Every principle applicable to the construction of such a paper as this forbids us to work its language, to charge the representative with a dereliction of duty, and deprive his constituents of a full representation in the House. Let us assume for the sake of argument, that Mr. Stevens was outraged by the conduct of the majority of this House, and of those sympathizing in their political sentiments out of doors; that he considered the House illegally constituted and that its existence was threatening the well being of the commonwealth; that his presence in the body would not enable him to arrest its mischeds, or act in behalf of his constituents with advantage to them; that his sojourn would not adjust upon consistent part, that their organization was legal, and that they truly represented the people, and that he was determined not to participate in their proceedings, and to declare such determination to his constituents, and await their decision on his conduct in this particular. I ask whether his intention could not have been well expressed in the words quoted—I repeat them.

"I have no difficulty in choosing my own course—in selecting between an association with successful insurgents or withdrawing from office. Such voluntary association would sanctify or at least palliate their treason.—Preferring retirement to dishonor, I withdraw from the legislature to mingle again with you, and await your decision on my conduct."

The case I have stated as assumed is the case before us. The whole letter distinctly reveals his intentions to be such as I have supposed. The word withdraw is not equivalent to resign. The first means to retreat retire; the letter to surrender or give up. I think that it will be difficult for the gentleman from Northumberland, to produce an instance of a paper prepared by any person, however unskilled in the use of the English language, intended to be a resignation that does not use the word resign. Can it be supposed that Mr. Stevens whose ability and command of the whole resource of the language he speaks, is admitted, was unable to use the only appropriate word to express his purpose, if it were such as the committee ascribe to him.

I have said that the language used in this letter is not a resignation. Had it been addressed to the Speaker it would not have been sufficient in issuing a new writ. That officer would not have a right to collect from ambiguous and equivocal terms an intention to resign. Such a construction of not a matter of inference; and can only be found in terms plain and direct. If this letter had been addressed to the Speaker, and he had issued his writ would he not have been bound to recall it had Mr. Stevens promptly made known to him that it was not his intention to resign, but merely not to attend the session of the House?

But Sir, how much is the difficulty of the Committee, in making out their report, increased by the letter being addressed to his constituents?

Such a resignation being an entire novelty, altogether unknown, and without precedent. I shall not enter at length, into the discussion of this point, which was ably and fully treated by my colleague (Mr. Smith,) I shall content myself with stating some of the difficulties attending such a procedure. How are the people to take notice of the fact of resignation? What is to be deemed sufficient evidence of the fact? And how are they to ascertain it? What is to be deemed sufficient for their action? Are they to take a statement of the newspapers as a warrant for their proceeding at once to an election? Could they act without a warrant issued by the Speaker? Are they to be deprived of representation for much the larger part of the session, unless a member who is supposed to resign sets to the House and to his seat and a committee is appointed as in this case to enquire into the fact? Can the House supply any neglect on the part of the constituency in not bringing the matter before it by petition? The Speaker, or, and I presume the House in the language of the report, cannot take notice of mere newspaper articles. It is an error to suppose that the only portion of the people at all interested are the immediate constituents of the resigning member. The whole people are concerned. The delegation from Philadelphia, represent not only that city, but the whole commonwealth. Every section is entitled to their consideration and vote. They are warmly attached to the project of a canal by the West branch to unite the waters of the Allegheny with those of the Susquehannah; the project of the Rail Road from Sunbury to Erie; to the improvement of the unjustly neglected Northern and North western counties. Would it not be a wrong to those sections of the county to deprive them of our vote should we conclude our resignation to be obvious that I shall not think myself warranted in discussing it, at the expense of the House.

I believe that it will be conceded that the most the gentleman from Northumberland can make of this letter is, that its terms are ambiguous, and may express as well an intention to resign, as the purpose of absenting himself from the House. When words occur in instruments of writing subjected to legal interpretation which express a double sense, parol evidence may be admitted to explain the real meaning of the writer. Had the committee sought the truth: really desired to ascertain the intention with which Mr. Stevens had written this letter, they would have found no difficulty, by an examination of proper witnesses in doing so.

Such however, I am afraid was not their object. They were appointed in order to devise a method by which Mr. Stevens might be deprived of his seat. Such was the will of the party, resolved upon before and no one could oppose that will, without expecting the instant denunciation of his fellows, and his political destruction. I does not appear that the committee desired to know, or made any effort to ascertain the intention with which Mr. Stevens wrote this letter, or the interpretation placed upon it by his constituents. The committee examined me as to one single point the authorship of the letter. Had they chosen to prosecute the examination further, I should have told them under oath what I now declare to the House. That I was frequently with Mr. Stevens during the period he resided in Harrisburg, after the commencement of the session. That he read the letter to me when the ink was scarcely dry. At that time he declared to me that he did not intend to resign. That he would take his seat if his constituents instructed him to do so. He distinctly stated his conviction that he ought not to resign; and that he would act in that manner if he desired—as he called the Hopkins association, was not the House, and a resignation to the people was a novelty so questionable in principle as not to be entertained seriously. At the first temporary adjournment, he expressed a design to take his seat, and I expected he would do so. Never, Sir, in the numerable instances in which his position to the House & his constituents was the subject of conversation with myself and others, did I hear him doubt his right to take his seat, or express the belief that he had resigned, or that his letter could in any wise be taken as a resignation. His constituents are also interested in this matter. Their acts show the light in which this letter was regarded both by Mr. Stevens and themselves.

I will not enter into a review of the proceedings of the Hopkins House, which I do not consider as constituting a portion of the proceedings of the House. I have not yet been able to find in the constitution, or any law, or any precedent, the power of British Parliament sought in the practices of Tory administrations a justification or apology for views expressed on this floor.

It is well known to the gentleman that Parliament claims to be omnipotent; that its privileges are undefined and the creatures of the respective Houses. The privileges they enjoy in all cases the supreme judges.—The words of Blackstone are familiar to the gentleman.

"The whole of the law and custom of Parliament has its origin from this one maxim "that whatever matter arises concerning either House of Parliament ought to be examined and adjudged in that House to which it relates and not elsewhere.

"But the maxims on which they proceed, together with the method of proceeding, rest entirely in the breast of Parliament itself; and are not defined and ascertained by any particular stated laws."

"The privileges of Parliament are likewise very large and indefinite, and therefore, when [31, H. VI.] the House of Lords propounded a question to the judges concerning them, the Chief Justice, Sir John Fortescue, in the name of his brethren, declared that they ought not to make answer to that question; for it hath not been used aforetime that the Justices should in any wise determine the privileges of the high court of Parliament. For it is so high and mighty in its nature, that it may make laws; and that which is law it may make no law; and the determination and knowledge of that privilege belongs to the Lords of Parliament and not to the Justices."

I can discover in this picture no likeness to our institutions. Undefined and indefinite privileges are unknown to us. We live under the authority of written constitutions, by which a portion of their power is delegated by the people to the Legislature while the sovereignty is reserved to themselves, while the constitution exists, or remains inviolate; the gentleman can assign no means of expelling or "*getting rid of a member in the easiest way*" without the concurrence of two thirds of the House. I cannot doubt that the sagacity of the people is sufficient to see in this forced resignation, an arbitrary contrivance to evade the letter of the constitution while its spirit is violated to the core.

The House may expel a member with the concurrence of two-thirds; and may punish a contempt. I must however deny that the language used by Mr. Stevens is such that the House could notice, were he not forced by a vote of the House to take his seat. So far from believing their representatives had resigned they instructed him to take his seat. So far from finding themselves called on to ask a new election to fill a vacancy; they have come to you and remonstrating in tones of just indignation against your purpose of excluding your representative on pretext false and tyrannical. They do not ask for a new election. They point to the election in October, when in the exercise of the right of freemen they elected Mr. Stevens by a triumphant majority. They refer you to the provisions of the constitution, which entitle him to take his seat, and demand his admission as his and their right; they call upon the people of the whole commonwealth to witness your proceedings, and unite with them in an effort to wrest from your hand power which is imposed to abuse in order to disenfranchise and punish them for presuming to elect a member obnoxious to you, and the object of your animosity. What intolerable oppression! What insult and injury! You turn to the freemen of Adams county and while they are at your doors demand the reason of this delay in admitting their representative to his seat. Members of the House to exercise the functions of an office they have freely bestowed upon him, and you tell them although he has for days been standing at the bar to be sworn, although they approved of his course in remaining for a time absent and have repeated him now to appear among you, that he has resigned to them, that they accepted his resignation, and are much to blame for not having asked long since a new *election*!

I quote the language of the minority of the committee—"no word or words of resignation are contained in Mr. Stevens' letter.

He did not intend it as a resignation as appears from the desire to take his seat.

His constituents did not receive it as a resignation, but on the contrary required him to take his seat.

This was therefore no resignation.

Were Euclid alive he would say the very statement of the facts reduced the position of the committee to absurdity."

Although the gentleman from Northumberland in the report and his remarks on the floor, has virtually abandoned the position that a bare majority may exclude a member in consequence of conduct subsequent to the election, he has advanced opinions and views that are all designed to prop up this fallen position, once so popular with the majority of the House. I have said that the right of a free representation is the characteristic of our republican institutions, their vital principle. This right has been secured with jealousy by the framers of our constitution. The power of a majority of the House of Commons, subservient to the ministry exercised in the reign of Wilkes, had given the whigs of the revolution warning of the oppressive use which could be made of an undefined power of expulsion. The influence of the talent, eloquence and integrity of an opponent feared by a powerful majority, improved the cause of hostility to him, and be the occasion of his expulsion, while pretenses false and flimsy were set up. To guard against the excesses of party feeling and injustice, it is provided both in the constitution of this State, and of the U. S. that two-thirds shall be necessary to expel a member; but by our own Constitution he cannot be expelled twice for the same offence. They believed that by these provisions they had secured to the people the power of electing representatives of their choice. If however, the heresies boldly proclaimed here, and countenanced at least by the gentleman from Northumberland, are admitted these clauses of your constitution are virtually expunged. That gentleman has referred to the power of British Parliament sought in the practices of Tory administrations a justification or apology for views expressed on this floor.

It is well known to the gentleman that Parliament claims to be omnipotent; that its privileges are undefined and the creatures of the respective Houses. The privileges they enjoy in all cases the supreme judges.—The words of Blackstone are familiar to the gentleman.

"The whole of the law and custom of Parliament has its origin from this one maxim "that whatever matter arises concerning either House of Parliament ought to be examined and adjudged in that House to which it relates and not elsewhere.

"But the maxims on which they proceed, together with the method of proceeding, rest entirely in the breast of Parliament itself; and are not defined and ascertained by any particular stated laws."

"The privileges of Parliament are likewise very large and indefinite, and therefore, when [31, H. VI.] the House of Lords propounded a question to the judges concerning them, the Chief Justice, Sir John Fortescue, in the name of his brethren, declared that they ought not to make answer to that question; for it hath not been used aforetime that the Justices should in any wise determine the privileges of the high court of Parliament. For it is so high and mighty in its nature, that it may make laws; and that which is law it may make no law; and the determination and knowledge of that privilege belongs to the Lords of Parliament and not to the Justices."

I can discover in this picture no likeness to our institutions. Undefined and indefinite privileges are unknown to us. We live under the authority of written constitutions, by which a portion of their power is delegated by the people to the Legislature while the sovereignty is reserved to themselves, while the constitution exists, or remains inviolate; the gentleman can assign no means of expelling or "*getting rid of a member in the easiest way*" without the concurrence of two thirds of the House. I cannot doubt that the sagacity of the people is sufficient to see in this forced resignation, an arbitrary contrivance to evade the letter of the constitution while its spirit is violated to the core.

The House may expel a member with the concurrence of two-thirds; and may punish a contempt. I must however deny that the language used by Mr. Stevens is such that the House could notice, were he not forced by a vote of the House to take his seat. So far from believing their representatives had resigned they instructed him to take his seat. So far from finding themselves called on to ask a new election to fill a vacancy; they have come to you and remonstrating in tones of just indignation against your purpose of excluding your representative on pretext false and tyrannical. They do not ask for a new election. They point to the election in October, when in the exercise of the right of freemen they elected Mr. Stevens by a triumphant majority. They refer you to the provisions of the constitution, which entitle him to take his seat, and demand his admission as his and their right; they call upon the people of the whole commonwealth to witness your proceedings, and unite with them in an effort to wrest from your hand power which is imposed to abuse in order to disenfranchise and punish them for presuming to elect a member obnoxious to you, and the object of your animosity. What intolerable oppression! What insult and injury! You turn to the freemen of Adams county and while they are at your doors demand the reason of this delay in admitting their representative to his seat. Members of the House to exercise the functions of an office they have freely bestowed upon him, and you tell them although he has for days been standing at the bar to be sworn, although they approved of his course in remaining for a time absent and have repeated him now to appear among you, that he has resigned to them, that they accepted his resignation, and are much to blame for not having asked long since a new *election*!

I quote the language of the minority of the committee—"no word or words of resignation are contained in Mr. Stevens' letter.

He did not intend it as a resignation as appears from the desire to take his seat.

His constituents did not receive it as a resignation, but on the contrary required him to take his seat.

This was therefore no resignation.

Were Euclid alive he would say the very statement of the facts reduced the position of the committee to absurdity."

Although the gentleman from Northumberland in the report and his remarks on the floor, has virtually abandoned the position that a bare majority may exclude a member in consequence of conduct subsequent to the election, he has advanced opinions and views that are all designed to prop up this fallen position, once so popular with the majority of the House. I have said that the right of a free representation is the characteristic of our republican institutions, their vital principle. This right has been secured with jealousy by the framers of our constitution. The power of a majority of the House of Commons, subservient to the ministry exercised in the reign of Wilkes, had given the whigs of the revolution warning of the oppressive use which could be made of an undefined power of expulsion. The influence of the talent, eloquence and integrity of an opponent feared by a powerful majority, improved the cause of hostility to him, and be the occasion of his expulsion, while pretenses false and flimsy were set up. To guard against the excesses of party feeling and injustice, it is provided both in the constitution of this State, and of the U. S. that two-thirds shall be necessary to expel a member; but by our own Constitution he cannot be expelled twice for the same offence. They believed that by these provisions they had secured to the people the power of electing representatives of their choice. If however, the heresies boldly proclaimed here, and countenanced at least by the gentleman from Northumberland, are admitted these clauses of your constitution are virtually expunged. That gentleman has referred to the power of British Parliament sought in the practices of Tory administrations a justification or apology for views expressed on this floor.

It is well known to the gentleman that Parliament claims to be omnipotent; that its privileges are undefined and the creatures of the respective Houses. The privileges they enjoy in all cases the supreme judges.—The words of Blackstone are familiar to the gentleman.

"The whole of the law and custom of Parliament has its origin from this one maxim "that whatever matter arises concerning either House of Parliament ought to be examined and adjudged in that House to which it relates and not elsewhere.

"But the maxims on which they proceed, together with the method of proceeding, rest entirely in the breast of Parliament itself; and are not defined and ascertained by any particular stated laws."

"The privileges of Parliament are likewise very large and indefinite, and therefore, when [31, H. VI.] the House of Lords propounded a question to the judges concerning them, the Chief Justice, Sir John Fortescue, in the name of his brethren, declared that they ought not to make answer to that question; for it hath not been used aforetime that the Justices should in any wise determine the privileges of the high court of Parliament. For it is so high and mighty in its nature, that it may make laws; and that which is law it may make no law; and the determination and knowledge of that privilege belongs to the Lords of Parliament and not to the Justices."

I can discover in this picture no likeness to our institutions. Undefined and indefinite privileges are unknown to us. We live under the authority of written constitutions, by which a portion of their power is delegated by the people to the Legislature while the sovereignty is reserved to themselves, while the constitution exists, or remains inviolate; the gentleman can assign no means of expelling or "*getting rid of a member in the easiest way*" without the concurrence of two thirds of the House. I cannot doubt that the sagacity of the people is sufficient to see in this forced resignation, an arbitrary contrivance to evade the letter of the constitution while its spirit is violated to the core.

The House may expel a member with the concurrence of two-thirds; and may punish a contempt. I must however deny that the language used by Mr. Stevens is such that the House could notice, were he not forced by a vote of the House to take his seat. So far from believing their representatives had resigned they instructed him to take his seat. So far from finding themselves called on to ask a new election to fill a vacancy; they have come to you and remonstrating in tones of just indignation against your purpose of excluding your representative on pretext false and tyrannical. They do not ask for a new election. They point to the election in October, when in the exercise of the right of freemen they elected Mr. Stevens by a triumphant majority. They refer you to the provisions of the constitution, which entitle him to take his seat, and demand his admission as his and their right; they call upon the people of the whole commonwealth to witness your proceedings, and unite with them in an effort to wrest from your hand power which is imposed to abuse in order to disenfranchise and punish them for presuming to elect a member obnoxious to you, and the object of your animosity. What intolerable oppression! What insult and injury! You turn to the freemen of Adams county and while they are at your doors demand the reason of this delay in admitting their representative to his seat. Members of the House to exercise the functions of an office they have freely bestowed upon him, and you tell them although he has for days been standing at the bar to be sworn, at

STAR & REPUBLICAN BANNER.

GETTYSBURG, PA.

Tuesday, June 25, 1839.

DEMOCRATIC ANTI-MASONIC NOMINATIONS FOR PRESIDENT,

Gen. Wm. Henry Harrison.

FOR VICE-PRESIDENT,

Daniel Webster.

Senatorial Electors.

JOHN ANDREW SHULZE, JOSEPH RITNER.

Representative Delegates:

1st District:	LEVIS PASSMORE,
2d do	CADWALLADER EVANS,
do	CHARLES WATRES.
3d do	JONATHAN GILLINGHAM,
4th do	AMOS ELLMAKER,
do	JOHN K. ZEIGLER,
do	DAVID FOTTERALL.
5th do	ROBERT STINSON,
6th do	WILLIAM S. HENDEU,
7th do	J. JENKINS ROSS,
8th do	PETER FILBERT,
9th do	JOSEPH H. SPAYD,
10th do	JOHN HARPER,
11th do	WILLIAM WALWAINE,
12th do	JOHN DICKSON,
24th do	JOHN WILLIAMSON,
14th do	JOHN REID,
15th do	NATHAN HIS CH,
16th do	PETER MIDDLESWARTH,
17th do	GEORGE WALKER,
18th do	BERNARD CONNELLY, Jr.
19th do	GEN. JOSEPH MARKLE,
20th do	JUSTICE S. FORDYCE,
21st do	JOSEPH HENDERSON,
22d do	HARMAN DENNY,
23d do	JOSEPH BUFFINGTON,
24th do	JAMES MONTGOMERY,
25th do	JOHN DICK.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"Philo," "S. W. N," and "A Citizen of Fredrick County," will appear in our next, they were unavoidably crowded out this week.

☞We invite the attention of our readers to the address of Mr. Speakman of Philadelphia, before the House of Representatives on the resolution to declare the seats of Mr. Stevens vacant, it is a production we will be deterred from reading it, on account of its length, it will amply repay the time spent in its perusal. It abounds with the most eloquent and convincing truths, sufficient to satisfy the most prejudiced, of the flimsy pretext, upon which our representative was excluded from his seat.

The Fourth of July.

Great preparations are being made throughout the State to celebrate this day. The Locos of Harrisburg, are to be honored with the presence of the President of the United States, he is to pass through that place on his way to the north, on an electioneering trip! It is supposed he will remain a few days. Mr. *John Van Buren*, returned to the United States in the Great Western.

☞$800,000 worth of property has been destroyed by fire in the town of Port Gibson, Mississippi.

☞The Secretary of War has joined the Temperance Society, and seems determined to make every one convert who comes within "follow in his footsteps." In his Temperance orders recently issued he has not only forbid the cadets at West Point to use spirituous liquors, but even the board of visiters.

☞A mine of Quick Silver has been discovered on the north side of the Blue Ridge Mountain; said to be of an excellent quality.

☞On our first page will be found another beautiful poetical article from the pen of Mrs. Lydia Jane Pierson, of Tioga County.

A Failure.

Four hundred bottles of Champaign had been bespoken by the tories, at the different taverns in Harrisburg, to celebrate the defeat of Mr. Stevens! They were confident he would be beaten. So officers had were their plans and determined their exertions.

A landlord in Harisburg says, he is *sorry* that Stevens was elected, he had no would not sell by a twentieth part as much liquor as if he had been defeated, the chaps would have soaked it up by the barrel—it would have been a glorious harvest for him.

☞Reports have been made in the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania (Monday-day) from the Select Committee appointed to investigate the conduct of the late board of Canal Commissioners. Also from the Committee appointed to inquire into the conduct of the Banks in Harrisburg, in December last. And from the Select Committee with the veritable M'Elwee at its head appointed to draw up "a declaratory act" against the Gettysburg Republican. Minority reports are in preperation from all the above named Committees.

☞Judge McKinney of Harrisburg proposes to publish a new work to be called the "*Pennsylvania Justice of the peace.*" Such a work as this will be absolutely necessary to meet the emergencies of the New Constitution.

Mr. Stevens.

By the letter, addressed by Thaddeus Stevens, Esq. to his constituents, it will be seen that he has declined being again a candidate for the Legislature. We have known for sometime past, that it was the wish of Mr. Stevens to retire from public life, and devote himself to his profession, in which he has acquired an eminence as enviable as he has done by his career as a Legislator.

Mr. Stevens has given his services to the public, at the expense of a great pecuniary sacrifice to himself; but if he has lost money, he has won renown; if he has sacrificed the yellow dross, he has gained that which is more enviable, than the profession of gold and gems—an honest fame and the blessings of the poor and their children.

We were sorry, when we became aware of his determination to withdraw from public life; because we believed, that whilst he stood in the breach, between the Constitution and those vandal assailants, who despise all the salutary restraints of law, and trample on the people and the honor of the commonwealth would still be protected. But when he has withdrawn, we fear that in some irruption of the barbarians, the common people—the constitution will be broken down the interests and safety of the people and the honor of the State involved in ruin. Such a catastrophe we pray may be averted, but the signs of the times are fearfully ominous. In such times as those, the good patriot must come to the rescue, and if the salvation of the commonwealth should require it. Mr. Stevens as such patriot, should forego his own wishes.

The Election.

The vote at the special election on Friday week was small, but 2651 votes having been polled—whereas the vote of the permanent residents of the county, is but little short of 4000. The tremendous inclemency of the day, prevented a fuller vote.

The majority for Mr. Stevens was 465, being the LARGEST MAJORITY, he has ever received, except when swelled by the votes of the laborers on the Public Works, or when the opposite party was divided, and run two tickets.

At the General Election, in October last; the Majority of Mr. Stevens, over James Divitt in the county was	1431
Of this majority 1074 was obtained at Millerstown,	1074
Leaving his majority in the rest of the county,	357
At the special election, on the 15th inst. his majority in the county was	465
Of this majority 92 was obtained at Millerstown	92
Leaving his majority in the rest of the county,	373
His majority being 16 greater, in the balance of the county, at the special election, than at the General Election; although at the General Election the vote was so much larger.	
At the General Election the whole vote of Mr. Stevens in the county was	3116
Of this vote 1217 was polled at Millerstown	1217
Leaving his vote in the rest of the county	1899
At the Special Election Mr. Stevens whole vote, in the county was	1561
Of this vote 196 was polled at Millerstown	196
Leaving his vote in the rest of the county.	1365
Thus it will be seen that at the October Election the vote for Mr. Stevens, in the county, independently of Millerstown was	1899
At the special election, independently of Millerstown	1365
At the October Election his majority, in the rest of the county, out of 1899 votes was	357
At the Special Election, his majority in the rest of the county, out of 1365, votes was	373

Showing, that although at the late election, owing to the inclemency of the weather, the vote had diminished, *one fourth*, the majority had *increased*.

At the Special Election, held on the 15th day of January last, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Jacob Cassatt, Esq. John F. McFarlane, Esq. had a majority of 465 but by reference to the Clerk's list, it will be found that there were upwards of 300 votes polled by laborers on the Public Works, all of which Mr. McFarlane received.

Thus it will be seen, that Mr. Stevens' majority of the permanent residents of the county was is greater than that of Mr. McFarlane, and greater than that he was ever received at any former election. The Constitution and its supporters will be sustained in Adams county.

Compiler Arithmetic.

There is a long foolish article in the last Compiler, attempting to prove, that the Loco Foco strength, in the Borough, is increasing, notwithstanding, the same paper alledges that the "democrats," (I polled 104 votes at the General Election,—whence they pulled up, at the late election on the 15th inst.!! This is a gain with a vengeance, if the 104 story be true; however it is the kind, the Loco Focos are likely to meet with in Adams county.

☞An evening or two before the Election, there were flaming handbills, stuck up by the Locos, upon the corners, on the doors, and on the door posts all over the Borough, calling upon 104 Democrats, to attend a meeting at Mr. Yeatts' tavern the same evening. Evening came, and 16 democrats (?) such as Moses McClean, Joel B. Danner, &c. However, at the election 90 responded to the call.

Following in the footsteps.

On Friday week last at an election district not far distant from this place, a voter made his appearance and tendered his vote, which was promptly challenged by the Democratic Committeeman. Question into by the proper authority, the vote was taken, whereupon the challenger, with both hands uplifted, in a stentorian voice exclaimed, *Gentlemen I am scandalized before the Senate and my mouth is shut!*

Loco Foco quarrell in the House.

On Wednesday last, Tom McElwee got up in the House and seizing the desk with both hands to steady himself, informed the House that he had been basely slandered by the member from the county Charles Pray, who had reported that he had been dragged from the House when the vote on an important question was about to be taken. He said it was a slander an IMPEACHMENT OF HIS CHARACTER, and shaking his first at Pray, told him if he did not apologise he would make him.

Pray replied that it was true, that he had seen him led out, that he had seen the whole matter.

McElwee then called him a LIAR A LIAR. The Speaker how ever succeeded in restoring order and the "grim elements" were only permitted to scowl at one another.

☞We were obliged for want of room to postpone the publication of several articles relating to the Chamberburg Convention. They will appear in our next.

☞The speeches of Messrs. Speakman and Smith and a crowd of other important matter in relation to the late election, has prevented us from giving our usual space to the proceedings of the Legislature. In our next we will lay before our readers all of the proceedings of importance, which we have not yet published.

From the last "Telegraph" we learn, that when the Committee on Accounts made their report, (soon after Mr. Stevens was admitted,) upon the expense of McElwees' Committee, appointed to examine the Gettysburg Rail Road, since work was ordered to be stopped; It gave Mr. Stevens an opportunity of throwing a small harpoon among the whales. The report asked for SEVEN THOUSAND DOLLARS to pay the expences of the Committee while McElwee lay at Gettysburg "snake bit" in the afternoon, and while payment had been refused to poor Contractors, whose effects in some instances have been sacrificed at Constables Sales, to satisfy small debts, when the State owes them thousands. Mr Stevens exposed the iniquity of the Administration in a manner that was like heaping coals of fire on its head. He read extracts from the Grand Tape worm as more expensive than the living one, and stated that McElwee had made more money in the post mortem examination of it, than he had by his profession for many years—Think of this freemen, SEVEN THOUSAND DOLDARS, to pay the expense of a Committee, and what for, why to examine the Gettysburg Rail Road, after it had been declared abandoned, and the work stopped! Will such enormities be continued.

Mr. Stevens.

In speaking of the late triumph of the friends of the Constitution and laws in Adams county, our contemporary of the Telegraph say:

"Never were the Jacobins of France more certain of carrying their object than were the Loco Focos of defeating Mr. Stevens. Rifles were sent into every corner of the county, and money was distributed with an open hand by the employers of "butchers, dog keepers and bullies;" and when the day came and the rain poured down in torrents, they were certain of success, and boasted largely. But the result was only the more mortifying. Their preponderance in the great jollification was poured into beastly drunkenness to drown their sorrow. Their spirits sank, and despair now marks the countenance of those who were the violators of their own official oaths, and the ruthless assistants and foul mouthed traducers of Mr. Stevens.

When Mr. Stevens appeared to take his seat, the galleries were crowded to excess to witness the ceremony: and the bright countenances of the spectators, generally, exhibited a marked contrast with those of the Loco Focos who had used brute force to deprive him and his constituents of their rights. Their dark sulky and crest fallen appearance evinced the deep mortification that they felt at their defeat and disgrace. McElwee and some others of the ring leaders were not present—it was too trying for their feelings, and they "shot the pit."

HARRISBURG, June 19, 1839.

Mr. Paxton:

I this morning entered my seat in the Legislature, soon after the return of the late election was ordered to be read, which was done, and Mr. Stevens called and sworn in, he is now in his seat, quietly and peaceable representing the integrity of the people of Adams county, and of his Commonwealth, in his usual and able manner.

Yours, &c.

CHARLES KETTLEWELL.

HYMENIAL REGISTER.

MARRIED,

On the 16th inst. by the Rev. C. Weyl, Mr. *Valentine Myers*, (son of Ludwig deceased) to Miss *Elizabeth Chronister*, both of Latimore.

OBITUARY RECORD.

DIED,

At Littlestown, on the 13th inst. Miss *Margaret Hersig*, in the 6th year of her age.

RELIGIOUS NOTICES.

☞*This Rev. Dr. Kraduh, will preach in the Lutheran Church on Sunday morning next and the Rev. Mr. Jacobs in the evening.*

☞The Rev. Mr. McLean, will preach in his church on Sunday morning next.

☞The Rev. Mr. Purlong will preach in the Methodist Church in this place on Sunday morning and evening next.

BALTIMORE PRICES CURRENT.

Flour,	$ 0 00 to 5 75
Wheat,	1 20 to 1 25
Rye,	0 00 to 0 95
Corn,	0 85 to 0 86
Oats,	0 48 to 0 52
Bacon,	0 11 to 0 12
Lard,	0 00 to 0 13
Timothy,	2 75 to 3 00
Whiskey,	0 41 to 0 42
Beef,	12 50 to 14 50
Pork,	22 00 to 22 50

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Brass Knockers, Potatoe Steamers, Iron Furnaces, &c. &c.

Manufactured and for sale at the Gettysburg Foundry.

GEO. ARNOLD.

June 25, 1839. 4t-13

ADVERTISEMENTS.

NOTICE.

THE Subscriber, residing in Franklin township, hereby gives notice to all persons indebted to the Estate of

DENNIS M'GUIRE,

late of Franklin township, Adams County, Pa. deceased, to call and make immediate payment, to those having claims against said Estate, to present them without delay, properly authenticated, for settlement.

DAVID CHAMBERLAIN,

Administrator.

June 25, 1839. 6t-1

PROTHONOTARY.

PROTHONOTARY.

To the Voters of Adams County.

FELLOW CITIZENS:

I offer myself to your consideration for the office of

PROTHONOTARY,

at the ensuing election (should I receive the nomination of the County Convention.)

Having had some experience in the duties connected with this office, I flatter myself should I be so fortunate as to be nominated and elected, to be able to render general satisfaction.

JOHN PICKING.

East Berlin, June 25, 1839. tf-13

To the Freemen of Adams County.

FELLOW CITIZENS:

I offer myself to your consideration as a candidate for the office of *Register, and Recorder* (under such combination as may be adopted by the Legislature,) at the ensuing election.

Under a knowledge acquired from attending to several of the duties appertaining to said offices, and practical skill as a conveyancer, I hope (if nominated and elected) to be able to execute the duties thereof personally, in a prompt and correct manner.

Yours, respectfully,

JOHN L. GUBERNATOR.

March 12, 1839. tf-50

PUBLIC SALE.

THE Subscriber will sell at Public Sale *on Wednesday the 26th day of September next*, on the premises, at 10 o'clock, A. M. of said day,

A VALUABLE FARM OF

PATENTED LAND,

situated in Washington township, York county, about 12 miles from the borough of Berlin, and adjoining Conrad Eisenhardt's Mill, containing

212 ACRES

neat measure, of which between 50 and 60 acres consist of good heavy Timber Land. The improvements are

A Two Story Brick

HOUSE,

A Bank Barn, a new Wagon shed, double corn crib, a log tenant House, and a never failing Well of Water, with a pump near the House.

There are also four other never failing springs on various parts of the farm, insuring a constant supply of water convenient to the farm, as also a stream of running water passing thro' the meadow.

A due proportion of the above farm consists of good meadow land. There is a good thriving young

ORCHARD

of choice grafted fruits. The farm is under good fence and in good repair. Any further information regarding the same may be obtained by calling on the tenant residing on the property Jacob Smith, or on the subscriber residing in Berlin. Also, at the same time will be offered for sale a variety of farming Utensils, consisting of Ploughs, Harrows, Wagon and Horse-Gears, &c.

Attendance will be given and terms made known on the day of Sale by

GEORGE H. BINDER.

June 18, 1839. td-12

THE GETTYSBURG

Steam Foundry

THIS establishment has been fitted up at a heavy expense, by the subscriber, and is now in full operation and well calculated for doing all kinds of castings, both in

IRON AND BRASS,

in the very best manner, also all kinds of Mill Gearing constantly on hand and for the encouragement met with up to this time. The subscriber would here solicit a continuance of the same, and hopes that citizens of the county, and surrounding towns generally, who are friendly to home manufacture will take an interest in patronizing the establishment, having the best Gray Foundry Pig, the state can boast of, and long and well experienced Workmen, he is therefore enabled to produce work of a superior quality—all orders for work thankfully received and promptly attended to, a great variety of Castings constantly on hand and for sale at the Foundry, among which is Machinery for Mills, Factories, Threshing Machines, Lime Spreaders, Gudgeons, Cranks, Plough Irons, Cider Mills, Forge Hammers, Stoves, &c. &c. &c.

GEO. ARNOLD.

June 18, 1839. 4t-12

APPRENTICE

TO THE PRINTING BUSINESS.

Will be taken at this office, if application be made immediately.

Gettysburg, June 18, 1839.

FOR REGISTER & RECORDER.

To the Independent Voters of Adams County.

FELLOW-CITIZENS:

I offer myself to your consideration, at the ensuing General Election, as a candidate for the offices of *Register, Recorder, and Clerk of the Orphans' Court:* And pledge myself, if elected, to discharge the duties of those offices with fidelity and promptitude.

JACOB LEFEVER.

March 19, 1839. tc-51

To the Voters of Adams County.

FELLOW CITIZENS:

I offer myself to your consideration, as a candidate for the office of *Register, Recorder and Clerk of the Orphans' Court*, at the ensuing election.

Having, from practical experience acquired a perfect knowledge of the duties of those offices, I hope (if nominated and elected) to be able do the business promptly, correctly and in person.

The Public's Humble Servant.

WILLIAM KING.

Gettysburg, Feb. 26, 1839. tc-48

To the Voters of Adams County.

FELLOW CITIZENS:

I offer myself to your consideration