

an execution that was hanging over me, and in this case sir, I do contend that I have not done any thing that is morally wrong.

Doct. Smith to whom I sold the money was indebted to the Hernando Bank, for a discount obtained from the Bank for a Cotton Bond, sometime last spring or Summer, at that time Doct. Smith used the money, at par, to pay his debts, now he has bought \$220 of me at a discount of nearly fifty per cent, to pay the Bank, in this transaction you will see sir that I have been injured and not Doct. Smith benefited, are not the innocent imposed on as the Editor of the Memphis Inquirer, would represent. I wish you sir, to make strict inquiry as to my selling Hernando money, in the town of Holly Springs, or else where my trading has been wholly confined to this place and if I have been selling Hernando money to the extent reported, the facts can be easily established and on the contrary if upon inquiry you find I have been wrongfully charged, you will please correct the report under an Editorial. Yours Respectfully,
L. D. HENDERSON.

We call the attention of our readers to the following table, when there were three candidates in the field.

In 1836, when there was but a faint effort made for Gen. Harrison, in fifteen States, Van Buren only beat him by 27,813 votes!! Here is the vote for each.

	Harrison	Van Buren
Maine	15,230	22,000
New Hampshire	6,223	18,722
Vermont	20,990	14,630
Rhode Island	2,710	2,964
Connecticut	18,762	19,285
New York	138,513	166,815
New Jersey	25,302	25,817
Pennsylvania	87,111	91,475
Delaware	4,734	4,132
Maryland	25,852	22,168
Kentucky	36,835	33,435
Ohio	105,305	06,948
Indiana	41,281	32,178
Missouri	7,337	10,995
Illinois	11,983	18,037
	552,502	580,320

This was the run the old patriot made when the Whig party was divided and ran three candidates, White, Webster and Harrison. Now we are united and shall conquer most gloriously.

{Communicated.}

Mr. Editor—Allow me to offer to the young Whigs of Holly Springs and its vicinity, the following preamble and resolution.

... which is strictly a remedy allowing enforcing the contract and nothing more. Chancellor Kent, of New York, when he was judge, took this distinction, and in deciding a case where this question was raised, said: "That general prohibition cannot be understood to apply to all the detail of municipal regulations, rendering more easy or less inconvenient the process and proceedings for the recovery of debts. The time and mode of taking out executions, the regulating of sales on executions, the discharge of persons in execution, &c. are matters belonging to the ordinary and regular course of justice, and are not forbidden by the Constitution, so long as existing remedies are pursued in substance and in integrity." If a State legislature cannot pass a law respecting executions, and make them returnable at a different time, what can they legislate about, I ask? Can it be pretended that the State courts are forever to be tied down to the precise practice which was the law of the courts at the time the Constitution was adopted, and deprive themselves of all the lights and advantages of experience, and that the State Legislatures have no discretion in regard to the ever varying circumstances of their constituents? That idea is not to be entertained for a moment, and if we allow the State Legislatures to do any thing, or at all to change the practice of their courts, we must allow them the power of altering the returned law of an execution. This State has abolished imprisonment for debt; has the constitutionality of that law ever been questioned? I presume not. If then, the execution against the body may be taken away or denied, surely the execution against the goods and lands may be postponed. I am aware that there are decisions by some of the State courts, which seem to have a different bearing upon the question. But I feel very confident that the spirit of the decisions in the United States Court, will bear me out in my opinion, and those decisions are the paramount law upon this subject; and the reason of the thing in regard to the organization of our government, and a sound interpretation of State rights, is in favor of the opinion I have expressed. It is not right or politic for a State to allow a large interpretation and extent to the Federal Constitution. All that can be required of them is to allow a fair subject for the interpretation and operation thereof, and limit its power or restraint to as narrow grounds as is consistent with an honest and fair interpretation of the words in the sense in which those words are ordinarily understood; neither is it the duty of State courts to decide that a law of the State is unconstitutional in a doubtful case. The mind of the Judge should discover a clear incompatibility between the constitution and the

ment with a party of the... Dec. mber last, as reported by h... in Office; being shot in the... commencement of the action, wh... among the foremost of the adva... A public meeting was called... zens of Austin on the night of... January to adopt resolutions e... their regret on account of his... though so sorrow of his fri... quittance can restore his to th... via the grief of his relations... Still there is a pride which mou... whose memory lives in the he... countrymen.

THE QUEEN'S MARRIAGE

The ceremony of the Queen's marriage took place on the 10th of February at the Chapel Royal, St. James'. The household and the attendant Majesty began to arrive at the Palace about half past ten o'clock. The Earl of Uxbridge, the Earl of Liverpool, the Earl of Surrey, the Earl of Albemarle, Lord Alfred Paget, Sir Anson, the Lords in Waiting, the Women, Maids of Honor, British Women, Gentlemen Ushers, &c., were assembled at 11 o'clock. The ladies of the Queen's suite were summoned by the King of the Horse, and handed into the royal carriages by Col. Cavendish (Marshall) and Lord Albert Paget. At 11 the six gentlemen composing the suite of Prince Albert and the Duke of Coburg Cotha, mustered in the Hall. At a quarter to 12 the Royal party having returned, notice was given by the Royal bridegroom that all was in readiness for his departure. The prince immediately quitted the private apartments of the Queen, and passed through the state room in uniform of a British Field Marshal. He wore no other decoration than the sash of the Order of the Garter. The Prince was supported by his father and his brother, the hereditary Prince. His Serene Highness wore the collar of the Order of the Garter and the star of the Order of Coburg. Prince Ernest wore the insignia of the Cross of an Order of Knighthood. Prince Albert was preceded by the Lord Chamberlain, the Vice Chamberlain, the Treasurer and Controller of the Household, the Clerk Marshal, the Gentlemen Ushers, &c., the remainder of the foreign suite bringing up the rear. The Prince entered the carriage, the sound of trumpets, the lowering of the standard of arms, and all the honors paid to the Queen herself. His Royal Highness with his father and brother