

The W. & R. Rail Road Co's. Steamer Gov. Dudley, arrived safely in Charleston, having suffered no damage, except the loss of smoke-stack.

Dancing.—We would call attention to the advertisement of Madame BLAKE, which will be found in another column. Madame B. has with her the highest credentials from the family of the Hon. W. S. ASHE, and other sources in Washington City, and throughout the South, of the very highest respectability. We hope that she will receive that encouragement which she unquestionably merits.

Mr. CLINGMAN'S LETTER.—The letter of Hon. T. L. Clingman will commend itself to the attention of all, both Democrats and Whigs. Its marked ability—the acknowledged prominence and influence of its author, together with the peculiar position of affairs in this State, alike give it interest and importance, and absolve us from the necessity of making any excuse for taking up so much of our space with its publication.

The Wilmington Herald of to-day, virtually admits the political alliance between itself and its Scott friends, and the Elyria Courier and such like. This is all for what we contended. Whatever course it may have chosen to adopt towards Democratic gentlemen, we, at least, are unwilling to resort to personal charges against our Whig fellow-citizens. Our cause requires no such supports. We are no correspondent of the papers which, without warrant, try to connect Pierce with the Abolitionists.

Was, or was not a letter from Hon. Geo. E. Badger to the Editor of the Fayetteville Observer, read some time ago in the Scott and Graham Club in Fayetteville; and did not Mr. B. say that "Scott was a bitter pill, but that it was Scott or the Locofocos, and the devil before the Locofocos," or words to that effect? We ask the question upon the authority of gentlemen from Fayetteville. and pause for a reply.

That Recruiting Letter of Gen. Scott.

We see that Schuyler Hamilton, "Captain by Brevet United States Army," publishes in the National Intelligencer, a communication contradicting the statement that Gen. Scott issued a letter to his Recruiting Officers in 1847, containing the instructions not to enlist foreigners, etc. We would simply state now, that we copied the statement from a paper of high standing and respectability, the Richmond Enquirer; and that our recollections are, that a letter of the kind did come out at the time, emanating from Gen. Scott. We have written to headquarters to have the whole truth on the subject, which we will lay before our readers, an example which our Scott cotemporaries might follow with profit to the cause of truth, if not of their candidate.

The Steamship El Dorado arrived at New Orleans on the 9th, from Aspinwall, with San Francisco dates to the 17th ult. The Golden Gate left San Francisco on the 16th ult., with \$2,000,000 in gold. The news from the mines was very favorable, and several large lumps of gold had been found.

Advices from Valparaiso state the Chilean affairs as very promising. The Government had sent \$200,000 to London to purchase a war steamer.

Business generally at San Francisco was steady and prosperous. The troubles with the Indians had subsided. Opposition to the Chinese still existed among the miners.

From Our Regular Correspondent.

RALEIGH, Monday, Oct. 11, 1852.

In the House to-day, a bill to repeal the 25th Section of the 53d Chapter Revised Statutes, was read through three times. A number of Bills and Resolutions of a private nature, were presented and read first time.

A motion to re-consider the vote of Saturday, by which the House refused to adjourn, was made, and laid on the table.

In the Senate, much time was consumed in arranging the rules of the Senate—making amendments, &c., and finally adopted, and ordered to be printed, together with State Constitution and Constitution of the United States—one copy for each member.

Two ineffectual attempts were made to elect an Engrossing Clerk. To-morrow both Houses will again ballot. A Mr. Harris, Whig, from Davidson, and a Mr. Jenkins, Democrat, from Warren, are the prominent candidates. From appearances, I think Jenkins will be elected.

I suppose you have seen Mr. Clingman's letter.—He is quite down on Gen. Scott, and advocates the election of Pierce & King. The letter has caused a fluttering in the political world, here. Whigs look sour, I assure you, and utter bitter language, at their parting.

Hon. E. Stanly is here; he is to address the Scott & Graham Club to-night. That Club cries loudly for help—it had well nigh died out; the hands of a Gilmer, McDugald, and a Stanly, will not, I assure you, be sufficient to arouse its members. Whiggery is dead here—and dying everywhere. W.

The telegraph sometimes makes sad blunders. When the steamer Black Warrior arrived at Mobile, with important news from Havana, her intelligence was telegraphed all over the country. Yesterday came across one of these despatches in an Arkansas exchange, evidently copied from some other paper, which stated that *One hundred black warriors had arrived at Mobile from Havana, bringing important news from that city.* We think this will pass as a specimen of telegraphic accuracy.—Philadelphia Bulletin.

Letter from Hon. T. L. Clingman.

RALEIGH, October 8, 1852.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request, I proceed briefly to state, in writing, the substance of my conversation with you in relation to the approaching Presidential election. I do this the more readily, not only because I have no political opinions that I wish to conceal, but because as one of my immediate constituents you are entitled to have them in a form capable of preservation for future reference.

From the time of Gen. Scott's nomination I have universally stated, in conversation with my colleagues, other members of Congress, and in fact all who felt an interest in knowing my views, that I did not intend to support Gen. Scott. In reply also to such letters as I received, asking for my opinion, I repeatedly wrote to the same effect, to gentlemen of both political parties who were residents of my District, and also to some other portions of the State. Several of these letters were written soon after Gen. Scott's nomination, to gentlemen of both parties canvassing for seats in the Legislature. I mention this lest it should be charged that I hesitated to commit myself in writing, since it was easy for any one of those gentlemen—there being no injunction of secrecy on them—to have furnished evidence of my position. I did not think it expedient to make a publication on the subject, partly because it was said by the papers friendly to Gen. Scott, that members of Congress ought not to attempt to dictate to the people, and in part, also, because I preferred giving my views to my constituents face to face, in a full and free manner, on my return to my District.

In 1848, seeing that the contest was likely to be between Gen. Taylor and Gen. Scott, and that the former had refused to take any position with reference to the great pending questions of the day, and not being disposed to adopt him on trust, and blindly support him, I, after long waiting for a development of Gen. Taylor's views, determined to advocate the nomination of Gen. Scott, rather than his. Since then I have had no reason to regret that course. As I apprehended and predicted, as soon as the policy of Gen. Taylor's Administration was developed, with reference to the great Slavery questions then pending, I, in conjunction with a majority of the Southern Whig members of Congress, was thrown into opposition to it. Though such was the condition of things for several months before Gen. Taylor's death, yet the public was not generally aware of it. His sudden demise prevented an open and violent collision. About the first of July, 1850, it was determined, at a meeting of a decided majority of the Southern Whig members of Congress, that it was our duty, before an open declaration of hostilities, to advise the then President of our purposes, &c. Three gentlemen were selected for that purpose, to wit, the Hon. C. M. Conrad, the present Secretary of War, the Hon. Humphrey Marshall, of Kentucky, and the Hon. Robert Toombs, of Georgia. They, in accordance with the views of the meeting, separately called on the President and gave him to understand that he must expect our determined opposition if he persisted in resisting such a compromise as we advocated, and insisted on his policy of admitting California and New Mexico as States, and supporting the claim of the latter to the territory on this side of the Rio Grande. According to their several reports to us, Gen. Taylor was unyielding, and frankly declared to them that as soon as the Constitution of New Mexico reached him, which he looked for in a few days, he should send in a message to Congress recommending its admission at once as a State, as he had done in the case of California; that he also declared that Texas had no right to the territory claimed by her, and that he was disposed to support the claim of New Mexico against her. To one of these gentlemen, he said that he was placed in such a position that he would probably be forced to sacrifice one wing of his party; and that we ought not to expect him to sacrifice eighty-four men from the North rather than twenty-nine men from the South, these being the number of members of the Northern and Southern sections of the Whig party in Congress. The great body of the Southern members of Congress, with Mr. Clay at their head, would thus have been thrown into opposition, and would have been compelled, with the aid of the conservative men of the North, to fight the whole force of the administration. The death of Gen. Taylor alone prevented a struggle which would have shaken the country to its centre.

The decree of Providence thus averted the contest, but the lesson is one which ought not to be lost on us. Without, however, going into detail on these points, I proceed at once to speak of General Scott. In the summer of 1849 his Canada annexation letter was published. Gen. Taylor having just been inaugurated, it seemed probable that he might be re-nominated for election, with the support, as it was then supposed, of the whole South. It would be necessary to secure the Northern vote in opposition, to supersede him. Gen. Scott, therefore, while expressing his wish for the acquisition of Canada, voluntarily and without being questioned on the point, went on to declare his opposition to the acquisition of Mexican territory. In substance he said that while he was for taking territory that would strengthen the North, he was opposed to such acquisition as might in like manner, keep the South even with the North. I then looked upon this as an open, undisguised declaration of his wish to be regarded as the Northern Presidential candidate. It would be considered in no other light than as a bid for Northern support, at the expense, too, of our essential interests. During my journey through the Northern States in the autumn of that year, I had other evidences to the same effect. I felt that Gen. Scott had not, in the position he had voluntarily taken, any claims on me or any other Southern man. On the contrary, I saw that the rights of my section under the Constitution, as equals in the Union, had been put up for sale in the political market for anti-slavery votes. It was obvious that Gen. Scott believed that he could be elected by Northern votes alone.—In fact I have the best reason to believe that he, much more recently than the time I refer to, repeatedly expressed the opinion that he could be elected without a vote from a slave State. For the last three years he has been identified with the anti-slavery party of the North; but, in 1848, Mr. Seward, who is the leader of that party, was opposed to him. During the session of the Whig Convention at Philadelphia, in that year, I had some conferences with Mr. Thurlow Weed, the Editor of the Albany Evening Journal, and with Mr. Horace Greeley, the Editor of the New York Tribune, both of them being well known as intimate friends and mouth pieces of William H. Seward. They were utterly hostile to Gen. Scott, and said he could not possibly be supported by them, on account of his Nativism and va-

rious other points enumerated by them. Why is it that Mr. Seward and these gentlemen have since taken up General Scott and given him the nomination? Because they found they could make use of him to destroy Messrs. Fillmore, Webster, and other friends of the compromise; and they therefore seized upon him as a fitting instrument for that purpose. But, it is said, that he had in his private conversations expressed himself in favor of those measures. If it be true, it makes the case stronger against him. After the passage of the bills, a fierce attack was made on those men at the North who had the liberality to assist in getting them through. Seward and his followers took the field to crush Webster & Fillmore. But while the storm of war was raging for their destruction, where was Gen. Scott? As they had only done what he thought it was their duty to do, why did he not stand by them like a man? A sentence from his pen declaring his approbation of their course would have materially aided them. Though appealed to again and again, he would not write it. On the contrary, he allowed his name to be inscribed on the banners of their enemies. It was under the cover of his military glory that Seward and his clan fought the battle against our allies. Was such a proceeding fair and honorable on the part of Gen. Scott? Let me state a similar case for illustration. Suppose that, during his Mexican campaign, a portion of his army had, in accordance with his approbation, taken an advanced and dangerous position, which nevertheless it was necessary for the safety of the army should be taken; suppose, too, that when they had been fiercely assailed by Santa Anna and his armies, that Gen. Scott, though able to protect them, had stood aloof and allowed them to be destroyed; suppose, too, that he had, without objection, permitted Santa Anna to carry his own banner, and fight them thus in the name of General Scott, who ought rather to have protected them; and suppose, to crown all, that Gen. Scott had then become the associates and triumphant leader of Santa Anna's party! To show that the cases are alike you have only to substitute Fillmore and Webster, who took the extreme position for the compromise with Gen. Scott's approbation; then put Seward, Johnston, and other Abolitionists as their assailants instead of Santa Anna and his followers. Under Gen. Scott's banner and in his name they have fought and conquered our allies in the North; and Gen. Scott takes the nomination from their hands. But it may be said that such a case as I have put could not have occurred—that Gen. Scott, as an honorable soldier, would not have so acted, and that he, in fact, did refuse the Presidency from the Mexicans. All this I admit. Gen. Scott, the soldier, would not have so behaved, but in the field of politics has he not so acted? I agree that he has done so because he was entrapped by the politicians, who were more cunning than he. Many of his friends try to evade it by saying that though under the influence of ambition, he acted wrong to get the nomination, yet he will do right if elected. But if Seward and company have had influence enough heretofore to keep him silent when it was his duty to have spoken, will they not have just as much influence after his election? Will they not threaten to abandon his administration? Will he not, to secure their support—being the great majority in his party—just as Gen. Taylor did, determine, as a military man, to sacrifice the small body from the South?—And when we are pressed again, as we doubtless shall be, what Northern man, either Whig or Democrat, will come to our relief? If we, the minority, sacrifice our friends and put in our enemies, what right have we to look for Northern support again?

But it may be said that if we refuse to support Gen. Scott, Gen. Pierce will be elected. If he were a dangerous man, there might be force in the objection. I have closely scrutinized his course, since the beginning of the canvass. Upon all questions connected with slavery and the rights of the South, no man that I know of, from any section of the Union, has a better record. While he has been, as far as I know, true to all the great essential interests of his own section, his votes and speeches prove him to have been eminently just and liberal to us. Since his retirement from Congress his course has been consistent and national. He was active in putting down, in the Democratic party of New Hampshire, John P. Hale, the Abolition candidate for the Presidency. More recently he did the same with respect to Atwood. Mr. Atwood, a political and personal friend of Gen. Pierce, was the Democratic nominee for Governor. Shortly before the election, when there was every prospect of the success of Mr. Atwood—as his opponent, the Whig candidate, was like all the other Whigs of New Hampshire, hostile to the fugitive-slave law—he likewise wrote a letter expressing his opposition to that measure. Gen. Pierce, being only then a private citizen, was under no particular obligation to interfere. He might, too, have said that both the candidates were merely standing on the same ground. Besides, neither he nor the people of New Hampshire had any practical interest in the fugitive-slave law. It was there a mere question of justice to the South; and yet Gen. Pierce took it upon himself to travel some distance to see Mr. Atwood; and on his refusal to take back his letter, he commenced a movement which resulted in degrading Atwood from his position as the Democratic candidate for Governor, and in substituting a sound man in his place. It was thus that Gen. Pierce, a private citizen, under no especial obligation to take so much trouble and odium on himself, acted from a mere determination to do justice to the Constitutional rights of the South. How does Gen. Scott's conduct compare with it? In Pennsylvania Gen. Scott was nominated for the Presidency by the same Convention that nominated Gov. Johnston for re-election. But Gov. Johnston refused to sign a bill passed by the Democratic Legislature of Pennsylvania to facilitate the execution of the fugitive-slave law, and was, in fact, avowedly hostile to that measure. Here, then, was a proper case for the interference of Gen. Scott, he being associated in the nomination of the Convention with Johnston. Ought he not, in justice to himself if he was a friend to the compromise, to have written at least a letter vindicating his position? But, on the contrary, he was as mute as the grave, and lent the whole weight of his military popularity to the support of Johnston. And he was repaid by the exertions of Gov. Johnston, who after his defeat by the Democratic candidate, came to the Convention at Baltimore and carried his delegation for General Scott.

But it is said that we were represented in the Convention; and are therefore bound to support its nominee. Suppose it had nominated Fred. Douglas, the free negro,—the same might have been said.—Should it be said that this is not a supposable case, then would we not have been bound to support Mr. Seward, who will doubtless, if the South acquiesces

and assists in the election of Gen. Scott, be the best nominee?

If we are not bound to go for any nominee unless he is a proper person, is not this the time for us to make the stand? It is, however, said that allegiance to our party requires support of its ticket. It was DeWitt's motto that one's country must be supported right or wrong; but are we to do the same by a party? The independent freemen of the section from which you and I come, have not thought so. When Gen. Jackson was first elected he did not lose two hundred votes in our Congressional District. But in 1840, when his party presented Martin Van Buren as a candidate for re-election, there was a majority of four thousand four hundred votes against him. That was an exhibition of independence worthy of American freemen, who ought always to prefer the interests of their country to mere party success. If the Whig Convention has now, as I think, made, under the circumstances, an unworthy nomination, ought we not to repudiate it? I do not at present see any practical issue pending between the parties, of sufficient magnitude to require us to sustain the Whig nominee at all hazards.—All the Whigs appear to be satisfied with Mr. Fillmore's administration. And yet since he came into office, there has been no new measure of a party character passed. The sub-Treasury, Tariff, and other general laws enacted in Mr. Polk's time, have not been changed. There is but one of them Mr. Fillmore recommended change in, viz: the Tariff. With reference to that, however, the last Legislature of our own State, with unanimity both among the Whigs and Democrats, passed strong resolutions against any increase of duties. There seems in fact, therefore, no reason to suppose that under Mr. Pierce, if he should come in, there would be any material change in these respects.

But it is said that the Van Burens and other Free Soilers are supporting Pierce. It must be remembered, however, that he was not nominated through their influences, but in direct opposition to them. It was the South, with the aid of the conservative democrats of the North, that effected his nomination.—These Free Soilers, therefore, being overpowered, merely for the sake of keeping in with their party, fell into the rear of the movement. But in the case of Gen. Scott the reverse was true. He was nominated by the influence of Seward, Johnston and other anti-slavery leaders, against the united and determined efforts of the whole South and the compromise men of the North, and if we support him we must expect to constitute a tail to the army of Abolitionists in front. It may be said that as the Van Burens, &c., have yielded, we ought to follow their example. But they have in reality surrendered nothing practical, because they had no interest in this question. Their anti-slavery, if not merely taken up to defeat Cass, was at least only a fancy matter, and in giving it up they have only to sacrifice some pride of consistency. We of the South, on the contrary, have a practical interest,—a great stake in the slavery question. Should we abandon it and throw ourselves into the embraces of the Abolitionists, who from the North will be able to extricate us? I pass over, sir, many grave points of objection to Gen. Scott that have been urged by others, especially his contemptuous manner of slurring over the platform by "accepting the nomination with the resolutions annexed." He not only fails to follow the example of Gen. Pierce by declaring that the principles met his approbation; but inasmuch as there was a great pressure upon him to get him up to the work, his failure is ominous. Fairly construed, his language, under all the circumstances, only seems to imply that he liked the nomination so much that he was willing to take it notwithstanding the objectionable resolutions tied on to it. So is he construed throughout the North; and he must, when he wrote the words, have felt the contempt for our understandings if he thought we could put any other construction on them. I am sorry that his supporters, instead of endeavoring to meet these issues, are merely endeavoring to get up an excitement in relation to his military services by the exhibition of pictures, &c. Brilliant military services, like his, are a great feather in the cap of any man; but our people have not deemed them alone sufficient to qualify one for the Presidential office, in despite of great political objections.

I make no reference to the personal charges against the candidates because they are unnecessarily and most unworthily made. Having known Gen. Scott for a great many years, it gives me pleasure to testify to his high moral worth and honorable qualities as a soldier and a man. Though I have never seen Gen. Pierce, yet all of those who served with him in Mexico, that I have met, concur in saying that no man there was more respected or more popular. The intelligence, courage and high tone of that army forbid the idea that they would have held Gen. Pierce in the estimation they did, if he had been deficient in any manly or honorable quality. Those politicians, too, who have served with him in either House of Congress, as far as I have heard them speak, have expressed themselves invariably in the most favorable terms with respect to him.

I am well aware, Sir, that the expression of these opinions may subject me to denunciation from some. If I had consulted only my personal convenience, I might well have fallen into the general current of the party. Not having in any way committed myself against Gen. Scott prior to his nomination, I might have claimed credit as an early supporter, and occupied, doubtless, a position in the front of his party. But had I done so, I would not have acted in accordance with my own sense of right. I have too often encountered oppositions in the conscientious discharge of my duty to hesitate now.

If Franklin Pierce was willing to encounter a storm of opposition and obloquy by opposing the strong abolition current of the North, as he did in putting down Atwood, merely to sustain the rights of a distant section of the Union, ought not you and I, and others, to be willing to make some sacrifices, if necessary, to maintain the great essential interests of our own section? When Gen. Scott received the nomination was it not the general feeling of our people that he ought not to be supported? That was an honest, patriotic impulse. Under pressing solicitation and the influence of party prejudice, many have reluctantly yielded acquiescence. Is it not better, however, to consider the matter calmly and act solely for the interest of the country? If Gen. Scott should be elected, under all the existing circumstances, it not only consigns to their political graves forever Messrs. Fillmore and Webster and other compromise Whigs of the North; but the defeat of Gen. Pierce will tend powerfully to deter any Northern Democrat from again standing up for our rights. This is what Seward and his followers are evidently seeking to accomplish. Ought we to aid them in such a movement intended as it is solely to effect our political and social destruction? Is it not, under all the circum-