Washington Sentinel.

BY BEVERLEY TUCKER.

EDITED BY
WM. M. OVERTON AND CH. MAURICE SMITH.

CITY OF WASHINGTON.

DECEMBER 20, 1853.

☞ Mr. George E. French, Bookseller, King street, Alexandria, is our authorized agent to receive advertisements and subscriptions. Single numbers can be procured at his counter every morning.

☞ Mr. E. K. Lundy, bookseller, Bridge street, Georgetown, will act as agent for the Sentinel in receiving subscriptions and advertisements.

☞ George W. Mearson is our authorized agent to receive subscriptions and advertisements, in Washington, Georgetown and Alexandria.

CONGRESS.

In the Senate, yesterday, the death of the Hon. Charles G. Atherton, of New Hampshire, was announced, and addresses appropriate to the occasion were delivered by Messrs. Norris, Hunter, and Williams.

In the House of Representatives, Mr. Houston, from the Committee of Ways and Means, reported a bill making appropriations for the civil and diplomatic expenses of the government, and a bill for the payment of invalid and other pensioners, for the year ending June, 1855, and a bill to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1854.

A message from the Senate, announcing the death of Mr. Atherton, late a member of that body, having been received, Messrs. Hibbard and Orr delivered eulogies upon the subject.

The two Houses severally adjourned, in token of respect for the memory of the deceased.

THE WASHINGTON UNION ON COALITIONS.

We had hoped our article, a few days since, would have so subdued the restiveness of the Washington *Union*, under the election of the publisher of the *Sentinel* as printer to the Senate of the United States, as to make all further comment from us unnecessary. Indeed, from its silence for the last few days upon this subject, we were led to believe it had profited by our sincere counsel, and that it would henceforward, manfully forgetting itself, turn to the true principles of its professed faith, and lend us its aid in maintaining them intact to the democratic party of the country. Not so, however. The Washington *Union*, unable to calm its troubled spirit, still saddens its readers by its heart-rending wailings. Grief, when wholesome and rationally indulged, turns us often from the wrong, to the direction of the right. Tears, too, if they be not crocodile's, are poetically characterized by Richard Lalor Sheill, as the "bursting evidence of nature's holy working in the heart." In the hope of this happy result upon the *Union*, we have been amiably disposed, though our own good fortune, to some degree, the cause of them, to indulge that journal in its piteous lamentations. But when we see our neighbor, after the soothing influence which time and friendly condolence should have effected, still tearing its hair and indulging in importunate clamors at the wrong the country has sustained, in the failure to secure again the *Union's* valuable services to the Senate of the United States, we cannot forbear tendering a little friendly comment upon some political points which may serve to divert its mind from its anguishing bereavement.

First, then, the *Union's* reiterated charge of coalition of "factious democrats with whigs and freesoilers," and which it makes the text of a leaden leader on the "sanctity of the ballot system." It seems that the *Union* would convince the country that the *administration* has not only been struck down by the rejection of its proprietor as public printer, but that this great public calamity must be deemed sufficient justification for the upturning of the long-established system of voting in the Senate of the United States. Verily, there are giants in these days! But to the charge of coalition with whigs and freesoilers. We have denied, and still deny, and challenge the proof, that there was any coalition between our friends and the senators representing these parties.

Far be it from us ungraciously to acknowledge the flattering preference given to ourselves by our whig friends.

We thank them sincerely, for their votes were freely given to the proprietor of a public journal, in whose columns have never been traced one line of anti-democratic doctrine. They were too generous to ask a pledge or consideration, as we should have been too honest to have given one. If the Washington *Union* lost their support, it was not for the want of asking it; and we apprehend the loss of their support was less attributable to the advocacy that paper gave to one of the *favorite whig doctrines*, than to the disgust for the daily fulsome adulations of all and every of the "powers that be," which was excited in every breast. And to those gentlemen denominated freesoilers, who are said to have given us their votes, we tender our thanks, and we trust the augury a good one in their future, since they passed over the Washington *Union*, whose labors for four months have been unremitting in their behalf, to take up our humble selves, whom, they will willingly acknowledge, have done valiant battle against them. Sycophancy and subserviency may win for a season, but truth and independence must at some period prevail. Thus much for the coalition charged upon us again by the *Union*!—and before we place for the second time in our columns, in a more imposing light, a certain coalition of the *Union's*, some eighteen months since, we beg leave, though somewhat discouraged by its obvious failure to adopt our recommendation of Seneca, to read it a text from a holier book, which we trust may be blessed to it. There is wise philosophy in this highly holy literature which we would all do well to lay oftener to heart. There is one of these divine maxims too often neglected by every one, and we fear the *Union* has fallen into the too common neglect. "Love thy neighbor as thyself." "Judge not that ye be not judged: For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

"And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or, how wilt thou say to thy brother, let me pull out the mote out of thine eye: and behold! a beam is in thine own eye?" "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye!"

Now, the *Union* must not complain if we find an apt application in itself of this very just and divine philosophy. The *Union* must not murmur when it charges upon us an unworthy coalition—never proved, but always denied—if we shall *convict it* of one that even makes our young blood chill to contemplate!

We would fain have averted the necessity of alluding to it in our columns, but it was forced upon us. We are forced now to repeat it, and we shall continue to repeat it again and again, until we drive from the very vocabulary of the Washington *Union* the use of such a word as coalition! *Did not the Washington Union, when party spirit ran high, on the eve of the political organizations preceding the last presidential canvass, enter into a deliberate contract with the proprietors of the Republic—a whig organ—to give them one-half of the profits of the public printing if they would induce its whig friends to vote for it as the public printer for the 32d Congress? And has not suit been brought by Gideon & Co. for their share of these profits?* Of a truth, here is a coalition that *is* a coalition. We only received the support of the whigs in the Senate, and even two of them we did not get; while the Washington *Union*, with a double barrel, brought down the whole covey! We have promised no such "aid and comfort" to the enemy for the support they generously conferred. Thus we claim a clearer democratic record than the Washington *Union* on this subject.

How stands the contrast upon the recommendations of the President's first annual message? It is charged by the *Union*, that we are opposed to the President, and to the administration. The President recommended the system of tonnage duties, instead of the unconstitutional appropriations, from the federal treasury, for the improvement of rivers and harbors. We commended it before it was known, at least to us, that the message would contain such a recommendation.

Internal improvements generally, by the federal government, were condemned by the President. For months before, and even since we saw the message, we did, to the utmost of our power, the same. The tariff question, as treated by the President, we concurred in, and so expressed that concurrence, save as to the manner of reducing the tariff recommended in Mr. Guthrie's report, which we feared was not in strict accordance with our avowed free trade faith.

The President's views, upon our foreign policy, are well known to be precisely those advocated in the *Sentinel* since its birth.

The construction of the Pacific railroad by the funds of the national treasury—that hydra-headed monster, more frightful to *a genuine democrat* than a thousand national banks—the President condemned in just and splendid censure. We read and re-read it with glorious pleasure. Every line of it we endorse, approve, and admire. And we sorrow truly, and as one without hope, that our able contemporary, the Washington *Union*, should have incapacitated itself from giving Franklin Pierce its hearty support upon this, the most important question to our political integrity, and by consequence, to our political organization. How does this happen? Which one of its variegated editorial corps has done this thing? Give us a peep into your editorial kaleidoscope.

Which, then, we ask our readers, especially our southern readers, is entitled to be called the true organ of the democratic party—of your principles? The Washington *Union*, which has labored day and night to build up the fallen fortunes of the Buffalo traitors—which threatens democratic Senators—which, to secure the public printing, agrees to give a large portion of the profits to a whig paper to secure whig votes, *upon the eve of the presidential canvass*—which advocates so earnestly and zealously the latitudinous construction of the power of Congress, under the Constitution, to create, out of the federal treasury, a mammoth corporation like the proposed Pacific railroad, whose articles upon this question so enthused our esteemed contemporary of the *National Intelligencer*, that he could only describe his joy by imagining himself reading one of Mr. Clay's splendid effusions on internal improvements? or the Washington *Sentinel*, which has been laboring, with unceasing industry, to purify the democratic party—which *never* threatens democratic Senators—which, to secure the public printing, *did not* agree to give a large portion of the profits to a whig paper to secure whig votes—which *never* advocated the power of Congress, under the Constitution, to create out of the federal treasury a mammoth corporation like the proposed Pacific railroad, which has never deviated from the true faith, except to permit the Senate of the United States to have the services of its proprietor, as public printer, for the thirty-third Congress? With this summing up, we feel half inclined to leave it to the *Union* to decide. Surely a just and discriminating public must give us the verdict; and having only sinned towards the Washington *Union*, until it is proven to us that General Armstrong is the great god of the democratic party, and the Washington *Union* its holy political Bible, we must be excused for asserting our superior claims to fellowship with our party.

THE MESSILLA VALLEY.—THE LOUISVILLE JOURNAL AND THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The President states in that portion of his message which refers to the Mexican boundary, that "a former commissioner of the United States, employed in running that line pursuant to the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, made a serious mistake in determining the initial point on the Rio Grande."

In commenting on this portion of the message, the Louisville *Journal* says: "The imputation upon a former commissioner of the United States" is unjust and untrue. The treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo specified that the commissioner in ascertaining the initial point from which to draw the boundary line should be governed by Disturnell's map of the edition of 1847. Every man who has given this matter the slightest investigation, knows that the commissioner did fix that initial point correctly according to that map, and that the error, if any, exists in the map."

If it was not notorious that the Louisville *Journal* is under the influence of the bitterest partisan feelings, we would stand amazed at the ignorance it displays in the sentences we have just quoted from it. What the President states in his message is strictly true; and although the boundary question has been elaborately discussed in Congress, and by the public press, we believe that not a corporal's guard can be found to sustain the commissioner in fixing the initial point of the boundary line on the Rio Grande, at the place he agreed to fix it. Indeed, he had no right under the treaty to fix upon that or any point, inasmuch as the treaty gave the United States two representatives on the joint commission to run and mark the boundary, and the commissioner undertook to act alone in the absence of his colleague. When his colleague arrived on the ground, and ascertained by reference to Disturnell's map of the edition of 1847, that a gross error, eminently injurious to the United States, had been committed, he entered his protest, and refused to run and mark the line from the initial point on the Rio Grande, which the commissioner, in conjunction with the Mexican commissioner, had determined on.

The matter was soon brought to the attention of Congress; and it was referred to the committee on foreign affairs of the Senate, of which Mr. Mason, of Virginia, was chairman. It was thoroughly examined by that committee, and Mr. Mason presented an able report against the initial point on the Rio Grande, which the commissioner had undertook to determine on, and he offered an amendment in the form of a proviso to the appropriation for continuing the survey, which required it to be discontinued, unless the initial point on the Rio Grande was not placed further north, in the opinion of the President, than Disturnell's map required it to be. This amendment passed the Senate and House of Representatives, and became a law. Then the late administration, which had previously sustained the commissioner, took the matter into more serious consideration and finally recalled the commission, and attempted to wash its hands of all responsibility for the blunder of the commissioner.

These facts being public and notorious, we hardly expected to see a paper which made pretension to an ordinary amount of information, assert that the President had cast an "unjust and untrue" imputation on the former commissioner, or that "every man who has given this matter the slightest investigation, knows that the commissioner did, fix the initial point correctly according to the map." Disturnell's map places the southern boundary of New Mexico—the dividing line according to the treaty—eight miles north of the town of El Paso, at the point where the Rio Grande breaks through the mountains. The inhabitants of Chihuahua and New Mexico had always agreed that the boundary between them crossed the Rio Grande at that point, and they were sustained in that belief by a decree of the Mexican Congress, issued in 1824.

But Mr. Bartlett, the former commissioner, in the absence of Andrew B. Gray, esq., his colleague on the joint commission, being outwitted and bamboozled by the Mexican commissioner, agreed to fix the point where the southern boundary of New Mexico crosses the Rio Grande, about thirty-four miles north of El Paso, instead of eight miles north of that town, as Disturnell's map of the edition of 1847 defined it. By this step, Mr. Bartlett agreed to retrocede a portion of American territory, about the size of the State of Massachusetts—a territory not only valuable because of its agricultural products, but inestimable on account of its geographical position. But for the professional skill and patriotic firmness of Mr. Gray, the surveyor, the retrocession would have been completed, and one of the great routes to the Pacific would have been effectually blocked against us. The Louisville *Journal* had better gain information, or moderate its partisan bitterness before it makes another attempt to criticise the President's message.

THE THREE DEPARTMENTS OF THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE KEPT SEPARATE.

Surely if there ever was a time when a recurrence to first principles was necessary and proper, that time is the present. One of the most important of these first principles, is that which teaches a separation of the several departments of government—a due distribution of power between the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary departments. Patriots and statesmen, at every epoch of our history, have sedulously guarded against a fusion of the three into one—or the encroachment of any one on the others. They have watched with sleepless jealousy any and all measures that have tended to bring about that state of things. The Constitution has organized a system of checks and balances, with the view of perpetuating our peculiar system in its purity.

It becomes us, as we value the noble institutions bequeathed to us by our ancestors, to imitate their zeal, and to cultivate and keep alive their patriotic jealousy.

Latterly many of the presses and politicians of the country have manifested a much to be lamented indifference to the preservation of this important system. All the sentiments expressed by them, have tended to break it down, and to bring about political demoralization. They have taught that a party must slavishly support all the measures of their rulers, whether right or wrong. We are denied all freedom of thought, all independence of action. The moment a citizen of this country dares to express disapprobation of any man or any measure, he is denounced and vilified as a traitor to his party.

From time to time we have deemed it fit and proper to resist the efforts of these men, and to spread before our readers those wholesome and honest doctrines, which were taught us by our fathers, and without which we would soon become a profligate and demoralized people.

One of the worst signs of the times that has recently been exhibited, and most offensively exhibited, is the denunciation, by a portion of the press of the country, of those senators and members of Congress who thought fit to cast their votes, in the election of public printer, for the publisher of this paper. They have been denounced as factionists and as false to party obligations.

These presses and people have chosen to assume that the administration had its candidate and that General Armstrong was that candidate. They have chosen to assume that General Armstrong, being the candidate of the administration, no member of either house of Congress had a right to vote against him. We have several remarks to make in regard to these assumptions.

The administration has no right to indicate any one as its candidate for that office, and to cast its influence in favor of such an one. The President has not the nominating power. The printer is exclusively an officer of the body which elects him, and to claim for the President any power to dictate to the Senate or the House of Representatives, is to seek to tamper and interfere with the powers and the duties of Congress—is to make the legislative branch inferior and subordinate to the executive, and bring about a slavish dependence of the former on the latter. We have never asserted that the President claimed any right to interfere in the election of the officer we refer to—we have never asserted that the President attempted to exercise any influence in regard to it, and we would be the last to do him any such injustice—but this we know, that those presses that claim to be his most trusted friends have impliedly asserted these things, by denouncing as factious opposers of the administration, all who voted for Mr. Tucker in the House and in the Senate.

Has it come to this, that the most cherished lessons of the fathers of the republic are to be disregarded, that the present principles of democracy are to be violated, that the Senate and the House of Representatives are to be degraded, just to secure the spoils of office to one journal and prevent them from being given to another.

These journals are constantly complaining that injury is done to the administration by those who assert good, honest, old-fashioned doctrines. Our own opinion is, that nothing is so well calculated to damage the democratic party, and the administration of its choice, as the tortuous and ill-advised course of those journals. They try to leave the country under the impression that the President is responsible for all that they write and do. It is not compatible with the dignity of that high officer to go about denying and contradicting what is thus written, and many times the President is blamed for the follies of others.

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENCE OF THE PRESS.

Within the last few years, what was but an appendage to the press—metropolitan correspondence—has grown up into a sort of institution. It has become a most important adjunct, indispensably essential to its success. The best and most influential journals in our country have their regular correspondents. From them they derive their impressions and their information in regard to the transactions at Washington. Many of these correspondents are intelligent, cultivated, and reliable gentlemen. Some of them are ignorant and unreliable. Some write the truth to their papers; some start idle and unfounded rumors, which are copied and scattered all over the country. Some speculate most judiciously on public affairs, and suggest to the Editors with whom they correspond most excellent arguments. Others are content to write slander and gossip, at a penny a line.

Now, as Washington is the great political centre of this confederacy, and as the object of having correspondents here is to keep distant editors informed as to the true condition of affairs—to furnish them with topics and with arguments for editorials—this branch of the press ought to be its very right arm. These correspondents are the ambassadors of the press to the court of the country. Every year their position is becoming more and more important. By discretion, dignity, and truthfulness, they may elevate themselves to the most enviable position; or, by gossip, scandal, slander and ignorance, they may degrade themselves into a mere hireling tribe.

We regard the metropolitan correspondence of the press as a most important institution.

☞ We extract the following paragraph from a letter of the Washington correspondent of the Petersburg *South Side Democrat*:

"The Washington *Union*, since the election of Tucker as printer to the Senate, has been behaving in the most ridiculous manner conceivable, cutting more capers than a monkey at a menagerie. It is laboring to produce the impression that the refusal of the Senate to elect its publisher printer was a blow aimed at the administration, and daily reviles the democratic senators who voted for Tucker as 'factionists' and enemies of the President and his cabinet. Now, the truth of the matter is, that the *Union* has no right to connect its fortunes with those of the administration, and if the President is to be held responsible for all the silly twaddle published in its columns, the Lord help him. General Armstrong is a good-hearted old gentleman, one for whom I entertain a sincere esteem, but he has sucked quite enough of the government pap. For my part, I am glad that Tucker was elected, while I don't endorse the extremes to which his paper went in the 'war of the shells,' yet he erred on the right side. Better for a journalist to be too bold and independent than too time-serving, adulatory, and truculent. Free writing was never more needed than in these times."

This is but one of a hundred letters written from Washington on this subject. It is the first from which we have made any extract. The constant and persevering efforts of some of the presses of the country to damage us by representing us as factious, have not been without some effect. Calm reflection, however, will show that we have not been rash—that we have not gone to extremes. We have but promulged the true principles of the constitutional democracy of the country.

SOUTHERN LITERARY MESSENGER, AND DEBOW'S REVIEW.

The December number of the messenger has been on our table for several days. As usual, it contains some capital articles, both of prose and poetry. This journal deservedly has a high reputation. Its editor is a gentleman of fine literary taste and acquirements, and among his contributors are some of the first men of the country.

The same pressing engagements that prevented us from hitherto noticing the messenger, have prevented us from noticing this unusually attractive and interesting December number of DeBow's *Review*, which was sent to us by Franck Taylor.

We have so often expressed our opinion of the merits of this publication that it is needless to repeat it. We would advise all who desire profitable and instructive reading to get this number of DeBow.

Congressional.

THIRTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

Senate—Monday, December 19, 1853.

Mr. CLAY presented the credentials of the Hon. Benjamin Fitzpatrick, Senator elect from Alabama, for the unexpired term of the Hon. William R. King, resigned; which were read.

Mr. FITZPATRICK appeared and was sworn.

DEATH OF THE HON. C. G. ATHERTON.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to introduce resolutions in relation to the death of my late colleague, the Hon. Charles G. Atherton.

Unanimous consent was given.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before offering the resolutions, which, by the kind indulgence of the Senate, I am enabled to present at this time, I will submit a few remarks in connection with the subject.

During the four years I have been honored with a seat in this chamber, often has the attention of the Senate been arrested from its ordinary business to the contemplation of the solemn scenes of death. Of those who have been associated with us here during that brief period, no less than nine have passed to their final account. The most distinguished minds of the land—I might well say of the world—have been removed from us by the hand of death. Their wisdom to counsel—their eloquence to inspire—live only in the history of the past. It seems to me that if ever there was a body of men taught by the admonitions of an all-wise Providence the utter emptiness of the highest earthly places of honor and trust, that body is the Senate of the United States. While the pathway of death has been thronged by our fellow-countrymen who have conferred upon us the high places we occupy, that dark pathway has also been trod by an unprecedented number of our associates, all hastening to, and mingling together in the same common resting-place—the grave.

The last on the catalogue of the fated number of our associates was my esteemed and lamented friend and colleague, Charles Gordon Atherton, who, at the time of his recent death, was a member of this body from the State of New Hampshire. He died suddenly at Manchester, in that State, on the 15th of November last, of paralysis; on the morning of the 10th, he came into the court-room in that city, where he had been actively and laboriously engaged some two or three weeks in the discharge of professional duties, apparently as full of health and spirits as any of us now enjoy, and with the brightest prospects of a useful and distinguished future. Soon after coming into the court, while conversing with a member of the bar, his countenance suddenly changed, and his tongue refused its utterance. His left side was paralyzed. He was immediately removed to his lodgings, and the ablest medical aid procured. During the remainder of that day (Thursday) and the next he seemed fully conscious of his condition, and communicated with his friends; but on Saturday he sunk into a state of unconsciousness, from which he never awoke, but continued to sink gradually under the force of the attack until Tuesday, the 15th, at one o'clock, P. M., when he breathed his last.

Thus, abruptly, has been stricken down in an unexpected moment, our late esteemed associate, in the meridian of physical and intellectual manhood.

He left us at the close of the last special session with as well-founded expectations of being here to-day as any member of this body; but, alas, that seat has been vacated. How suddenly does Providence, by his inscrutable decrees, blast our fondest anticipations, and teach us the true tenure of man's estate—the true yet frail tenure of all earthly honor and station, and of life itself. Indeed, what are all these but an empty inheritance, except so far as they are made subservient to individual and the public prosperity—to the happiness and permanent good of the race.?

Mr. Atherton left no children. His parents—indeed the whole of his father's family—had gone before him to the tomb. Nevertheless, he died amid a large circle of ardent and cherished friends, who sincerely mourn his death. He was descended from ancestors distinguished in the history of his State. His grandfather, Joshua Atherton, was a lawyer of much eminence, and settled early at Amherst, a shire town in Hillsborough county—was a member of the convention which ratified the Constitution of the United States, and subsequently a senator and attorney general of New Hampshire. His father, Charles H. Atherton, was also a thoroughly-read and accomplished lawyer, a man of brilliant genius, and a fine orator. He was frequently a member of the State legislature, and a member of the House of Representatives in the fourteenth Congress.

The subject of my present remarks was born at Amherst, Hillsborough county, New Hampshire, the residence of his father and grandfather, on the 4th day of July, 1804. He exhibited, at a very early age, a strong taste for classic literature, and a capacity to master, with remarkable quickness and ease, the fundamental elements of a classic and liberal education. He entered Cambridge University in 1818, being then only fourteen years of age, and was graduated in 1822, beloved and esteemed both by the faculty and his fellow-students. His college life was exemplary, and his standing as a scholar was among the first of his class.

After leaving college, he studied law in the office of his father, and was admitted to the bar at the age of twenty-one years, and established himself in his profession at Nashua, in his native county, where he resided until his recent death.

Mr. Atherton had been much in public life, a circumstance showing better, perhaps, than any other test, the high estimation in which he was held for fidelity and capacity, by the people of his State. In 1830 he was chosen a member of the legislature, and in 1831 he was elected secretary of the Senate. He was again chosen a member of the legislature in 1833, and continued a member until 1836, and was the Speaker of the House of Representatives for three successive years. He was a member of the House of Representatives of the United States, for the twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, and twenty-seventh Congresses. In 1842 he was chosen by the legislature of New Hampshire a member of this body for the term of six years. After having served out his term, he retired from public life and resumed the practice of his profession. In 1850 he was elected to the convention called to revise the constitution of New Hampshire. In 1852 he was again elected to represent his State in the Senate of the United States for six years, and took his seat here on the fourth of March last. From the tasks of the school-room to the high duties of a Senator, he well and ably acted his part. As a scholar, he was thorough, enthusiastic, and accomplished. As a lawyer, a master in the profession, quick of perception, yet always safe and judicious in counsel. As an advocate, forcible and logical, oftentimes soaring into the highest regions of forensic eloquence. As a statesman, he was fearless and just, enlightened and able. While tenacious of the interest of his own immediate constituents, he was always liberal and just towards the interests of every other section of the country, taking the Constitution as the great chart to guide and limit his action. As a patriot, his views were as broad as the confederacy, adhering with inflexible firmness to those conservative and constitutional principles which secure to every section of our common country the rights peculiar to each. He acknowledged no political law higher or more sacred for his rule of conduct here than that sacred instrument which we are all sworn to support. As a friend, he was ever faithful and true.

The death of such a man is not merely a sad bereavement to the State whose immediate representative he was, but a calamity coextensive with the Union, reaching as deep as the foundation of those great principles of republican liberty on which our prosperity and happiness as a united people depend.

This lamentable event again teaches us the all-important and solemn lesson to be "also ready," for we know not the moment when we, too, shall be called to our final account.

Sir, while we, in common with his numerous friends, lament his death, let us not forget that there is one of his own immediate family circle left behind with whom we can only sympathize. I mean the loved and chosen partner of his youth—the amiable and accomplished companion of his maturer manhood—who, with stricken heart and a soothing care that none but woman can bestow, watched with anxious solicitude the fitful pulsations of sinking nature, and bathed his aching head with her tears. While we extend to her our deepest sympathies, it is God alone can heal the crushed heart.

I offer the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate deeply laments the death of the Hon. Charles Gordon Atherton, who, at the time of his decease was a member of this body from the State of New Hampshire, and tenders to his widow a sincere sympathy in this most afflicting bereavement.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of the foregoing resolution to the widow of the deceased; and further, that he communicate these proceedings to the House of Representatives.

Mr. HUNTER. I rise to second the resolution which the Senator from New Hampshire has offered, and to which he has spoken so feelingly and eloquently. This is the second time, within the brief period of our session, that the Senate has been called upon to pay funeral honors to the dead. Awhile ago it was to one who, ripe with years and honors, descended to the tomb when life had fulfilled its promises, and seemed to have reached its natural and appropriate close. Now, sir, we are to pay them to one stricken down in the prime of life, with his hopes and aspirations fresh and growing around him. He had already won a high position before the country, and had possessed himself of great opportunities for future usefulness, which, in hands able to use them, are perhaps, to be reckoned among the chief of earthly blessings.

Trusted by his friends, respected by his opponents, and honored by his State, a thousand favoring circumstances invited his reappearance upon the political arena, and a bright and promising future seemed to be opening before him. And yet, in an instant of time, with the untasted cup beside him, without forewarning or foreshadow of the fatal event which was coming so swiftly upon him, he was stricken down in mid-career. The mind was smitten in its fastness, and the stream of life stood still at its spring. The living spirit which sometimes "o'er-infuses its tenement of clay," had loosed the connecting link between mind and body, and the oracle was hushed whilst the earth-built walls of its sanctuary still remained. Under such circumstances continued existence could have been no blessing; and our regrets are more due to the first than to the second blow, which completed the ruin after the grace and charm of life had fled.

Mr. President, my acquaintance with Charles G. Atherton commenced in 1835, when I first entered the House of Representatives, of which body I found him an ardent, active, and efficient member—even at that early day he was a marked and trusted man in his party. Here, sir, I afterwards served with him in the more intimate relations upon the Committee of Finance, on which he was chairman. I can safely testify to his fidelity to principle, and the efficiency with which he discharged the duties of that trust. He was upright and honorable in all the relations of life. As his colleague has well said, he was an eminently safe man in council, and one, I may add, who pursued his purposes, when once they were formed, with firmness and ability.

Mr. President, when we look to a life thus cut short in its midst, as it were, we feel as if we had heard some half-told tale, and the imagination is on the stretch to fill up the vacuum—supply the loss. What is lost we cannot restore; and yet we have enough of his history to warrant the belief that, with the last sight of his physical existence there passed away thoughts, conceptions, and aspirations which constituted a noble scheme of life. The objects of pursuit of such a man must have been pure and elevated, and we have every reason to believe that his expectations were founded upon a just confidence in his own high character and abilities. That he did not live to fulfill this scheme, his friends most deeply deplore; but who, sir, shall undertake to reason upon the decrees of Providence, unless he is also acquainted with his secrets?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, such has been my acquaintance with our friend whose death has been announced by my colleague, that I cannot refrain on this, to me, unexpected occasion, from adding my humble but heartfelt tribute to his memory. My first acquaintance with Mr. Atherton commenced in 1830. He was then a member of the New Hampshire house of representatives; and I was connected with him as a member of the house or State senate for seven successive years. Three years of that time he was speaker of the house, and by a dignified, impartial, prompt, and correct discharge of duty, distinguished himself as an efficient and accomplished presiding officer.

The next four years, during the administration of Mr. Van Buren, I was associated with him as a member of the House of Representatives in the other end of this building. In that body, very few, if any, brought to its service more integrity of purpose, more clear and discriminating judgment to settle questions of difficulty, or more ready powers in debate, or greater legislative knowledge, skill and ability. It was my happiness generally to concur with him on all important national questions, and to share so liberally in his personal friendship, as to be able to estimate his personal, as well as his public character. He was not only distinguished for high qualities in the discharge of public duty, but equally distinguished for his humane, sincere, generous, and kind feelings, which endeared him to his friends. The perfect respect and friendship then formed for his character I shall fondly and gratefully cherish for his memory till I am gathered with him to the silent tomb.

In his manners, Mr. Atherton was naturally reserved, quiet, and unobtrusive, but affable and courteous, gentlemanly and polished. He was incapable of deceiving by false or hypocritical professions, and by keeping his faith with all, gave a beautiful exemplification of the *incorrupta fides*, in a life devoted to fidelity, justice, and truth, which left among the living not a single resentment or unkind feeling to be buried in his grave. The deceased was a graduate of Harvard College, an accomplished scholar, of varied and extensive literary attainments, possessing a mind quick, clear, and vigorous, highly cultivated, and remarkably well balanced.

Of his eminent talents, public character and services, it is unnecessary for me to add to what has been eloquently and truthfully said by those who have preceded me. These are the property of the country, and belong to the bright pages of its history. It belongs to me now only to say, that in every position to which the deceased has been elevated, he has discharged his duty acceptably and with marked fidelity and ability.

In his native State, which he represented here, he shared, as he richly deserved, largely in her confidence and support, and was regarded by her citizens at the head of their bar, and one of their most able lawyers and eloquent advocates. His constituents admired his high, noble, and patriotic character, and often felt a glow of exultation and State pride in view of the signal ability with which he maintained an honorable position here amidst the assembled galaxy of the master-minds of the nation. He loved his country, and nobly maintained those principles on which its prosperity and security depends. Happy will it be for us if our footsteps are guided by the calm and steady light of his example, which brightly shines along the pathway of duty and usefulness.

His accomplished and worthy partner, to whom he was ever devoted in his kindness and affection, and whose hand assuaged the bitterness of his parting life, lives to mourn her irreparable loss. To her stricken bosom should our sympathy and consolation be addressed. If her constant, abiding, and self-sacrificing affection, her cares, sympathies, and efforts triumphing over fatigue and exhausted nature, could have availed, her husband would long have been spared to her and to his friends, who now deplore his loss. But, alas! he has gone the road all must once pass. *Calendis sevet via lethi.* Talents and wealth, position and power, could not avert the arrows of death. In the prime of life and vigor of intellect, and mid-career of his usefulness, he has been stricken down, and a great light extinguished forever—leaving a seat here which cannot be filled with equal ability and devotion to principle, and a nation to mourn a sad and melancholy bereavement.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and

The Senate adjourned.

House of Representatives.

DELEGATE FROM NEW MEXICO.

Mr. BENTON rose to a question of privilege, and asked leave to present the credentials of Senor Jose Manuel Gallegos, a delegate from the Territory of New Mexico, and that he might be sworn and take his seat.

Mr. RICHARDSON desired that the credentials under which it was proposed to introduce Mr. Gallegos might be read. Before any action was taken thereon, he wished to call the attention of the House to what he conceived to be the state of the case under this presentation—that neither of the contestants is *prima facie* entitled to a seat on this floor.

The credentials were read at the clerk's table. [One of the certificates, from the governor, declares that Mr. Gallegos is duly elected a delegate; and the other is from the secretary of the territory, attesting to the state of the poll; giving Mr. Gallegos 539 majority over Wm. Carr Lane.]

Mr. RICHARDSON said it seemed that the credentials of Mr. Gallegos were covered by two certificates, which of course, present a *prima facie* case. He would state, however, in explanation of his position, that previously the secretary of the Territory issued a certificate in conflict, as he conceived, with the one just read. The papers before him showed that the secretary had given a certificate under his seal, but not that of the Territory to the contestant, General Lane. The case, he presumed, would be properly investigated by the Committee of Elections.

SENOR GALLEGOS then took the oath to support the Constitution of the United States and was accompanied to his seat by Mr. Benton.

COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES.

Mr. SMITH, of Virginia, asked to be excused from service on the Committee on Territories; and after remarks by several gentlemen, the request was granted.

THE LATE VICE-PRESIDENT.

Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Printing, to whom the subject was referred, reported the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the members of the House Committee on Printing cause to be published and bound in pamphlet form, in such manner as may seem to them appropriate, for the use of the House, thirty thousand copies of the proceedings of the Senate and House of Representatives, and the addresses of the members, in regard to the death of the late Vice President of the United States, the Hon. William R. King, together with so much of the President's message of the present session as relates thereto, and the proceedings of the Supreme Court of the United States on the same subject.

Resolved, That the Committee on Printing cause to be published and bound in pamphlet form, in such manner as may seem to them appropriate, for the use of the House, thirty thousand copies of the addresses made by the members of the Senate and members of the House of Representatives, together with so much of the message of the President of the United States, at the commencement of the session, as relates to the death of the Hon. William R. King.

The question was taken, and the resolutions were adopted.

Mr. RICHARDSON presented the evidence and poll book in the New Mexico contested election case; and they were referred to the Committee of Elections.

COMMITTEE CLERK.

Mr. DISNEY, from the Committee on Public Lands, reported a resolution, authorizing said committee to employ a clerk, at the rate of four dollars a day; and, after debate, the resolution was amended, so as to limit the employment of the clerk for the session, and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported

A bill making appropriation for the civil and diplomatic expenses of the government for the year ending June 30, 1855;

A bill to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1854; and

A bill making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensioners of the United States for the year ending June 30, 1855;

Which were severally referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

DEATH OF MR. ATHERTON.

A message was received from the Senate by the hands of Mr. Asbury Dickins, its secretary, announcing the action of that body in respect to the memory of the Hon. Charles G. Atherton, late a senator from New Hampshire.

The resolutions accompanying the message having been read—

Mr. HIBBARD rose and said: Mr. Speaker, the tones of eloquent eulogy which announced the death of the illustrious statesman of Alabama have hardly ceased to linger in these halls ere the message from the Senate reminds us of the decease of an eminent member of that body—the Hon. Charles G. Atherton, of New Hampshire. And while I am glad to pay my humble tribute to his memory, the duty is yet sad and painful. It awakes anew our recollections of the public bereavement. It thrills, alas, but too keenly, in many hearts, the freshly sundered ties of domestic affection and personal friendship.

It was said by one of the gifted of ancient days that no man's life should be accounted happy until it had ended. For we know not what clouds may darken the setting of the most brilliant meridian sun. Tried by this rule, even the life of Atherton must be deemed a most prosperous one. Learning, intellect, wealth, and distinction, all were his. His public career was one ascending series of honors, fairly won and worthily sustained. Quiet and unostentatious in private life, he enjoyed the respect and good will of all; whilst those so fortunate as to be numbered among his familiar friends, were bound to him as with hooks of steel. He was a gentleman of unsullied probity, and a high sense of personal honor. No serious illness is known ever to have afflicted him, until that fearful stroke which consigned him so suddenly, though with little apparent agony, to an untimely grave—retaining his entire consciousness for most of the time until the final moment. He knew from the first attack that his end was nigh. He met it like one prepared. Calmly, and without fear,

"——he sank to rest,
By all his country's wishes blest."

The family of Atherton has long been noted in New Hampshire for talent and accomplishment. But it has become extinct, in the direct line, with the subject of these remarks.

Mr. HIBBARD then recounted events in the political history of Mr. Atherton, and concluded his remarks by saying:

It was not Mr. Atherton's fate to waste by slow decay. No gradually-advancing decrepitude, nor torturing malady, nor faltering of the outworn faculties gave premonition of his approaching end. Suddenly and without warning, "ere his eye was dimmed, or his natural force abated," he was stricken down in the maturity of his intellect, the vigor of his manhood, and the pride of place and power. His voice will be heard no more in yonder hall. His familiar presence will no longer adorn the social circle, nor gladden again the bereaved one who mourns his loss in the pleasant home his departure has made desolate. But his name will live among us in the recollections of his well-spent life. His cherished memory will beam and brighten with an effulgence not soon to fade away.

Mr. HIBBARD offered the following resolutions:

Resolved, unanimously, That, as a testimonial of respect for the memory of Charles G. Atherton, late a member of the United States Senate, now deceased, the members and officers of this House will go into mourning, and wear crape on the left arm for thirty days.

Resolved, That the Clerk be directed to communicate a copy of these resolutions to the widow of the deceased.

Resolved, As a further mark of respect, that the House do now adjourn.

The resolutions having been read—

Mr. ORR rose to respond. He had been a participant in the felicitations resulting from the political triumphs of New Hampshire's sons, and now, when the heavy hand of affliction sorely oppressed them, he came to mingle his tears with theirs,