coming 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, in 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 derived by individuals—that the profits now made by igdividual 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 "secresy" 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, sincere 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 law, 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 Legislative 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 1835, very properly insisted that slave property should also 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 *Constituional 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 106th 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 concurring) 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, Bregden, 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—29."

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

bership 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 Congress or out of it! 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 freesoil 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 act 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 was 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 char-

spoke of the sufferings and martyrdom of our ancestors in defending the Protestant religion—that they were persecuted for righteousness' sake, but were willing to die rather than abandon their principles.

Mr. Gilmer said that he abused no one—that he was willing to stand or fall by his principles—that the staple of Gov. Bragg's speech was abuse and denunciation of the American party, but that because he abused good men and patriots it did not change them to bad men—that some years ago Mr. Clingman abused the Democrats as a set of knaves and guilty of the grossest kind of corruption; but that because Mr. Clingman said so it did not make them so; and it would seem that Mr. Clingman did not believe so himself, for that he had now joined them, when it is pretty certain they are no better now, to say the least of it, than they were then.

After paying a handsome compliment to the ladies, who were always for their country and the Union, Mr. Gilmer concluded his speech.—He discussed several minor topics, which we have not embraced in the foregoing report. The speech was an able defense of American principles, and, in regard to matters of State policy, showed that Mr. Gilmer is the man for the times.

Mr. Bragg commenced by saying that he had no compliments to pay to our county. He admitted that Mr. Gilmer, as a member of the Legislature, had voted for *all* liberal Internal Improvement projects, calculated to develope the resources of the State: He had very little to say himself about Internal Improvements—compared himself to the man who was carried to the whipping post, who besought the Sheriff when he struck high to strike lower, and when he struck low to strike higher—that he found it difficult to please every body—thus virtually admitting, we take it, that he had been somewhat vacillating in his course upon Internal Improvement. He said he would refer his readers to his Inaugural Address, if they would know his views upon this subject. (Wishing to reserve his ammunition for "Sam," the subject of Railroads, Common Schools, and matters of that sort were "side issues," and he was too smart to be drawn into a discussion of these subjects to the neglect of the "paramount question" of Know Nothingism.) He denounced, as he did two years ago, the proposition of the Whigs to distribute the public lands among the States for Internal Improvement purposes, as a humbug. But he neglected to state that the Congress now in session, during this Democratic Administration, have appropriated 1,500,000 acres of land to Iowa to build railroads in that State, when, in fact, these lands belong as much, by right, to North Carolina, as to Iowa.

In regard to the question of financial reform, the Gov said he would not and could not be forced to discuss it. He confessed he did not understand it, (a humiliating confession for a Governor to make,) and, therefore, could not be expected to discuss it. He then made a very unsuccessful attempt at demagogism, by saying that if the proposed bank or banks made anything, it was to come out of the pockets of the people.—We differ with the Governor, and contend that the benefits of banking are reciprocal, benefitting alike, as a general thing, the borrower and lender. Certain it is, no sensible man would become a borrower, if he thought he would be injured by it. The Governor professed to be a very candid man—did not wish to deceive the people—said he was in favor of a sinking fund, but neglected to suggest a plan for creating such a fund. In regard to the State bonds, he said it was impracticable to sell them in the State. But he failed to state satisfactorily why such was the case.

The Governor then mounted the Free Suffrage hobby, and rode it quite as dexterously as his illustrious predecessor. He charged that Mr Gilmer's vote killed Free Suffrage in 1852, when, in fact, Weldon N. Edwards, the Speaker of the Senate, and a particular friend of Gov. Bragg, gave the casting vote and killed it. We were "at the killing" and saw it done with our own eyes. He admitted that *all* the Western people were in favor of a Convention, and yet he advised them to go against what they believed to be right! He said that Mr. Gilmer's idea about taxing land more than polls was "entirely chimerical"—said it was a sufficient protection, that the Senators were each required to have a property qualification of 300 acres of land, and that they could not pass a law to tax their neighbors, without taxing themselves. The Governor is perhaps not aware that this qualification, in many cases, is merely nominal, particularly in this mountain region, where 300 acres of mountain land can be purchased for a mere song.

The subject of Know Nothingism was then brought upon the tapis, and here we must refer our readers, if they would know what Gov. B. said on this prolific theme, to Mr. Clingman's manifesto before the last August election, and to the still later one issued to his constituents a few weeks ago. There they will find the Gov.'s views in full. This subject was the burthen of his song, devoting at least two-thirds of his time to it. We speak in sincerity, when we say, that our State pride was wounded, when we sat and heard our State Executive descending to the miserable, low, contemptible warfare against the American Party, that had characterized the course of such a blackguard as Wise, of Virginia, and such a miserable demagogue as Clingman. He even imitated Clingman in quoting Scripture.—There was neither reason, sense, nor wit in anything he said. It was a glaring attempt to blind the people with prejudice, by railing against the secrecy and oaths of the order, which have long been done away with. In reply to the letter of Gen. Washington, read by Mr. Gilmer, in relation to the evils of foreign influence, Gov. Bragg said that the Father of his country had probably written it hastily, whilst in a bad humor, and that his cooler judgment did not sanction the sentiments it expressed! What a charge to make against the great and illustrious Washington!—Certainly *Gov. B.'s* cooler judgment will not allow him to repeat so sacrilegious a charge. Having neither facts nor argument to bear against the American Party, Gov. Bragg seems to rely for success upon popular ignorance. In this we think he is much mistaken. The people are more intelligent than he seems to suppose, and the first Thursday in August will a tale unfold, and strike the scales from his eyes; and we suppose he will conclude, after the first of January, 1857, that "the post of honor is the private station."—*Asheville Spectator.*

that their interests should be one and the same, and that hereafter forever there should be no discord or abstraction between them. Mr. Gilmer showed most conclusively that though his adversaries were endeavoring to make him the peculiar friend and advocate of the West in order to prejudice the East against him, yet that he had never done or said aught in her behalf that he would not do or say under like circumstances for any other section or people—that never did he refuse aid or relief to the East when he was called upon by his Eastern friends to give it; but, Mr. Editor, I am violating the promise I set out with, "that I would not attempt an outline of the speeches," so I will hold up. Suffice it to say that Mr. G. was listened to with the most profound and respectful attention throughout his entire speech, and gave entire satisfaction to all the good and true Whigs and Americans present, and even to some few democrats his speech was not objectionable. Gov. Bragg next took the stand and led off in a very pretty introductory, thanking those who voted for him two years ago and complimenting the people in the West by telling them that they live in the richest, most beautiful and most desirable part of North Carolina, and that it is capable of being made the garden spot of the world, &c.—that he had heard of no serious charges being made against him as Governor, and that if he had done the people and the State no great good as the executive officer, he was glad to say, that he had done them no serious harm—he then dwelt a short time upon that old hobby free-suffrage,—left it and said he did not understand Mr. G. on the Currency—and therefore would not attempt to reply to him and then he pitched into the Know-Nothings; did not attempt to discuss the privileges of the party at all, but consumed an hour and a half in attempting to make the American party odious by abuse and detraction. As soon, however, as he commenced this mode of warfare, his hearers began to leave him, and before he got half through the large crowd had dwindled down to some thirty-five or forty locofocos and some fifteen Americans and Whigs, who remained solely out of respect to the Governor of their State. Governor Bragg, perceiving this, closed his speech before his time was out, saying that he discovered the people were becoming wearied and that he would stop, though he had not said all he desired to say. In conclusion I will say, that in August you may expect to hear the usual report from Burke County—a handsome majority against the Democracy.

Truly, yours, T.

THE CANING AFFAIR.—We are as much the friends of law and order, and of freedom of speech and of the press, as it is reasonable to be; but not of the abuses which are too often perpetrated in these names. There are points beyond which even the most salutary and conservative rule may become a galling oppression, and that is when it tolerates licentiousness and thereby requires passive obedience and non-resistance under circumstances of the greatest provocation. We consider that a member of a court, or of a legislative body, forfeits his privilege of free discussion when he descends to scurrilous and libellous personalities; and that he lays himself open to personal chastisement, as the only remedy within the reach of the aggrieved party, who, if he chooses to inflict it, cannot be said in strict truth and justice to have committed any breach of privilege, though he may of the peace, and consequently subject himself to such penalty as a jury of his peers shall assess. Nor have we any fears for the liberty of the press, or sympathy with any member of it when he draws down upon himself a severe retribution from some party whose feelings and character he has outraged by abusive and slanderous personalities. No good end can be attained by a departure from courtesy and respectful language either on the floors of Congress or in the columns of a newspaper It was Goldsmith, we believe, who uttered the sentiment, that the heaviest calamities are often borne with philosophic resignation, where little villainies penetrate the soul and sting it into madness. And thus, while the severest wounds are given in the polished language of debate, (*gentlemen* use no other,) and borne without wincing, coarse and slanderous invective defies all human effort to preserve an equanimity of temper, in keeping with the dignity of the House—and "quite athwart goes all decorum."

With regard to the special case of Senator Sumner, our only regret, if we may allow ourselves to feel any on the occasion is, that he, a member of so grave and dignified a body as the Senate of the United States—perhaps we might here add, *once was*—should so far have forgot what was due to his senatorial position, to the State which he represented, and to his own self-respect, as to have indulged in *such* language as his used in debate—so grossly scurrilous, vituperative and insulting as to have provoked the chastisement he received. Mark you—although it was inflicted on him in the Senate chamber, it was not until after the Senate had adjourned.—His attack on Mr. Butler was the most dastardly, unmanly and unpardonable, from the fact of that gentleman's absence from Washington—added to which, his advanced age and venerable character made him no match in a personal contest with Mr. Sumner, who is in the prime of life, even if he had sought personal redress.

The affair, it seems, has produced an immense sensation in Boston. The Black Republicans regarded it as their exclusive property, and held an indignation meeting of their party, at which it was resolved, that none but Black Republicans felt any interest in the mauling which their Senator had suffered, and that all who were not Black Republicans were indifferent on the occasion. No doubt they will do their ugliest and worst to turn the Sumner licks to account as political capital in the approaching contest. They had much better admonish their Senator to keep a civil tongue in his head for the future—though perhaps the lesson he has already received will suffice for that.

We have presented our views of this affair in no sectional spirit. They contain just such sentiments as we would have felt and uttered under the same circumstances, if the geographical position of the parties had been changed. In all matters of national import, save those involving the constitutional rights of the South, we can truly say, we know no North, no South, no East, no West.—*Norfolk Herald.*

PLAIN TRUTH FROM AN IRISHMAN.—Mr. J. Crawford, editor of the Protestant American, published at Aberdeen, Mississippi, is an Irishman by birth, an accomplished scholar, and a fearless and eloquent writer. He took strong ground in favor of the American party, and, having been violently denounced for this by the editor of the Florence, Alabama, Gazette, he made a powerful and overwhelming response, from which we take these paragraphs. Many foreign-born citizens, and not a few natives, might read them with profit and edification:

You charge against us that we conduct a Know-Nothing journal. Did it ever strike you, sir, as possible, that the principles we advocate in this paper, and which you fear will arouse the indignation of your readers, are the principles we held many years before the Know-Nothings had an existence; that we have not gone to them, but that they have come to us; that from the circumstances of our foreign birth we knew the force and necessity of one great vital doctrine of the American party long before circumstances forced it upon their attention so strongly that they cannot avoid it. They must meet it and crush it, or be crushed by it.

It would be of considerable advantage to you, sir, if, relinquishing your present Quixotic battle against the American party, you would go and see for yourself what Popery is where she has the power. You are now "running a muck" with all the fury of an exasperated Thug against Know-Nothing newspapers—suppose you wipe your dripping brow and let your panting system cool, and get a little information on the subject of Popery with power in her hands. It will teach you charity for the opinions of those you oppose. It will give you time to practice your native politeness; and you may cease to call us serf, slave, sycophant, because we choose to set our faces, "like a flint," against a system which enslaves not the bodies, but worse, infinitely worse—the souls and minds, the hopes, the fears of its votaries.

Sir, I am guilty of the charge. What is the crime? I am guilty of the charge. What is the crime? I am guilty of the charge. What is the crime?