shall have fair play. Particularly there is no difference worth quarrelling about.

"It appears to me to be perfectly absurd for us to be grumbling about "squatter sovereignty," at the present time, when squatter sovereignty will make free every inch of territory now belonging to the United States.

"After the acquisition of California, with the prospect of the addition of more Mexican territory, when Gen. Cass proposed the doctrine of non-intervention, it was an important question, as it might have led to the introduction of many slave States; *but after the South had been completely checkmated by Congress's declaration in favor of freedom, we had no reason to object to the doctrine of non-intervention, or squatter sovereignty.* We have now, besides Kansas and Nebraska, New Mexico, Utah, Minnesota, Oregon and Washington, making seven Territories, which will give us seven free States. Some think the fate of Kansas doubtful, but the invasion of the *Missouri ruffians*, independent of natural causes will make it a free State. These borderers came over first to vote for pro-slavery men—the second time to vote against them in the election of the Capital—and the third time to make a blister under Shannon, *place the people*, and drink whiskey.

"Under such circumstances I cannot conceive what has hitherto *excluded slavery from our Territories.*

"The slaveholders will not get Kansas, and they are now deprived of the pretext of going into the Territories south of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes, under the compromise. They generally opposed non-intervention on that ground, and contended for carrying the compromise line to the Pacific ocean. *It is evident that for our interests some line must be kept, and compromise line restored.* Why the South should have voted for its repeal is a question for themselves to settle. They all, at the time, admitted that Kansas would never be a slave State. I hope our friends will meet the issue boldly, and leave the question of State organization to the people of the Territory, who have the natural and best right to decide for themselves.

"*Let the squatters alone*—but let it be, that the principle of the Nebraska act shall have fair play, and shall not be controlled by invaders from Missouri, or any military power whatever. As to more slave States, there are none in prospect, and it is useless to embarrass ourselves by anticipating questions which may or may not arise.

Now, sir, these two wings are standing to-day exactly where they stood before.—You see, if you please, why these men you are hugging to your bosom on the other side, stand with you! These men who were, and now are, rank Free Soilers! Tell us why the Green amendment is admitted!—Which would you rather have for your bedfellows? I tell you the difference is very much like the slave's reply when asked whether Jim and Mose were not very much alike! He said, "Yes, very much alike, indeed; and particularly *Mose.*"—[Laughter.] It is not so much, I fear, that they care about getting negroes into Kansas, or getting them out. It is not any principle of that kind. It is, I apprehend, a mere contrivance by which jobbing has been carried on in this country to keep certain men in power. In fact this whole management and shuffling reminds me of what occurred in one of our North Carolina towns some years ago. A only fellow declared himself a candidate for town constable. The boys had a circular printed for him. It was printed on both sides of the ticket—with Lecompton on one side, and Green upon the other. On one side, he addressed himself to the Democrats: "Fellow citizens, vote for me, and if I am elected constable, I will never force you to payment, even at many extremity." On the other side was an address to the creditors: "If you will come up and vote for me, and I shall be elected, I promise, upon my honor, I will have your money paid, to every farthing, at the drop of a hat."

Mr. Chairman, I am not disposed to detain this Committee with a review of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case. All I have to say to this is that my views upon the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise were known long before that decision was made; and I thought that the compromise was not in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution. Although my opinion inclines to that of the Supreme Court, and out before the decision was made, yet, from the length of time it had been a compromise, I was disposed to look upon it as a compromise which had I never be abolished by. As in the case of two neighbors whose boundary line is in dispute—a boundary which can only be settled by the production of a deed, and no agreement they might make by parol would change the line fixed by the deed; any more than any agreement between two sections of the country by Congress could be changed. But when the neighbors have established a line by parol agreement, stated and clapped it off, and have lived in peace, harmony, and prosperity under it for more than thirty years, if they should come to me to ask my advice, whether they should break up this old landmark—now the true line being ascertained by the deed—and go back to their rights according to law, I should say, as a man, a neighbor, and a Christian, also, that they had better let the old landmark stand and abide by them; and try to make people will disputes and quarrels. So with the case of this Missouri compromise. I do not believe the South is going to gain anything by its repeal, and I firmly believe that the only reward the South will ever get from its repeal will be to her true interests.

But it is said that the only way to justify the country is to adopt an amendment to this bill. Hath it come to better? That in no way can it be improved; that it has got to be passed in the shape in which it is presented, even though a proposition should be presented, which, if carried out, would more effectually pacify and quiet the country than settle the whole question. Why, say they it would be intervention. Now, let me ask the committee a moment to show how ridiculous that idea is. What is this thing of non-intervention? Why, it is intervention to leave the people of a Territory perfectly free and untrammeled to settle this, with all other questions, in their own way fairly and properly, subject only to the Constitution of the United States?

Now, sir, do we consider it any better treason, in the case of a trial by jury, after the verdict is ascertained, to set the same aside, and grant a new trial upon affidavits which clearly prove and satisfy the judge that the verdict was obtained by fraud, by perjury, duress, or by any illegal practice? Is it any intervention for an honest and conscientious judge, after being satisfied of the facts by reliable affidavits, to say that he doubted whether the verdict had been fairly obtained, and in the exercise of the discretion which is vested in him, decided to grant a new trial, in order that justice might be done? Is that an interference with the right of trial by jury? And suppose a jury is empanelled to settle the question, and they come back to the judge, and one of the jury gets up and says verdict is so and so, and another says it is not so, and the judge tells them, "gentlemen, you had better retire, get together again and consult, and agree upon your verdict, and, when you come in, it will be recorded"—is that any interference? I wanted to show how ridiculous this idea is. Is that intervention?

What are Green's and Pugh's amendments? Let our Northern anti-slavery men, of all parties, understand the President of the United states has given a true construction of the Dred Scott decision, and you will never have any more fuss about this matter from them. The President says it means that when the people of any State see proper to get together in a legal way, to get a convention sanctioned by law, a mere majority of their assembly vote *Free Soil* they may form a constitution and the negroes all slope.—That is giving the Abolitionists a new cue, and which will run out the institution of my beloved section from all the Territories, certainly, and endanger it in many of the States.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to look upon this question without reference to any section, or how it will affect any body other than the general good and peace of the whole country. If no other plan can be devised and agreed on, I may feel myself constrained to vote for the measure, being urged by Southern friends and sectional pressure. And if I do, the Green amendment stricken out, it will not be (and I say it here) a measure which my sound judgment can approve as the better plan. If I could, I would put the whole responsibility upon the Democracy, where it belongs, for I do believe if they would relax a little, and honestly set their heads to work with our Southern friends and other conservative men in this House, this whole matter might be put upon a footing entirely satisfactory to the South—to the East—to the West—to the North—satisfactory to the people of Kansas—and without any compromise of any principle—substantially in the manner indicated by me heretofore.

I must say that when I hear it asserted here, and everywhere, and the proofs strongly tending to show that the government of Kansas was, in the first instance, ruthlessly snatched from the people, unconstitutional test oaths applied, by which the minority, who by fraud obtained the control of the government, and by which the majority were kept from participating in the government—when I am told—and the proof tends that way—that no more than one half of the counties of the Territory were permitted to be represented in the convention, I doubt the propriety of supporting the constitution from thus. I dissent from the idea that a majority of the counties of any State can make a constitution that is binding on the minority of the counties who did not have a chance to be represented in the convention. Why have you more judges than one? It is not simply for the sake of numbers, but that there may be conference, argument, interchange of views. We may be to-day ill inclined one way, and to-morrow a greater and better mind than any of us, representing but one district, may make a suggestion sufficient to change the opinion of the whole Congress. We know that the election of the 9th of January was recognised by the Secretary of State who gave instructions that that election should be fairly held, and the votes fairly and impartially taken; that vote turns out to be over ten thousand against the constitution. We are told, too, and sworn, that the Legislature of the Territory, representing the will of the people, are unanimously protesting against this thing; and we are also told that the whole constitution rests on fraud, deception and chicanery. And, permit me to say further, as a Southern man, that when I see my Southern friends on the Special Committee in this matter, declining to obey the instructions of the House, and shrinking from inquiry, it leaves the suspicion stronger on my mind that these reports are true. I hope that they are not. I hope that the deeds perpetrated there have not been so horrible as they have been represented; but when I see chivalrous gentlemen from my own section of the Union turning their back upon an investigation, and saying that we had better not look into these things, I take it for granted that there is more in these assertions than I before supposed. But, sir, this Special Committee was directed to do another thing. That was to tell us whether this Territory had within its confines ninety-three thousand inhabitants. Now, I ask every man here, on what figures, and on what evidence, he can satisfy his mind that there are ninety-three thousand in Kansas? What was the last census?

Mr. Sherman, of Ohio. Twenty-three thousand.

Mr. Gilmer. How long ago was that?

Mr. Sherman, of Ohio. Last June.

Mr. Gilmer. Then, sir, here, I appeal to Southern men, do you get the requisite 93,000 population? But they come forward and say that the Republicans wanted to have Kansas admitted under the Topeka constitution, and therefore they are stopped. And they also say that at the last Congress our Democratic friends undertook to pass an enabling act, and therefore they are stopped. Well, that may apply to the Republicans, and may put them out of court. It may very well apply to our Democratic Southern friends, and turn them out of court. But what are they going to do with the poor Americans? We say that the Republicans were mistaken, and that that was only a movement of intemperate zeal. We want to know what the facts are. I venture to say that there are not four individuals there to every single voter. The experience of this country shows that in a territory where there are but few females, and few old or very young persons, the voters are in the ratio of not more than one to every three or four. Well, now, take the 10,000 voters and multiply by 3—you have but 30,000 of population there. Multiply it by 4, and you have but 40,000. Multiply it by 5, and you have but 50,000. Multiply it by 6—what we all know is far beyond the ratio—and you have only got 60,000, and yet here are Southern gentlemen—men who want to protect the equality of Southern representation in Congress—coming forward to let have and denouncing as abolitionists every man who will not consent to allow the 30,000 or 40,000 quarrelling people of Kansas to come in as a State, add to swell here two Jim Lanes and somebody else like them, to vote in the Congress of the United States. And that all for the sake of the South! I know there is not a man here who can say that he has evidence that there is a population of 93,000 people in the Territory of Kansas. The fact is not so; and the fact that our Southern friends having the control of the Special Committee, declined to inquire into that important point, proves that it is not so.

But, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say, in conclusion, that we are not left in the dark and without precedents, as to the proper course to be pursued in a difficulty of this kind. Kentucky, after several attempts, was admitted into the Union and allowed to frame her constitution subsequently, in her own way. So I believe now, that Kansas should be allowed to settle this question and frame her constitution for herself. Do this, and Kansas will be satisfied—the House will be satisfied—and the whole Union will be satisfied.

A SCENE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

QUESTION OF VERACITY.

In the House of Representatives on Tuesday last, Mr. Shaw, Locofoco member from the Edenton District in North Carolina, delivered a long speech in reply to Mr. Gilmer's speech on Kansas. Shortly after he began to speak, Mr. Campbell asked him if he was aware that Mr. Gilmer was not present. Mr. Shaw replied, "I am aware of that fact; and some of my friends know that I sought earnestly to obtain the floor while my colleague was still here. And I desire to say to the gentleman from Ohio, that no word which I utter here, will I refuse to proclaim in the face of my colleague, here or elsewhere."

He then went on, and towards the close he said,—

Mr. Chairman, I have not said all that I desired to in reply to my colleague. My time will not admit. I am admonished that it has already expired; but I cannot resume my seat, without giving expression here in my place to the indignation I felt on seeing the senior member from Ohio offering his congratulations to my colleague at the close of his speech. Once before, during my legislative experience here, it has been my lot to witness a similar exhibition. Once before have I seen the enemies of the South congratulate a southern man on account of a speech he had made upon a question in which the rights of the South were involved.

Mr. Giddings. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him? Did I understand the gentleman to say that I went to Mr. Gilmer and congratulated him? May I correct him in that statement?

Mr. Shaw, of North Carolina. I am aware that the gentleman from Ohio congratulated him upon his speech. I saw the gentleman approach my colleague as he approached another gentleman upon a former occasion, who made a speech in reference to southern rights. I saw the gentleman approach him with both hands extended, and I imagined that he was pronouncing a benediction upon my colleague, which would be a withering curse upon him to his grave.

Mr. Giddings. Does the gentleman intend to represent me as congratulating Mr Gilmer? Does he understand that I went towards Mr. Gilmer to congratulate him?

Mr. Shaw, of North Carolina. I say that the gentleman did go towards him, shake him by the hand, and, I suppose, congratulate him.

Mr. Giddings. Let me say that the gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. Shaw, of North Carolina. Why, sir, I saw it with my own eyes, and there were gentlemen upon this side whose attention was called to it.

Mr. Giddings. I will correct the gentleman. Let me explain it.

Mr. Shaw, of North Carolina. I beg the gentleman not to interrupt me.

Mr. Giddings. I wish to correct the gentleman. [Loud cries of "Order!"]

Mr. Shaw, of North Carolina. I ask the gentleman from Ohio, then, if he did not approach my colleague, at the conclusion of his speech, shake him by the hands, and offer his congratulations?

Mr. Giddings. I did not. Mr. Gilmer was in his place, and I was in the aisle. I inquired of him if he intended to compare my name with that of James Buchanan. Neither gave him my hand nor took his.

Mr. Shaw, of North Carolina. I know not, nor do I pretend to say, what occurred between the gentlemen. I say, again, that I not only saw the gentleman approach my colleague and extend towards him both hands——

Mr. Giddings. I did not. The gentleman is mistaken. I did not. [Loud cries of "Order!"]

Mr. Shaw, of North Carolina. I not only saw him, but some fifteen or twenty others saw him approach my colleague, and I must be permitted to say that, when I witnessed that spectacle, I felt then, as I feel now, that whenever the time should come——

Mr. Giddings. I say the gentleman is entirely mistaken. [Renewed and deafening shouts of "Order!" from the Democratic side of the House.]

Mr. Clingman. I call the gentleman to order.

Mr. Keitt. I insist that order shall be preserved in the committee. The gentleman from North Carolina is entitled to the floor and demands to yield it.

The Chairman. The gentleman from South Carolina is out of order.

Mr. Keitt. The gentleman from Ohio——[Loud and continued shouts of "Order" from the Republican side of the House.]

Mr Keitt. Let the Blackguards over there act their outside of the House.

The Chairman. The gentleman from North Carolina is entitled to the floor, and will proceed.

Mr. Shaw, of North Carolina. As I said before, I do not undertake to say what passed between the gentleman from Ohio and my colleague. I know not what the gentleman from Ohio said, but I know he said something very grateful to my colleague's feelings, for there was a smile of complacency on his face.

Mr. Giddings. I say I did not take Mr. Gilmer's hand. [Cries of "Order!"]

Mr. Shaw, of North Carolina. Many gentlemen here know that the scene occurred as I have described it; and, sir, as I was about to say when I was interrupted, when I witnessed it, I felt, as I feel now, that if ever the time should come when I should be so far capable of misrepresenting the honorable and confiding constituency which had sent me here to protect their rights and defend their honor, as to make a speech that would bring down upon my head the approbation and congratulations of the gentleman from Ohio and his allies upon that side, I should instinctively raise my hands to Heaven and, in the language of the Indian prince exclaim, "What have I done that the enemies of my country should praise me?"

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. Giddings. Mr. Chairman, we are in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and I will say a few words in reply to what has been said by the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. Shaw.] I understood him to assert that, when one of his colleagues [Mr. Gilmer] had concluded his speech, I went to him, extending my hands and taking his, and congratulated him on his speech. I endeavored to put the gentleman right at the time he was making this statement, but there was so much noise and confusion I am not sure whether gentlemen heard or understood me. However that may be, I desire the country, this House, and the gentleman, to know, that there was not one word of truth in what he uttered on that point. I went no nearer to the gentleman's colleague [Mr. Gilmer] than the aisle up which I was passing; and, instead of congratulating him on his speech, I inquired whether he had used my name with the name of Mr. Buchanan. I remarked, further, that if he did, I should hold him responsible for it. I did not congratulate him on his speech; nor did I hear the remark of the gentleman, except as it was told me by other gentlemen. This is all there was of it. I did not congratulate him; I did not extend my hand to him; and I did not leave the aisle in passing up.

Mr. Campbell. In corroboration of what my colleague has just stated, I desire to say at this point that I was near the honorable gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Gilmer] when he made his speech. My colleague, who has just taken his seat, passed up the aisle and protested against the use which had been made of his name in connection with that of James Buchanan, and then he passed on.

Mr Clingman. My colleague [Mr. Shaw] is out of the Hall, and I state this lest it be imagined that what has been said passed unnoticed by him.

Mr. Morris, of Pennsylvania. I hope the gentleman from North Carolina will insert his rectification in his speech.

Mr. Clingman. I hope I will be allowed to say a word.

Mr. Cox. I object.

Mr. Clingman. Why not let the facts come out?

Mr Curtis. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Clingman. I dislike to interfere between my colleagues; but as the one who has spoken to-day [Mr. Shaw] is out of the Hall, I think injustice would be done him if I did not say a word here. I was sitting nearly where I am now when my colleague [M. Gilmer] made his speech. As he sat down, I saw a crowd gather round him. A gentleman near me said: "Look at the Black Republicans, how they congratulate Gilmer." I looked at that moment and saw the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] near enough to put his hands upon my colleague and lean forward. I saw this, and I think I have eyes as good as most people; I did not hear what was said; I do not know that they grasped hands. They were near enough to do it. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Houston] exclaimed loudly: "Kiss him! Kiss him!" calling the gentleman from Ohio by name. I looked at it, and many others did. I do not know what was said between them. This statement is due to my colleague. All of us supposed that it was a congratulation. The gentleman from Ohio knows exactly what did occur.

Mr. Campbell. I was near enough to hear the words. My colleague protested against the use of his name in connection with that of James Buchanan.

Mr. McQueen. Did the gentleman congratulate him?

Mr. Campbell. I did; for I thought then, and think now, that he made a damaging speech for Lecompton.

Mr. McQueen. How many copies of that speech did the gentleman subscribe for?

Mr. Campbell. Three or four hundred; and they are so good, I wish I had more of them.

Mr. John Cochrane moved the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

COL. BENTON'S RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.

The St. Louis journals, of the 17th, contain full accounts of the Benton obsequies, which took place on that day. In the course of the funeral sermon preached by Rev. Mr. Cowan, of Carondelet—the following incident, illustrative of Col. Benton's religious experience, were related:

"The deceased has always been a believer in the truth of the christian religion. He was not one of those who supposed it necessary to repudiate the christian religion as an evidence of superior intellect. He was trained by a pious mother, who was an Episcopalian, and to whom he was indebted, in a great degree, for his distinction in subsequent life. In the kind providence of God, he has, moreover, been favored in having for his most intimate friends those who feared God, and cared for his soul.—His sainted wife was a devoted christian, and always felt a deep concern for his spiritual interests. Your former beloved Pastor, Dr. Potts, left no opportunity unimproved in an endeavor to bring him to Christ. He corresponded with him in regard to religion, and doubtless made him the subject of his prayers, as long as God left him on earth to be thus engaged. The mind of the deceased doubtless has long been interested, in a greater or less degree, on the matter of his salvation. It may not be improper to mention a circumstance which occurred in the year 1851. I was engaged in a protracted meeting in Scott county, in the town of Benton. The deceased visited the place during the meeting. He attended the exercises which took place during his stay in town. He listened attentively to the sermon. My text was, 'Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.' At the close, he came up and took me by the hand, and placing his mouth close to my ear, he remarked, in allusion to my text, 'It is all my own case—it is all my own case,' and bursted into a flood of tears. Those, therefore, who have intimately known his history, especially in the latter years of his life, have not been surprised at the happy termination of his earthly career. They have been expecting it, and have not been disappointed."

MONEY RETURNED.—The Secretary of the Treasury received on Tuesday fifteen hundred dollars in Treasury notes from an unknown individual in New York, who states that he had cheated the Government to that amount during Gen. Pierce's administration.

NORTH CAROLINA STOCKS.—The sales in New York have been small and few of late. The latest quotations are at 93.

North Carolina Whig.

NORTH CAROLINA

CHARLOTTE:

Tuesday, May 4, 1858.

Lectures on Travels in Europe.

We stated in our last, that the Rev. F Asbury Mood had consented to deliver to the citizens of this place, a course of lectures on his European tour. The proceeds of which was to be applied to aid in the erection of a new M. E. Church in this town.—That our readers may have some idea of the gratification and pleasure that may be derived from attending the delivery of these lectures we give the following notice taken from the Abbeville Independent Press of a Sermon and Lecture delivered by this talented gentleman to the citizens of that place:

The Sermon delivered on Sunday night, in the Methodist Church, was one of the most appropriate and finely conceived efforts that it was ever our privilege to hear. The text selected was, "Add to your Faith, Virtue," and the Sermon was an able exposition, and enforcement of the thoughts embraced in those suggestive words. The speaker showed that activity and progress were inscribed upon the whole animate creation, and this he illustrated by the researches of the geologist, the discoveries of the astronomer, the history of society, and the intellectual development of the individual. Man's moral nature presents no exception, and we are either progressing in virtue and holiness, or retrograding into vice. But all progress implies a point of departure, and a goal to which we are hastening. The starting point, with the Christian, is faith. Indeed it lies at the basis of all moral improvement, intellectual advancement, or social progress. In spite of all the cavils of the infidel he is bound to assume it as the very basis of his doubts; and he builds upon the very principles which he oppugns. From a well grounded faith, virtue (or courage as the speaker defined it,) springs as a natural and legitimate result. This courage, he distinguished from that false type; that mere animal excitement, which supports the duellist and warrior on the field of blood. It was rather a high moral purpose, grounded on virtuous principle which impelled one to do what was right in the face of public sentiment, and which braved the rack and the stake of the persecutor; a courage which has been exhibited in all ages of the church, as well by the delicate female, as by the sterner sex. The Sermon was characterized by a pervading unity and logical coherence, which showed the fruits of high culture and intellectual discipline.

On Tuesday evening, Mr. Mood favored a large audience in the Court House, with a sketch of his recent travels in Europe.—His entertaining letters contributed to the *Carolina Times* had prepared us for a very interesting lecture, and our expectations were more than realized. The lecture occupied more than two hours in the delivery, and presented in an easy conversational style, an agreeable variety of personal incident, and vivid description, enlivened by gleams of true humor. To have entertained an audience so long, of itself, indicates no common talent as a lecturer. By way of apology the lecturer stated that a familiarity with graver themes unfitted him for his present task, and he felt somewhat at sea in his subject. This remark suggested the first topic of the lecture, and we were furnished with a humorous and graphic sketch of a sea voyage; were then transported to England, and were entertained with a description of town and country; then to France; to Naples; to Rome; to Venice; over the Alps, and up the Rhine, back again to the sights and sounds of London. The lecturer had with him an ample portfolio, and we have no doubt has accumulated material enough for a very interesting book of travels. He is just the man, we think, to follow in the track of other tourists and to find new material in a well gleaned field.

Concert!

Attention is called to the advertisement of Professor Rives who proposes to give a Concert of Instrumental Music, at the Court House, on Wednesday night next. Prof. Rives comes well recommended as to his proficiency in the Art of Music, but his situation appeals to the sympathy of every individual in this community, as he is entirely blind, being thus afflicted from his childhood. We have examined a number of letters, and although he is in needy circumstances, they show that he is not a humbug, or an imposter, and no person who has the milk of human kindness in his heart will refuse to aid him. We commend to every one a stanza from Pope's Universal Prayer:

"Teach me to feel another's woe,
To hide the fault I see;
That mercy I to others show,
That mercy show to me."

Mr. Gilmer's Speech.

We give this week, Mr. Gilmer's speech on the admission of Kansas into the Union with the Lecompton Constitution. Our readers can now judge whether he has advanced arguments which show that he is either unfriendly to the South or that he has proved himself unfaithful to his constituents. It is too often the case that whenever a Whig or American member of Congress acts, as every man ought to act, independently, especially if it does not please the leaders of the Democracy, the cry is raised immediately, that he is opposed to the South. They expect a man to give up conscience and every thing else to please the requisitions of this party. But for one, Mr. Gilmer could not be brought to yield—he believed the Lecompton Constitution a fraud, and believing so he opposed it with all the powers he possessed, and to his own constituents he is responsible and will stand or fall, and not to the behests of a party whose leaders are so corrupt that they are only held together by the "cohesive power of public plunder."

The Protectorate.

Our readers will remember from the Congressional proceedings that Senator Houston had presented a resolution in favor of raising a select committee of the Senate, whose duty it shall be to inquire into and report upon the expediency of declaring and maintaining a "protectorate" over the Republic of Mexico. The National *Intelligencer* in commenting upon this subject says "a doubt may rest perhaps on the minds of some whether our own Government has shown any such excess of political wisdom in the management of its domestic affairs that it may becomingly appropriate to itself the benevolent task of keeping Mexico in order."

Kiss him Giddings!

After the delivery of Mr. Gilmer's speech in the House of Representatives, Mr Giddings approached Mr. Gilmer, and from reports put forth by the Democratic press, that Giddings had congratulated him, we supposed that Mr. Gilmer had went, "body and soul" over to the Black Republicans, but it seems to have been "a great cry" but "little wool." "Kiss him Giddings! kiss him Giddings!!" has been handed about by the Democratic press with considerable gusto, but it will be seen by reference to the report of a scene that took place in the House of Representatives, a few days ago, that Mr. Giddings denies congratulating him or even taking his hands. The Fayetteville *Observer* condemns the course of Mr. Shaw, and says, "was there ever a more shameful attempt to destroy the standing of another by bold assertion of untruths, or a more complete back out when cornered." Mr. Gilmer was absent and that may account for his not replying to Mr. Shaw on the report of Giddings congratulating him. Read the account of the denial in to-day's paper, and then you will be able to determine very easily who is in the wrong.

Mount Vernon.

It had been announced that the Ladies Mount Vernon Association had effected the purchase of Mount Vernon, the home and last resting place of the Father of his country, and that in a few days the terms would be made public. Having received a circular containing this information, we take great pleasure in laying it entire before our readers. Every person who has one spark of love for his country must rejoice to learn that this hallowed spot is the property of the Ladies of this country and into no better hands could such a sacred trust be more worthily deposited. It will become the shrine at which every patriot will go to draw instruction, and when it is adorned and beautified as only woman can do it, many a pilgrim will wend his way to that spot that he may have his love of country increased and his faith in the perpetuity of our institutions strengthened; and may this become a means by which the bonds of this Union may become more strongly cemented and all sectional differences be forever buried in the tomb of Washington.

Severe Weather.

Since our last, we have had several heavy frosts, and there is very little doubt that every thing which the frost could injure has been more or less affected. To the North of us the injury is more perceptible on the fruit, the wheat, &c. In our immediate vicinity, judging from some trees on our lots, the fruit has been but slightly injured, while garden vegetables have been seriously injured. Wheat is supposed by some to be seriously injured, others are of a different opinion, but a few days will determine who is right. After several very hot days the weather underwent a change and on yesterday morning fire was very comfortable.

Celebration at Newbern.

The pageant that came off at Newbern on Thursday last, we understand, was a grand affair, at least 10,000 being present from various sections of North Carolina and Virginia. It would have afforded much pleasure to have attended, but it being Court week we could not conveniently absent ourselves from home. We will give a more extended notice of the celebration in our next.

Kansas Bill Passed.

On Friday last, the bill offered to both Houses of Congress by the Conference Committee, was passed. In the Senate by a majority of 8, and in the House by a majority of 13. We will lay the bill before our readers next week. Thus has a question, which has agitated the country for sometime, been finally put at rest; and may all parties abide the settlement.

North Carolina Planter.

We have received the May No. of this periodical. It has been greatly improved in appearance. It is worthy the encouragement of our agricultural friends and is afforded at $1 per year *invariably in advance.* Direct A. M. Gorman, Publisher, Raleigh, North Carolina.

☞ Messrs. Holden & Wilson will please accept our thanks for a copy of the 5th Annual Report of the Superintendent of Common Schools.

☞ We return our thanks to C. F. Fisher, Esq., President of the N. C. Rail Road for a free ticket to the Newbern Celebration.

TEMPERANCE CELEBRATION.

MECKLENBURG DIVISION HALL,
April 27th, 1858.

In response to a call for a convention of the different Divisions of Sons of Temperance in Mecklenburg county, delegates appeared from all the Divisions except Pleasant Hill. On motion of E. C. Kime, Col. B. W. Alexander was called to the Chair, and S. W. Reid requested to act as Secretary.

The Chairman in a few appropriate remarks explained the object of the meeting to be, the selection of a time and place, for holding an *union* Temperance Celebration.

J. G. Wilkinson then offered the following resolutions which were unanimously adopted:

1st. That the Divisions of Sons of Temperance in Mecklenburg county hold an *union* Temperance Celebration on the 3d of July next.

2d. That Hebron Church be the place for holding said Celebration.

3d. That a committee consisting of one from each Division be appointed as a committee of Invitation.

4th. That a committee consisting of three members from Steele Creek Division, and three from Sharon Division, with one from each other Division in the county be appointed as a committee of arrangements.

In compliance with the third resolution the following brethren were appointed, viz:

From Hopewell Division,		A. M. Berry
" Pleasant Hill "		John Hart, Esq
" White Hall "		W. W. Grier
" Sharon "		H. C. Reid
" Big Spring "		S. J. Berryhill
" Mecklenburg "		E. C. Kime
" Steele Creek "		S. H. Elliott

In compliance with the fourth resolution the following brethren were appointed, viz:

From Sharon Division, Wm. Reid, Esq., Sampson Wolfe, and John W. Barnett.

From Steele Creek Division, W. C. Phillips, John Hunter, and Thomas B. Elliott.

From White Hall Division,		R. W. McDowell
" Mecklenburg "		C. Overman
" Hopewell "		B. W. Alexander
" Big Spring "		Dr. I. J. Sloan
" Pleasant Hill "		William Irwin

On motion it was resolved that the proceedings of this meeting be published in the town papers, and the Spirit of the Age.

The Convention then adjourned.

B. W. ALEXANDER, Chm'n.

S. W. REID, Secretary.

CONGRESS.

The Senate was engaged Thursday in the consideration of the deficiency bill, but did not reach final action when the usual hour of adjournment arrived.

In the House the bill offered by Mr Morrill to distribute land among the States for the benefit of agricultural societies and colleges was passed by a vote of 105 to 100. The pension bill introduced by Mr Savage, of Tennessee, giving pensions to the soldiers of 1812, was then taken up for consideration. It is the special order for to-day.

Mr English stated that he expected to make a report at 1 o'clock to-day from the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses of Congress upon the bill to admit Kansas into the Union as a State. We presume that the same report will be presented in the Senate at the same hour.

☞ In the United States Senate, on Saturday, the Deficiency bill was passed, as reported by the Committee, with the amendments that future contracts be submitted to Congress.

In the House, the motion to re-consider the postponement of further action on Kansas affairs, and on the report of the Committee of Conference, was tabled by a majority of four. The motion to postpone this subject till the 15th of May was still before the House when they adjourned.

A resolution was offered by Mr. Savage, providing that the debate on the bill granting pensions to the soldiers of the war of 1812, cease three hours from the time of going into the committee of the Whole.—The resolution was agreed to—yeas 100, nays 91.

WASHINGTON, April 26.

In the Senate, Mr. Seward presented the resolutions of the Legislature of New York in favor of the promotion of Lieut. Maury, refused by the Naval Committee.

The Utah resolutions were discussed.

The Kansas question was resumed.

The Senate adjourned without taking any action on Kansas. It will be up again to-morrow. The vote on the report is not anticipated before the latter part of the week.

The House postponed any action on the Kansas Committee report till Wednesday. It also disagreed to the Senate's amendments to the Deficiency bill.

Mr. Quitman sought to introduce a bill indicating the line of policy hereafter to be pursued. No new State to be admitted until they have sufficient population for one representative in Congress, nor until the people have been authorized by Congress to hold a Convention and frame a Constitution, and present the same for admission. He will seek another opportunity to present it.

WASHINGTON, April 27.

In the Senate, the joint resolution for the relief of the widow of Capt. Herndon, was read twice and referred to the Committee of Naval Affairs.

The Kansas question was resumed. The debate still continues. Mr. Crittenden pointed out the difference between the committee's substitute and his own.

Mr. Hunter made an able reply.

Mr. Wade spoke for an hour, characterizing the Administration as a corrupt one.

Mr. Green defended the committee and the Administration.

In the House a communication was received from the Secretary of the Treasury, giving a statement of Government relations with all the Banks in the country.

The Fort Snelling Committee presented a majority and minority report.

A resolution was adopted appropriating the evening sessions to debate only.

The bill to allow pensions to the soldiers of the war of 1812, and of the Indian wars, was discussed.

WASHINGTON, April 28.

In the Senate, to-day, but three speeches were made on the Kansas question—Senators Stuart, Pugh, and Doolittle, delivered themselves. The subject will be finished to-morrow. Several others have yet to speak.

In the House, Kansas was discussed. Messrs. Howard and Bingham defined their positions.

Mr. Davis opposed the report, because it imposed conditions on the admission of Kansas, in interfering with State Rights.

Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, eloquently re-