"Every Democrat in the Union will hail this resolution as oil poured upon the troubled waters. It asserts the great principle, that there is no intention on the part of those who entertain particular views on the slavery question to make their views a "political test"—an avowal that will be universally applauded, and everywhere greeted with joy. The Democracy of Bradford have set a noble example—an example that cannot fail to be generally followed, and that will lead to the happiest results. It is the belief entertained in many quarters, North and South, that the object was entertained of interpolating the National Democratic creed with the test here disavowed, that has led to all difficulties upon the question of slavery. This impression is completely dissipated by the resolution adopted by the Bradford Democracy—thus leaving to every member of the Democratic party the right of entertaining and urging whatever sentiments upon the subject may seem to him best, without hazarding his political position, or losing the confidence of his party."

(9.)

Letter from Mr. Gamble Democratic candidate for Canal Commissioner of Pennsylvania in 1849.

JERSEY SHORE, *September 12, 1850.*

GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, propounding to me the following questions, in pursuance of your appointments as a committee for that purpose by a meeting of "Free-Soil Democrats," held at Tioga, on the 3d of September instant.

However reluctant I feel to give publicity to my "views" upon a subject so foreign and distinct from the duties and functions of the office for which I have the honor to be the candidate of the Democratic party, I cannot, nevertheless, decline to answer questions emanating from, and of such importance by, so respectable a public meeting of my fellow-citizens.

To the first question, namely: "What are your views in relation to the constitutional power of Congress to prohibit slavery in the Territories belonging to the United States?" I answer: that, in my humble judgment, Congress possesses such constitutional power.

To the second question, namely: "If you believe Congress possesses the requisite authority for that purpose, are you in favor of the passage of an act extending to all such Territories the principles of the ordinance of 1787?" I answer: that I am in favor of the passage of such an act, or the adoption of any other constitutional measure deemed necessary, in order to prohibit the further extension of human slavery.

With sentiments of the highest respect, I remain your obedient servant,

JOHN A. GAMBLE.

F. E. Smith, U. C. Webb, and Levi Bigelow, Esqrs.

(10.)

Speech of General Cass, February 20, 1850.

"When the Wilmot proviso was first proposed, I have never concealed or denied that, had it been pushed to a vote, I should have voted for it. There is no need for any Senator to resort to and retail conversations in railroad cars to prove this. I had never examined the constitutional power of Congress, and, when the subject was proposed, it did not excite that opposition from the South which we have witnessed, nor lead reflecting men to doubt whether such a provision could be enforced without danger to the Union. Southern men, I believe, had previously voted for a similar measure; and it had not become a grave, sectional question, involving the most fearful consequences. At a subsequent session, convinced of its bearing, I spoke and voted against it; still, however, without touching the constitutional point. Afterwards circumstances required me to examine the subject more narrowly. The public mind in the South became highly excited, and the indications were full of danger and difficulty. I felt, then, as I do now, that the Union was the great object of every American, and that there are few sacrifices which ought not to be made to preserve it. I was prepared to go as far as my man ought to attain that object. I examined the Constitution with reference to the whole matter more narrowly than I had ever done before. I was startled by the conviction that no authority was granted in that instrument to Congress to legislate over the Territories, and that, consequently, there was no power to pass the Wilmot proviso.

"Not satisfied with my own impressions, and being unwilling to take such a ground without proper consideration, I determined immediately to converse with some person fully conversant with the history of the legislation and the judicial decisions on the subject. In looking about for that purpose, it immediately occurred to me that an eminent judge of the Supreme Court, [Judge McLean, of Ohio,] from his position and associations, as well as from his residence in the West, could give better information upon this subject than any other person. Anticipating that some discussion might soon arise that would render this explanation proper, I applied to that gentleman some days since, and requested his permission thus publicly to refer to him, should I deem it necessary. This he cheerfully granted, and I now make use of his name with his own consent. I immediately repaired to him and stated my doubts, as well as the circumstances which gave rise to them. I need not repeat the conversation here. It is enough to say that he confirmed my impressions, and informed me that, in an article published in the National Intelligencer a day or two previously, and which I had not seen, I should find his views fully set forth. That article has since been republished in other papers, and has attracted a good deal of attention, as it deserved, for it is powerfully written. I speak, sir, solely of the views which it presents of the power of Congress to legislate for the Territories. The question of slavery which it discusses I do not refer to. After reading this article, my doubts ripened into convictions, and I took the ground to which I shall always adhere, that the Wilmot proviso is unconstitutional. And you have now, sir, the history of my course upon this subject."

(11.)

Public meeting at Wilkesbarre, held 11th November 1850, to take into consideration the subject of the Fugitive Slave Bill, and to assert the supremacy of the law—Gen. E. W. Sturdivant, President.

Charles J. A. Chapman, Esq., reported the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the present crisis in our national affairs, and the alarming spread of seditious and fanatical doctrines, openly avowed and propagated, call upon all true patriots to define their position and stand by the country in the hour of need.

Resolved, That we cherish the Union for the sake of the Union; for the noble spirits who framed and the hallowed blood which cements it; we cherish it more for its security to life and its protection to property.

Resolved, That we look upon the late act of Congress, in regard to fugitive slaves, as intended to carry out one of the compromises of the Constitution, creating no new judicial authority, abolishing no fundamental right, and as such we are bound to sustain it.

Resolved, That only genuine liberty is found in obedience to righteous law; and we hold the man who encourages resistance to law a traitor to his country, and an enemy to mankind.

Resolved, That the President of the United States, by his firmness and decision in carrying out the provisions and maintaining the supremacy of the law, merits the applause and will receive the support of his countrymen.—"Well done, good and faithful servant!"

Resolved, That the noble stand taken in the late struggle between the spirit of anarchy and the spirit of constitutional freedom, by Messrs. Cass, Clay, Webster, Dickinson, Foote, Douglas, Cooper, and other noble coadjutors upon the Congress, chime our warmest admiration; and our aspirations are, that they may ever be brethren, separated by no dark gulf of disunion, but interpreting the laws of a common country, shielded by the same glorious flag.

Resolved, That we wish neither let nor part with men who, in pursuit of their own dogmas, malign the memory of Washington—that we know nothing of any "higher law" paramount to the Constitution—that we regard that instrument as the highest achievement of human intellect, holding out the only sure hope of man amidst the dark waves of legitimacy. By it we have lived, and by it we wish to die; and we feel assured that this "Dagon" twice fallen, which the Philistines would again set up, will be broken by the breath of the American people.

(12.)

Senator Atchison, in a speech as late as March 3, 1848, held the following language:

"'It was my opinion' * * * 'that the law of Congress, when the State of Missouri was admitted into the Union, excluding slavery from the Territory of Louisiana north of 36 30, would be enforced; and that Territory, unless it was specially rescinded, did whether that law was in consonance with the Constitution of the United States or not, it would do its work, and that work would be to preclude slaveholders from going to that Territory.' But when I came to look into that question, I found that there was no prospect, no hope, of a repeal of the Missouri compromise excluding slavery from that Territory. * * * * I have always been of opinion that the first great error committed in the political history of this country was the ordinance of 1787, rendering the North-west Territory free. The next great error was the Missouri compromise. But they are both irremediable. There is no remedy for them. We must submit to them. I am prepared to do it. It is evident that the Missouri compromise cannot be repealed."

(13.)

In a speech made by General Cass in favor of the *non-intervention* policy, on the 20th of February, 1854, he used the following language on the subject:

"Mr. President, I have not withheld the expression of my regret elsewhere, nor shall I withhold it here, that this question of repeal of the Missouri compromise, which opens all the disputed points connected with the subject of congressional action upon slavery in the Territories of the United States, has been brought before us. I do not think the practical advantages to result from the measure will outweigh the injury which the ill-feeling, fated to accompany the discussion of this subject through the country, is sure to produce. And I was confirmed in this impression from what was said by the Senator from Tennessee, [Mr. Jones,] by the Senator from Kentucky, [Mr. Dixon,] and from North Carolina, [Mr. Badger,] and also by the remarks which fell from the Senator from Virginia, [Mr. Hunter,] and in which I fully concur, that the South will never receive any benefit from this measure, so far as respects the extension of slavery: for, legislate as we may, no human power can establish it in the regions defined by these bills. And such were the sentiments of two eminent patriots, to whose exertions we are greatly indebted for the satisfactory termination of the difficulties of 1850, and who since have passed from their labors, and, I trust, to their reward. Thus believing, I should have been better content had the whole subject been left as it was by the bill when first introduced by the Senator from Illinois, without any provision regarding the Missouri compromise. I am aware that it was reported that I intended to propose the repeal of that measure, but it was an error. My intentions were wholly misunderstood. I had no design whatever to take such a step, and also reconsidered a deed of conciliation which had done its work, and done it well, and which was hallowed by patriotism, by success, and by association with great names, now transferred to history. It belonged to a past generation; and in the midst of a political tempest which appalled the wisest and firmest in the land, it had said to the waves of agitation, *Peace, be still!* and they became still. It would have been better, in my opinion, not to disturb its slumber, as all useful and practical objects could have been attained without it. But the question is here without my agency."

(14.)

Subsequent to the motion made in the Senate to repeal the Missouri compromise, the Washington Union of 29th January, 1854, expressed itself as follows:

"We are free to declare that we should have been content to see the question (of repealing the Missouri compromise) left where the compromise of 1850 and the bill of Judge Douglas both left it; and yet it would be unmanful in us if we did not add, that a clause in the compromise of 1850, and in Mr. Douglas's Nebraska bill, declaring the act of 1820 null and void, because it contravenes the principle of congressional non-intervention, would have made both of these measures more in consonance with our opinions and wishes. But we accepted the acts of 1850 *as they were passed*, and approved their passage as a FINAL COMPROMISE; in the same spirit we have been content with *perpetuation* of that compromise *as proposed by Mr. Douglas's Nebraska bill.*"

The same article proceeds to call it a solemn covenant as follows:

"We have never yielded to the Missouri compromise any other obligatory force than that which attaches to a *solemn covenant* entered into by two opposing parties for the preservation of amicable relations. To such considerations we have felt bound to yield as ready an acquiescence as if the compromise was the law of the land, not only in *form*, but in substance and reality.—Viewed as a legal question, we should be constrained to pronounce it unsustained by constitutional authority; viewed as the evidence of a compromise of conflicting interests and opinions, we have been ready to waive the legal question, and to abide faithfully by its terms. If we have studied the southern sentiment correctly, this has been the view taken of the Missouri compromise in that division of the Union." * * * * *

"Prudence *patriotism, devotion to the Union* the interest of the Democratic party, all suggest that the public sentiment, which now acquiesces cheerfully in the *principle* of the compromise of 1850, should not be *inconsiderately disturbed.*"

Alluding to the repeal, the same article speaks of it as an *interpolation*, as follows:

"We only venture to suggest, that it is well worthy of consideration, whether a faithful adherence to the compromise, and which has been so triumphantly indorsed by the people, does not require all good Democrats to hesitate and reflect maturely upon any proposition which any member of the party can object to as an *interpolation* upon that creed. In a word, it would be wise in all Democrats to consider whether it would not be safest to "LET WELL ENOUGH ALONE." To repeal the Missouri compromise might, according to our view, would, clear the principle of congressional non-intervention of all embarrassment; but we doubt whether the good thus promised is so important that it would be wise to seek it through the agitation which necessarily stands in our path. Upon a calm review of the whole ground, we yet see no such reasons for disturbing the compromise of 1850 as could induce us to advocate either of the amendments proposed to Mr. Douglas's bill."

Several members rose to address the Chair.

Mr. Todd. Mr. Speaker, I was the first to whom my colleague alluded, and I have only a few remarks to submit in reply to what he has said.

Mr. Jones, of Pennsylvania. I trust that my colleague will yield to me for a moment.

Mr. Todd. Not now. I shall not reply to all that my colleague [Mr. Fuller] has said. I may advert to the subject hereafter.

Mr. Smith, of Virginia. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has just concluded his remarks, I understood held the floor by unanimous consent for personal explanation. Has that privilege been extended to any other gentleman?

The Speaker. The Chair does not know for what exact purpose the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Todd] has risen. [Cries of "Hear him!"] If there be no objection, the gentleman will proceed with his explanation.

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I shall only reply to that portion of my colleague's remarks which refer to me personally, without, on the present occasion, desiring to travel over the ground he has occupied. He will bear me witness that, previous to my arrival here in December last, I had no political acquaintance with him; that our political positions in Pennsylvania were antagonistic, he having always, so far as I know, acted with the Whig, I with the Democratic party. I had no political association with him whatever. I came to Washington believing that he, in common with others of my colleagues with whom I acted, was elected on the anti-Nebraska issue. I knew that he had been the candidate of the Whig party for an important State office; and that the platform of that party at that time was anti slavery extension. I knew that there were reports and speeches to bear me out in that assumption; and I was assured by my other colleagues that he was perfectly sound. I had no personal knowledge of his political antecedents. I did not know what were his personal opinions, nor did I ask them. I knew that the papers which advocated his election as Speaker of this body, both in the city of Philadelphia and his own district, held him up as a sound anti-Nebraska man. I did not have the pleasure of making his acquaintance until several days after the ballotings had commenced; and it was not until the evening of the day previous to the time I ceased to vote for him, that my colleague, in a meeting of the Pennsylvania delegation, stated that, if Kansas had a population of one hundred thousand inhabitants, and fairly, legally, and legitimately adopted a constitution either prohibiting or allowing slavery, he did not see why her administration should be refused. I deny specifically that my colleague did say, on that or any other occasion, that he would not vote for the restoration of the Missouri compromise line. I deny also that he then or at any other time said that he did not recognize the right of the inhabitants of the Territory to prohibit slavery while they were in a territorial condition, or that he limited their right to do so to the time when they came to form a State constitution preparatory to their admission into the Union. He made then none of the allegations which he afterwards made on this floor. On the very night my colleague made that declaration, a gentleman from my State [Mr. ROBINSON] rose and avowed his determination no longer to cast his vote for him, but in a conversation had that evening with another colleague, [Mr. PUNCHARD,] which was communicated to me, he *did* state specifically that, on the anti-Nebraska question, he would yield his own individual opinions to the public sentiment of his constituents; and knowing that that constituency had repudiated the Hon. Hendrick B. Wright on that issue, I felt that they would be sound, and that he might be trusted. These were the reasons which induced me to vote for my colleague. Had he stated then that he would have voted against the restoration of the Missouri compromise line, and that he doubted the power of the people of the Territory, whilst in a territorial condition, to prohibit slavery, I would not only have let my right hand, but my heart also, wither, before I would have cast a single vote for Him.

The expression my colleague refers to may have been a strong one. It was made under the impulse of the moment, and without premeditation. I am one of those men who have no fear in avowing an opinion honestly entertained, and I always, under all circumstances, and at all times, act up to the convictions of my own judgment and the dictates of my own conscience.

Now, sir, it is singular that this explanation of my colleague was not made at an earlier period. Five long months have passed by, and this is the first occasion on which his mouth has been opened to deny that he did not entertain the opinions attributed to him, that I had acted inconsistently in voting for him, after a declaration of his opinions, or had done him injustice by denouncing, at the time, the alleged change in his principles. Had he made his explanation at that time, I should have been prepared to meet it. I had the means to do so in my desk, and it was only two or three weeks ago that I cast them upon this floor, supposing the time would never come for their use. I had a collection of extracts from papers in my own State, which advocated his election, and denounced me for voting against him, and for you, Mr. Speaker, on the ground that he was as good an anti-Nebraska man for yourself and those allegations never ceased in those papers until he made the avowal upon this floor which he did in reference to his views.

I regret that this explanation has been made. I regret to be placed in an antagonistic position with my colleague. As I said before, I never knew him previous to this session of Congress, and ever since I have regarded him as a gentleman. I never intended to impute to him an intention to practice a deception upon me. What I meant to say was, that from the fact that I was not personally acquainted with him, and that publications were made throughout his State, in reference to his antecedents, going conclusively to prove that he was an anti-Nebraska man, I was in error, and that he did not entertain anti-Nebraska principles, that I ceased to vote for him, and voted for another.

This explanation has come suddenly upon me. I am sorry I did not know that it was to be made, otherwise I could have put my reply in a shape that would be perfectly satisfactory to this House, and myself in a position that would not have left my colleague any occasion to allege that I had behaved inconsistently with my opinions in voting for him. In justification of the votes given for my colleague, during one day after the declaration of his inability to see how Kansas could be refused admission into the Union, either with a free or slave constitution fairly formed, I have only to say, that they were given because I believed he would conform to the wishes of his constituents, and, also, from deference to the wishes of my colleagues, who had confidence in his anti-Nebraskaism. I stated on that occasion that, if my colleague was opposed to the restoration of the Missouri compromise line, and to the admission of Kansas as a free State, I would not vote for him. My colleagues here will bear me out in this statement, and that there was no inconsistency upon my part, and nothing wrong, to young as I am.

Mr. JONES, of Pennsylvania. I do not wish to state to the House, on account of the peculiar manner my colleague has brought this subject up, that I rose to a point of order while he was speaking, not for the purpose of interrupting my colleague—because I am desirous that he should say not only what he has said, but that he shall, if he chooses, from this time forth until the presidential election, raise all the points he possibly can against the Democracy of Pennsylvania, or so humble and individual as myself—but for the purpose, in order that I might not be misrepresented, of ascertaining whether my colleague would allow me to interrogate him as he proceeded, and that it might not be said that I did not correct his errors as he advanced them.

He had prepared an elaborate speech, in which I believe my own name is introduced, though I did not hear it. That speech has been prepared with great care. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to congratulate the Democracy of the country that the attack has come from that quarter; it gives me a great deal of pleasure to look upon it as a significant fact, because the friends of my distinguished colleague made the same attacks a few days ago in Philadelphia, and if this shall be productive of a similar result I shall be the last man to regret it.

I only rose now to say that, after my colleague's speech is in print, I shall then ask the privilege of the House to reply at length.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee. In April last, I addressed a letter to my constituents, which was published, and I sent a copy to each member of this House. In that letter, sir, I gave what purported to be a letter from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has addressed the House this morning, addressed to B. F. Sexton, which letter the gentleman this morning repudiates as a forgery. That letter, sir, and also what purported to be his Alleghany speech, was published in the papers of Pennsylvania and of other States during the last winter. In the month of February, another member of this House—a gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CARUTHERS]—addressed a letter to his constituents, and he gave both these extracts in his letter, and it was circulated through the country by the members of this House. Some five or six weeks after the publication of that letter, I took those extracts, and gave them a place in the letter which I addressed to my constituents. During all that time I had seen no contradiction, and no suspicion or question as to their authenticity, and had I believed that they were not authentic I would not have given them circulation in that or any other form.

But I understood the gentleman to say that there was a letter written to a Mr. Sexton on that subject, and that this one is a forgery, manufactured perhaps from the one which he addressed to Mr. Sexton, and which was stolen and published, as I understand him. Now, sir, I shall be glad to see the genuine one. I do not understand the gentleman to repudiate the sentiments in that letter as being entertained by him in 1849. Nor do I understand him as repudiating the sentiments attributed to him in the report of the Alleghany speech, though he said it was such a report as that he did not recognize it as his speech. The gentleman can now say whether he entertains those sentiments.

Mr. Fuller. I said I would publish the letter as it was written; and I said that the report of the speech at Alleghany was so much stronger in substance and in language than anything which I had uttered, that I did not recognize it at all; and I denied the utterance of the sentiments imputed to me.

Mr. Jones. I would inquire of the gentleman whether it is correctly stated that the paper in which that speech was reported was in his support, or favorable to his election, when he was a candidate for the office of Canal Commissioner; and whether he repudiated that report at the time it was published, and pending the canvass in that State?

Mr. Fuller. I stated the fact to one of the publishers of the paper in which the report appeared. I left the city on the day, I believe, that the publication was made. It was just previous to the election, and I had some four hundred miles or more to travel, with numerous appointments to meet. I had no time to revise the newspapers.

Mr. Jones. Then I do not understand that the gentleman ever publicly repudiated the report, or that the paper which published it made any correction.

Mr. Sneed. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. Jones. Yes; make your question.

Mr. Sneed. I shall object to nothing that my colleague desires to say in personal explanation, or vindication, under this leave of the House; but I protest against gentlemen getting up, and, under the plea of personal explanations, making accusations against others.

The Speaker. The Chair must make the same decision on the question of order raised by the gentleman from Tennessee as it made on that raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. Jones.] The gentleman's colleague [Mr. Jones, of Tennessee] obtained consent to make a statement relating to his personal position; and it is impossible for the Chair to say that the discussion of these matters to which he alludes is not necessary to determine his own position.

Mr. Sneed. My colleague has not been assailed at all——

The Speaker. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Jones] has the floor.

Mr. Jones. I submit to my colleague whether it was a personal explanation when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fuller] was making an assault on Mr. Buchanan?

Mr. Sneed. Certainly it was.

Mr. Jones. And I would ask him why he did not then raise the question of order?

Mr. Sneed. The allusion to Mr. Buchanan was intimately connected with his own position.

Mr. Jones. I do not see how. I do not suppose that the gentleman pretended, or pretends now, to be a supporter of Mr. Buchanan. All I want in this case is to get at the fact.

I shall be rejoiced—if the gentleman from Pennsylvania did in 1849 entertain the sentiments attributed to him—if he has repudiated those sentiments; and I would be rejoiced if every other one throughout this country, who entertains such sentiments, would follow his example, and, if he has repudiated them, do likewise. Sir, I do not understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania to repudiate the sentiments of anti-slavery, and of opposition to the extension of slavery, entertained by him in 1849. I do not understand that at that time he was an opponent of the Wilmot proviso. And, sir, I should be gratified to know whether the gentleman does not occupy now the position with regard to the slavery issues which he has always occupied?—That, sir, is a question which I should be glad if the gentleman would answer.

Mr. Fuller. I stated, as I supposed very clearly and distinctly, that I denied the utterance of any sentiments in favor of northern interference to secure the abolition of slavery. I stated this distinctly. I repeat it, that on those occasions the question of slavery was discussed in Pennsylvania in consequence of the then recent acquisition from Mexico, and was treated by me in the manner I have stated.

Mr. Jones. That is what I understand even the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] will advocate to-day—that they will not interfere with the institution in the States where it exists; that if the South wish to retain it they have a right to do so. But I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he did not, in that canvass, at that time, advocate the adoption by Congress of the Wilmot proviso, and if he was not at the time acting with the Wilmot-proviso or anti-slavery party of Pennsylvania?

Mr. Fuller. I will say to the gentleman, that during that contest, I had not the folly to argue a great constitutional question like that of the Wilmot proviso. It had nothing to do with the discharge of the duties of the office for which I was a candidate, and I therefore did not attempt to argue it. Why, sir, as late as 1849, General Cass here in the Senate, declared that the Wilmot proviso——

Mr. Jones. If the gentleman is going to make a speech, he had better take another hour.

Mr. Fuller. Just a moment, by way of illustration; I say, General Cass declared in the Senate that he had not examined the question of the constitutionality of the Wilmot proviso.—And sir, certainly, if General Cass, who had been engaged all his life in the public service, as Governor of a Territory, as Senator in Congress, and as Minister abroad, with all his vast opportunities, and his acknowledged intellect, had not had time, and was not prepared, to pass upon the constitutionality of the Wilmot proviso, how could I, a young and humble candidate for the office of Canal Commissioner, be expected to entertain any opinion upon the subject? [Great laughter.]

From the Asheville Spectator.

GUBERNATORIAL CANVASS.

Since our last, we have had the pleasure of hearing the discussion between Messrs. Gilmer and Bragg, both at Hendersonville and in this place. We took pretty full notes at both places, but we are unable, for the want of space, to write out the discussion as fully as we could desire.—Our object will be to report only the substance of the speeches, without endeavoring to give the language.

Mr. Gilmer made the opening speech at Hendersonville. He commenced by speaking in glowing terms of our mountain country, its climate, and the richness and fertility of its soil, which, in all these respects, far surpassed his expectations. He said that if we could be placed in connection with the rest of the world by means of railroad facilities, millions of money expended by the seekers of health and pleasure, in regions less favored by nature, would be expended in this beautiful section of the country, and we would become a wealthy and prosperous people. He then challenged an examination of his Legislative record since 1840, when he first became a member of the Legislature; he declared, and was ready to prove by the record, that no project had ever been put on foot for the improvement of the State, East or West, that John A. Gilmer did not vote for—that he had voted for the French Broad railroad charter, and was opposed to and voted against the restrictions calculated to embarrass the success of this road. The Democratic party said Mr. Gilmer, had been an *anti*-Internal Improvement party, until, by the liberal policy of the Whigs, the State became an Internal Improvement State, and then, and not till then, did the Democrats advocate Improvement: then they tried to appropriate all the credit to themselves, somewhat like the man, who, after his wife had killed the bear, came to the scene of the conflict and very *bravely* said, "now, wife, ain't we brave!"

Mr. Gilmer then stated that while the State debt is being increased, and the people are becoming more oppressed, by taxation, it becomes our duty, as a prudent people, to look about and endeavor to devise ways and means to pay off and liquidate this public debt, and thus save the credit of the State, and relieve the people of taxation. He thought this, to a measure, at least, could be accomplished, in the first place, by making the State bonds payable at home instead of in N. York, as has been the case hitherto; and, secondly, by giving the *State*, as far as practicable, the benefits of Banking now principally enjoyed by individuals—that the profits now made by individual bankers, if the State were to unite Banking with Internal Improvement, might be saved to the State, and thus lessen the burthens of taxation—that it is in the power of the State to realize what individuals realize—that what the State might realize, over and above six per cent., could be laid up as a sinking fund to finally liquidate the principal of the State's indebtedness. To show the great disadvantage of making the State bonds payable abroad, he stated that when they fell due, payment is to be made in gold and silver or their equivalent, the effect of which had a ruinous tendency. Suppose, said he, that the immense public debt of England had to be paid in other countries, or the debts of the States of N. York or Pennsylvania—why, the effect would be, that they would become insolvent and would have to repudiate. Mr. Gilmer contended that if this policy (of which the foregoing is a mere outline) should add new encouragement to Internal Improvement, that our good old State would go on in a career of prosperity, imparting new life and vigor to it in every section. Mr. G. stated that he was no banker himself, but that he hoped he had common sense, and this was all that was necessary to understand and appreciate this question. He had challenged his competitor (Gov. Bragg) to come out and show his hand upon this question—that it was a question pregnant with importance, affecting the interests of the farmers and mechanics, the main stay, the bone and sinew of the State—that it was a question of State policy well worthy of the serious consideration of the Governor of the State, and who was again seeking to be elevated to that high and distinguished station. But no; he could not get him (the Gov.) to discuss it—that, instead of discussing subjects in which the people of the State were deeply and seriously interested, he preferred to devote his time to talking about "dark lanterns," the "secrecy" and the "oaths" of the Know Nothings although these things had been done away with!"

Mr. Gilmer, on the subject of amending the Constitution so as to let all who vote at the Commons box vote also at the Senate box, was clear, conclusive, and satisfactory—showed great candor and honesty—also that he was a practical, sensible man. He admitted that he and his friends had been for effecting this by a Convention, as the safer and more republican plan, and one by which *law making* and *Constitution making* would be kept separate—the people keep their *own laws, their own Constitution* in their own hands, and all contests and differences about the Constitution quieted and settled at once, for years to come. This he showed clearly. But he showed that the result of the struggle for the last eight years—some contending for one mode of amendment, and some for another, had resulted in a failure,—that those who favored the amendment by the Legislature had failed, for the want of a two-thirds vote in the Senate—that he and others, who desired all who voted at the one box to vote also at the other, but who advocated the republican mode of a convention of the people, had for the same cause failed—that it was important that this question should be ended, and for this purpose he and his friends had tried to amend the bill, so that they could vote for it, and their votes be satisfactory to their constituents—the freeholders, their immediate constituents, would be satisfied—that if the convention men insisted on that mode nothing could be done, and if those who insisted on the Legislature mode persisted, nothing could be done, without some compromise. He showed that by reason of the land being protected, those who were more interested in slave property in the convention of 18—, (slavery properly insisted that slave property should not be protected against unequal taxation by the assembly,) that this was granted—and that now, slave property, by an express provision of *the Constitution itself*, was secured against unequal and excessive taxation—so is land by the provision that landholders alone elect the Senate. That if, in providing to let all vote for Senators, the bill had gone on and made a *Constitutional provision*, providing that the Assembly should not have power to tax the lands proportionally higher than the taxable white and slave polls—then *this Constitutional provision, providing for equality of taxation*, would have answered all the purposes of the Senate—and that this provision being added to the free suffrage bill, (which does not contain it,) he never could see any fair or reasonable objection with any who really wanted the measure to pass—that no voter, whether he owned land or not, could have any objection. He called attention to the 100th page of the following, to wit:

"Mr. Ashe moved to amend the bill by adding the following as Section 2d, viz:

"Be it further enacted, (three-fifths of each House concuring) that the following be inserted as an additional amendment to the Constitution:"

"That no tax shall be imposed and levied by the General Assembly on real estate, which shall exceed the proportion to the capitation tax of 6 cents on the hundred dollars value of land, to twenty cents on each poll."

"Those who voted in the affirmative, are Ashe, Cherry, Christian, Davis, Eaton, Eborn, Freeman, Gilmer, Graham, Haughton, Lane, McCleese, *Mitchell, Morisey*, Rayner, Thomas, of Davidson, Wiggins, Willey, and Winslow, of Pasquotank—16.

"Those who voted in the negative, are Biggs, Bower, Boyd, Brogden, Clark, *Coleman*, Cunningham, Drake, Faison, Fennell, Fisher, Fonville Graves, Herring, Hoke, *Jones, McDowell, Martin, Mills*, Oldfield, Person, Sanders, Speight, Taylor, Thomas, of Jackson, Walker, Wilder and Wood—20."

He went on in a clear and conclusive manner to show, that had this amendment been added, the bill would have had his vote, and nearly the whole Senate—that the amendment was proper and just—that it would have put land and slaves on the same footing as to paying and being liable to taxes, that they now are as the Constitution now stands—that the whole question would have been ended—that in the coming elections the freeholders, being satisfied, would have elected their Senators in favor of the bill, now their lands being provided for as the slaves are provided for. He showed that he was *practically* and wisely the true friend of the measure, and was working properly to have the measure pass in such shape, not only that his constituents would be satisfied—*all parties—all voters*—and all material objections to its passing at the next session be moved out of the way.

Gov. Bragg on being asked whether this amendment ought not to have been added and passed, would not answer, but asked Mr. Gilmer what he would do, if he had anything to say when it came up again at the next session. Mr. Gilmer said that was asking a good deal of him, in as much as the next Senate would be elected, and Gov. Bragg submit his message, and the mode passed or defeated before: in any event he could say any more than he had said and done—but if it became his duty to say anything on this subject, he would exert himself to compromise and end this question—which could be done by the Senate's passing the bill in its present shape, with the pledge and understanding for the satisfaction of the freeholders, in all the districts, that the said amendment, securing equality as to the taxing power, should pass and be submitted as a new and distinct proposition, and if passed under such a compromise, it would at the next session also pass—and if they, the Senate, would not do this—then submit the present bill amended as proposed, and that would end it.

Mr. Gilmer then discussed at length, the subject of Americanism. He said that Gov. Bragg studiously avoided discussing the *principles* of the American party; that his chief object seemed to be to arouse the prejudices of the people against what really did not exist—that is, the secrecy and the obligations of the members, these having, long ago, been done away with—there being at this time, nothing necessary to membership of the American party, save the approval of its *principles*. Mr. G. then stated, (what is a matter of history,) that the position occupied by the Disunionists, in the Nashville Convention, in 1850, was identical, in reference to the Missouri Compromise, with that occupied by the Black Republicans at this time. That the proceedings of that Convention will show that they were then in favor of the extension of the Missouri Compromise to the Pacific ocean *as an ultimatum*—that, if this were not done, they were for dissolving the Union. Now, said Mr. G. the Missouri restriction having been repealed, the Black Republicans insist upon the *restoration* of this restriction as an *ultimatum*. He also showed that the Democratic convention of this State, in 1850, were in favor of abiding by the Missouri Compromise, by the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Compromise, known as the Missouri Compromise, was adopted in a spirit of mutual concession and conciliation; and though the South feels that it detracts from her constitutional rights, yet for their love of the Union, this Convention is willing to abide by it, and would cheerfully see all the distracting questions settled on this basis."

At that time, continued Mr. G., the Raleigh *Standard*, the organ of Gov. Bragg's party, denounced those who were for abiding by the Compromise of 1850, as "submissionists." He then read the pledge that was signed by Clay, Foote, Clemens, Stephens, Howell Cobb, and many other distinguished gentlemen, Whigs and Democrats, to the effect, that they would not support for President or Vice President, for Senator or Representative in Congress, or for member of a State Legislature, any man, *of whatever party*, who was not known to be opposed to the disturbance of the Compromise of 1850, or to the renewal, in any form, of agitation, either in or out of Congress, upon the subject of slavery." He spoke thus to show the inconsistency, not to say the hypocrisy, of the Democratic party in relation to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.

Mr. Gilmer next alluded to the course pursued by Mr. Fillmore as President; that this pure patriot, during the whole of his administration, did not appoint a single freesoiler to office, but, on the contrary, when he found one in office, he turned him out and placed in his stead a sound national man, in favor of the finality of the Compromise of 1850; that Mr. Fillmore not only signed the Fugitive Slave Law, but enforced it stringently during his term of office, threatening, when the law was about to be placed at defiance in the city of Boston, that the *law should be enforced*, or Boston would be reduced to ashes! He next showed, that Gen. Pierce, by a resolution adopted by the Baltimore Convention that nominated him in 1852, *was pledged* to resist the agitation of the slavery question either in or out of Congress. A similar resolution was adopted by the National Whig Convention of the same year. In consequence, said Mr. G., of the general acquiescence in the Compromise of '50 when Gen. Pierce became President on the 4th of March, 1853, the agitation of the slavery question had ceased, and peace, quiet, and harmony reigned throughout the land. But how, inquired Mr. G., is it now? It was needless for him to answer this question. The country was known to be distracted by sectional excitement and controversy, and really in more imminent peril than previous to the adoption of the Compromise of 1850, notwithstanding Mr. Pierce's pledge that he would discountenance agitation either in or out of Congress. Mr. Gilmer significantly stated in this connection that Mr. Fillmore was the son of a poor farmer, while Gen. Pierce was the son of a Governor. He then charged, and dared Gov. Bragg to deny it, that President Pierce, in the dispensation of patronage in the North, discriminated largely in favor of the abolition free soil branch of his party—that he (Gen. Pierce) turned out Judge Bronson, as Collector in the city of New York, not because he was dishonest or inefficient, as an officer—for it was admitted that his qualifications were ample; but because he would not turn out national conservative men and appoint, in their places, men who were known to be freesoilers and abolitionists. Gov. Bragg did not attempt to deny this charge or excuse the act; but said nothing about it. Mr. Gilmer then stated that if Mr. Fillmore, when President, had been guilty of such an act as this of President Pierce, he (Mr. G.) would have turned his back upon him and denounced him as he deserved, and he believed that all his old friends would have done the same thing. But a *Democratic* President can do such a thing with impunity, and his party friends in the South will defend him in the act!

Mr. Gilmer then referred to a report, in the *Standard*, of the discussion between himself and Thos. Settle, Jr. in Stokes county, in which he (Mr. G.) is charged with having said that he was in favor of the restoration of the Missouri Compromise. He pronounced this a gross misrepresentation. Mr. Gilmer here distinctly stated, that whatever might have been his views as to the propriety of disturbing the Compromise of 1820, yet, that not having been repealed, opposed as he was to sectional agitation, he was for abiding by and maintaining the Nebraska-Kansas act in its integrity; although he thought that the Squatter Sovereignty principle it embraced a bad one—that this principle some years ago had been denounced by Mr. Calhoun and other Southern rights men as even worse than the Wilmot Proviso.

Mr. Gilmer then discussed, with great ability, the question of foreignism; read the sentiments of Washington and Jackson, showing that those great men and pure patriots advocated the same doctrines now advocated by the American party. He maintained that if the evils of foreign influence were such as to excite the alarm of those men, when the number of immigrants annually was but a few thousand, how much greater are the evils now, when the number annually spewed upon our shores is half a million! To show what Gen. Jackson thought of the evils of foreign influence, Mr. G. stated that his (Gen. J.'s) chief objection to the United States Bank was that foreigners held stock in it and thus controlled the finances of the country. He also read the sentiments of Mr. Buchanan, many years ago, when that distinguished statesman thought there was much danger to be apprehended from foreign influence.

Mr. Gilmer next spoke of the Janus-face character and double dealing of the Democratic party—that in regard to the touchstone of Democracy, the Nebraska-Kansas bill, it was supported by that party, both North and South, but for entirely different reasons—that it was favorable to the organization of free States and would exclude slavery from Nebraska and Kansas—that it was "a proposition in favor of freedom," and that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise opened the territory *South* of 36 30 to freedom; whereas, while the line continued to bind the faith of the country to abide by it, it was dedicated to slavery. This was the argument of *Northern* Nebraska Democrats, including President Pierce, and Mr. Douglas, the author of the bill. But *Southern*