DISCUSSION AT HENDERSONVILLE.

We copy from the Asheville Spectator, an account of the discussion between the candidates for the office of Governor, John A. Gilmer, and Thomas Bragg, which took place at Hendersonville a few days ago. We intended to have given it in our last issue, but we did not receive it in time to do so, and we give it entire in this week's issue.

Mr. Gilmer lead off by speaking in glowing terms of our mountain country, its scenery, its climate, and the richness and fertility of its soil, which, in all three 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 1846, when he first became a member of the Legislature; he declared and was ready to prove by the record, that no project had ever bee i 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 had 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 tried to appropriate all the credit the themselves, somewhat like the man, who after his wife had killed the bear, came to the scene of 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, 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 individual bankers, if the State were 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 be adopted by North Carolina, it would add new encouragement to Internal Improvement, and that our good old State would go 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 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 "darklanterns," 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, sincere man. He admitted that he and his friend 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—as is fixed 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 166th page of the Senate Journal, on which may be found 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, Moriery, Rayner, Thomas, of "Davidson, Wiggins, Willey, and Winslow of "Perquimans—16.

"Those who voted in the negative, are Biggs, "Bower, Boyd, Brogden, Clark, *Coleman*, Cunningham, Drake, Folsom, Fennel, 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 his 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 a shape, not only that his constituents would be satisfied, but that *all* would be satisfied —*all parties—all voters*—and all material objections to its passing at the next session to 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 come 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 become 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 obligation 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 1855, 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 Henry 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 1840, 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 states 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 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, at the North, it was contended 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* Democrats advocate it, because, they contend, it is a proposition in favor of slavery, and opens the territory *North* of 36° 30' to the "peculiar institution."—Northern Democrats insist that the legitimate effect of the Nebraska act, recognizing, as it does, the principle of Squatter Sovereignty, is to prevent the admission of any more slave States into the Union, either North or South of the Missouri line! And yet Southern Democrats unite with them and talk largely about the national Democracy! Mr. Gilmer said the same tactics were pursued in 1848, when Gen. Cass was supported in the North as a Wilmot proviso man, and in the South as opposed to it.

Mr. G. next spoke of the extravagance of the present Administration. The expenses of the government during the administration of Gen. Washington were annually about \$2,000,000.—Gen. Pierce now requires \$76,000,000 a year to defray expenses! Mr. G. thought there was great need of retrenchment and reform.

He eloquently spoke of our duty to be governed by *principles* and to suffer no one to dictate to us —that in this free country every man should exercise his own judgment and act accordingly without interference from any one—said that it was becoming a too popular error, one that portended evil to the country, to have a desire to be on the strong side, without regard to principle—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 that 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, i. 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 stated that the Congress now in session, uring 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, (a humiliating confession for a Governor to make,) and, therefore, could not be expectected 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 the 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 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, when 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 or 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."

Diplomatic Relations with England—Dismissal of Mr. Crampton.

Washington, May 28.—Mr. Crampton the British Minister was this evening notified that our government desired a discontinuance of his diplomatic relations with the country, and at the same time his passports for England were enclosed to him.

The consuls also at Philadelphia, New York, and Cincinnati were dismissed and the revocation of their exequaturs will be communicated by the morning.

A message will be duly communicated to Congress to-morrow, explaining the grounds of the Executive's action in the premises.

Also another message will be sent in enclosing the documents relative to the Central American affairs, and particularly in relation to the propositions of Great Britain to arbitrate any question of political geography, which may be raised under the Central American treaty; but declining arbitration as to its construction.

Congressional.

Thirty-Fourth Congress—First Session.

Washington, May 26, 1856.

Senate. Mr. Pearce stated that the special committee to investigate the circumstances of the assault committed upon Mr. Sumner found it impossible to pursue that investigation without power to send for persons and papers, and he asked that such power be given. This was agreed to.

Mr. Weller presented the petition of seventy five thousand citizens of California, (handsomely bound in two large volumes,) asking for the establishment of a wagon road to connect that State with the Atlantic States. He made some remarks urging the importance of the proposed measure.

He then introduced a bill for the construction of a military road from the western boundary of Missouri to Carson Valley, and another for the construction of a military road from El Paso to Fort Yuma.

Mr. Pugh spoke on the subject of Kansas and in opposition to the freesoil side of the question.

The Senate adjourned.

House of Representatives. The Speaker announ the first business in order was the motion to suspend the rules, made last Monday, by Mr. Ball, in order that he might introduce a resolution calling on the President to inform the House what amount have, respectively, been expended on the Capitol and Post Office extensions, what amount will be required to finish the same, with full and specific information relating to the material as well as persons employed on these works.

The rules were suspended—yeas, 131; nays, 25.

Mr. Ball condemned the extravagance of the Secretary of the Treasury, and of Captain Meigs, in the construction of the Capitol, the Post Office and the Treasury extension buildings—charging that money has been unnecessarily expended, and that contracts have been given to the highest instead of the lowest bidders. When he concluded, the resolution was passed.

Mr. Kelley, of New York, asked and obtained permission to print a speech showing that the Softs are the true democratic party of that State.

Mr. Humphrey Marshall, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported a bill providing for the issue of patents on the final adjudication of California land claims. It was not disposed of when

The House adjourned.

Washington, May 27.

Senate. Mr. Trumbull gave notice of his intention to introduce a bill to prevent civil war and restore peace in Kansas.

The bill to provide for the general introduction of a uniform national code of marine signals was taken up, on the motion of Mr. Benjamin and read a third time and passed.

Mr. Slidell called attention to the statement of Mr Sumner before the House investigating committee, as published in the Baltimore morning papers; and made such explanations as would remove any false impression as might result from the statement. He said he had not the slightest idea before the occurrence took place that Mr. Brooks or any body else had any intention of attacking Mr. Sumner, and was entirely free from any participation or counsel in the matter.

Mr. Douglas made an explanation. He did not approach Mr. Brooks, no speak to him, nor was he within fifty feet of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Toombs.) The published statement might carry the impression to the country that he was aiding and abetting the assault and was in fact a participant in it; but that was an entirely erroneous idea, as he did not even know that Mr. Sumner was in the Capitol at the time the assault was committted.

Mr. Toombs said that he was in his seat at the time, and how Mr. Sumner could have supposed that he saw him near Mr. Brooks, he could not tell. It might be in the confusion Mr. Sumner mistook Governor Gorman for him. He said he approved of the assault.

Mr. Butler said that if he had been here at the time he should have assumed all the responsibility which had been taken by his gallant relative (Mr. Brooks) Not a single one of the remarks which had been quoted in application to him was a response to any thing which he had said upon the Kansas question. He had scrupulously avoided saying anything to violate the courtesies of the Senate, and he spoke neither of the Senator from Massachusetts, to him, or about him.

Mr. Wade was exceedingly earnest in the vindication of the liberty of debate. He should vindicate this as long as he lived. A man could die in no better cause. If the principles announced here are to prevail, he said, let us come armed for the combat.

Mr. Wilson thought the explanation of the Senator from Louisiana was not inconsistent with any thing stated by his collegue, (Mr. Sumner.)

He had no idea Mr. Sumner intended to place Mr. Slidell in a false position. Mr. Wilson said, the Senator from Illinois has also made his explanation; and I see nothing in that, inconsistent with the statement of Mr. Sumner. He was stricken down upon this floor by a brutal, murderous and cowardly assault.

Mr. Butler (in his seat)—You are a liar!

Mr. Stuart call the Senator to order, and

Mr. Butler afterward apologised for the language spoken in a moment of excitement.

Mr. Wilson concluded his remarks, saying that as soon as Mr. Sumner shall have recovered and be able to take his place in the Senate, he would be ready to meet the Senator from South Carolina, or any other Senator, in debate upon these matters.

Mr. Butler said that in discussing the resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature, if he should transgress the bounds of propriety it would be because he was provoked to it. He said he had never been the aggressor, and called upon the Senate to bear witness to the fact.

Mr. Foster asserted his entire approval of freedom of speech here or elsewhere, to be maintained at whatever price, at whatever cost, and whatever might be the consequences. If the contrary doctrine should ever prevail in this country there would be an end to liberty.

Mr. Trumbull wished to speak on this topic for about five minutes; but the hour arrived for considering the special order.

Mr. Hale moved to postpone the special order, with a view to allow Mr. Trumbull to speak.—The motion was not carried. Yeas 11, nays 29.

Mr. Cass made a further explanation in reference to the Crampton correspondence, which misrepresented him.

The veto of the bill for the improvement of the mouth of the Mississippi river was fully discussed, and

The Senate adjourned.

House of Representatives. Mr. Walbridge, from the Committee on Public Lands, reported a bill appropriating one million three hundred thousand acres to Michigan, to aid in the construction of certain railroads therein; and he moved the previous question.

Mr. Jones, of Tennessee, made an unsuccessful appeal to Mr Walbridge to withdraw the motion. He thought it but fair that the opponents of such bills should be heard.

Mr. Craige asked that at least the bill shall be printed.

Mr. Walbridge refused to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Jones, of Tennessee moved that the bill be laid upon the table; but the motion did not prevail—yeas 67. nays 80.

The bill was ordered to a third reading by a vote of—yeas 80, nays 56, and was finally passed —yeas 78, nays 51.

The House then adjourned.

Washington, May 28.

Senate. Mr. Pearce, from the Select Committee to investigate the facts attending the recent assault on Mr. Sumner, made a report in writing, which was read. The report states that precedents are to be found only in the action of the House of Representatives, the Senate never having been called upon to pronounce judgment in a similar case. Several precedents are cited, and the committee, come to the conclusion that although the assault was a violation of the privileges of the Senate, it is not within their jurisdiction, and the offence can only be punished by the House, of which Mr. Brooks is a member. This conclusion is in strict conformity with the parliamentary law and the requirements of the Constitution; and they therefore recommend that the Senate make a complaint to the House; and submit a resolution that the report be accepted and that a copy there of, with the affidavits accompanying the same, be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to; Mr. Toombs alone voting "nay."

Mr. Mason made a speech in vindication of the President's veto of the bill making appropriations for the improvement of the mouth of the Mississippi river.

And the Senate adjourned.

House of Representatives. Mr. Thorington introduced a bill giving lands to Minnesota, Nebraska, and Kansas, to aid in the construction of railroads therein.

Mr. Caruthers introduced a bill to cede the public lands to the States in which they lie.

Mr. Greenwood introduced a bill to repeal the act establishing the Court of Claims.

The Senate bill for the benefit of the Hebrew Society of Washington was passed.

Also, a Senate bill incorporating the St. Thomas Literary Society of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Bennett, of New York, from the Committee on Public Lands, reported a bill granting lands for the benefit of Louisiana railroads; and, after proceedings, the bill was passed yeas 62, nays 58.

The House adjourned.

Washington, May 29.

Senate. The House bills granting public lands to the States of Wisconsin, Alabama, Louisiana and Michigan, to aid in the construction of certain railroads therein, were considered and passed.

A message was received from the President of the United States, which was read. The President states that he has ceased to hold intercourse with the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of her Britannic Majesty near this government; and in making a communication of this fact, he has deemed it proper also to lay before Congress the considerations of public duty which have led to the adoption of a measure of so much importance. He accordingly transmits voluminous correspondence on the subject, the most important of which is the despatch of Mr. Marcy to Mr. Dallas dated "Washington, May 27, 1856."

Mr. Marcy says that the President has carefully considered the note of Lord Clarendon to Mr. Dallas of the 30th ult., relative to the enlistment question, and has directed him to present his views thereon, for the purpose of having them communicated to the British Government. The President is much gratified by the conciliatory spirit of that note, and by the desire which Lord Clarendon expresses, to adjust the existing difficulties and to preserve and strengthen the friendly relations between the two Governments. The disclaimer of any intention to violate the laws of the United States, and the expression of regret that, contrary to the intention and direction of the British Government, there has been such infringement, are satisfactory to the President; and the main complaint, so far as respects Her Majesty's Government, is thus removed. But the President extremely regrets that he cannot concur with Lord Clarendon in the opinion that Mr. Crampton and the Consuls at New York, Philadelphia and Cincinnati, are not implicated in these proceedings. In regard to those who have no connection with this Government, he has nothing to ask of Her Majesty's Government; but in the cases of the individuals mentioned, he deems it proper that their relations with this Government should cease.

In taking this step, however, he does not intend to make any interruption in the diplomatic relations between the United States and Great Britain, but on the contrary, is desirous of keeping the two countries upon a friendly footing. Mr. Crampton's withdrawal was asked for expressly upon the ground that his connection with the enlistment business had rendered him an unacceptable representative of Her Britannic Majesty near this government; and for the same reason the withdrawal of the three British Consuls was also requested. These officers are all as this government still believes, implicated in a violation of the laws of the United States, contrary to the reiterated instructions of their own government. This complicity did not rest solely on the testimony of Strobel and Hertz, but was sustained by the testimony of other witnesses, and original letters from Mr. Crampton and others. The despatch proceeds to detail, at some length, the evidence against the British officers.

Mr. Mason moved to dispense with the further reading, as it was a very long document, and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. Mason spoke in complimentary terms of the ability with which the question had been discussed by Mr. Marcy.

Mr. Cass thought that no pretext for war could arise out of the dismissal of Mr. Crampton unless England was determined to go to war.

Mr. Toombs thought if this Government was satisfied with the explanation of Lord Clarendon, Mr. Crampton should not have been dismissed.

Mr. Cass replied that this Government had not expressed its satisfaction with Mr. Crampton's conduct, but with the assurance of the British Government that they intended no violation of our laws. It now turned out that Mr. Crampton had acted in violation of the intentions and directions of his own Government.

Mr. Toombs was of the opinion that neither England nor her officers had violated our laws at all. While the matter was pending, he did not choose to argue the question against our Government; but he would now say that he disapproved the construction which this Government had place upon our neutrality laws.

Mr. Butler thought it would have been better to have dismissed Mr. Crampton as soon as his complicity in the matter was discovered.

Adjourned till Monday.

House of Representatives. Mr. Campbell, of Ohio, from the select committee on the challenged assault on Senator Sumner, said the committe, have unanimously instructed them to ask the House to adopt the following resolution:

Resolved, That the select committee appointed under the resolution of the 22d day of this month, to investigate the matter of the alleged assault on Senator Sumner, by Mr. Brooks of the House, may present their report or reports with the journals of proceedings, at any time when the House is in session, and thereupon it shall be laid upon the table and printed.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

On motion of Mr. Grow, the report of the majority of the Committee on Territories, proposing to admit Kansas into the Union with the Topeka constitution was made the subject of consideration for the twenty-fifth of June,

The House passed several private bills.

Mr. Florence offered a resolution, which was adopted, directing the Clerk to refit the Hall for summer use.

The House adjourned till Monday.

A Perfect Unit.

The jokes of the Richmond Enquirer are sometimes exceedingly rich and dashing. We have one of this sort in the following paragraph from the yesterday's issue of that paper:

"For the first time in its history, the Democratic party is a real and perfect unity. Though concurring on cardinal doctrines, the Democracy have heretofore betrayed some dissent in respect of less important matters; but now every spirit is driven out, every leprous limb is cut off, and the party has attained the utmost purity of principle and soundness of organization. We are all in free and friendly fellowship; we all stand up on the same platform, in which the perverse ingenuity of party can detect no unsound plank."

"The Democratic party a real and perfect unity!" And then the gravity of the declaration is so wonderfully refreshing. The *Enquirer* also announces that its party is a unit "for the first in its history." Now it occurs to us that this claim has been set up for the Democracy, by all the politicians and presses of the party, from time immemorial. The *Enquirer* itself has never failed on any occasion—in season or out of season —to proclaim the thorough unity and nationality of the Democracy. And so, it must either have been talking for Buncombe now.

But how can it be said that the Democratic party is a real and perfect unity? What reason is there for any such flippant allegation? Upon what question is it not divided and split into a dozen antagonistic factions? Take the Nebraska bill, for example. Does not at least a third—probably a large portion—of the Northern Democracy spit upon and repudiate it? And even among the supporters of that measure, is there not a wide and radical difference of opinion between them as to the construction to be put upon it? That is, does not the Northern wing of the party, almost to a man, claim that it recognizes and establishes the doctrine of squatter sovereignty, while the Southern wing contend for just the opposite conclusion? The *Enquirer*, we apprehend, is fully aware that such is the fact—indeed it has admitted such to be the fact in divers articles and on sundry occasions. And yet in the face of its own repeated admissions on this point, it coolly tells us that the Democratic party is a real and perfect unity. We confess that such a declaration takes us somewhat by surprise, although we are but little accustomed to have our astonishment excited by any thing a Democratic journal may say on the eve of a Presidential election.

Not only in regard to the Kansas bill, but on all other public occasions, we discover the same differences of opinion in the Democratic ranks.—See the conflicting views of the Democracy in Congress in reference to Congressional appropriations for internal improvements. Only a few days ago, an animated discussion arose in the Senate on this subject, which was participated in almost exclusively by members on the Democratic side of the house. And what did we witness? Did we see a real and perfect unity of sentiment on this question among the leading Democratic politicians and statesmen of the country? Very far from it! We found that all the Democratic Senators from the Northwest expressed opinions on this subject directly at variance with those entertained by their allies in this latitude and throughout the South generally. We saw Senators Cass, Stuart, Weller, Pugh, Toucy, and and other Northern Democrats, arrayed in irreconcilable opposition to Senators Butler, Brown, Yulee, and other Southern Democrats, on this grave and important question. Mr. Brown—the Democratic Senator from Mississippi—after listening to the speeches of his Northern brothers, had the frankness to tell them that they had given utterance to sentiments contrary to all his notions of what the true Democratic doctrine was, and certainly contrary to the teachings of the Baltimore platform. He stated very emphatically, too, that the Democratic party had been guilty of a vast deal of "cheatery and humbuggery" on this question, and that it was time for it to be a little more honest—to practice what it preached, and vote in conformity with its open avowals and recorded declarations. And yet the *Enquirer's* sagacity and penetration sees in all this radical and essential disagreement among the faithful, conclusive evidences of a "real and perfect unity!" Its readers, we are sure, will be forced to dissent from its very sage conclusion.

We might allude to various other issues, and show that the same contrariety of opinion existed among the Democracy in regard to them. But we deem it useless to attempt farther to disprove an allegation, which really has no earthly foundation to rest upon. If the *Enquirer* intended it only as a joke, why it will pass for a pretty good one. But if it meant to be serious, why then, its declaration is almost too absurd and ridiculous for grave comment.—*Richmond Whig.*

From the Petersburg Intelligencer.

The Prospects of Mr. Fillmore.

The Administration presses are calculating very flippantly upon the certain defeat of the American Nominee. They do not allow him we believe as much as the electoral votes of three States, whilst, on the other hand, they very confidently claim for the Cincinnati candidate an overwhelming triumph. This is an exceedingly innocent sort of exercise on the part of the Democracy. We have no sort of objection to their claiming every State in the Union if they choose to do so. But we have an opinion of our own in the matter which we cannot refrain from expressing, and are willing to leave it to time to verify or ignore. We think that the Democratic press, under much more favorable circumstances than the present, proclaimed with a confidence equal to that they now display, that General Harrison stood the smallest conceivable chance of being elected, after his nomination was announced. If we mistake not, his claims were ridiculed in the broadest terms, and his prospects of success mercilessly jeered at. Yet General Harrison, notwithstanding all the "coon," "hard cider," "log cabin" and "yaller kiver" flashes of wit, with which it was attempted to degrade him in popular estimation, came out a long way a head in the race; distancing, in fact, the greatest democratic pet of the day—the special embodiment of Albany Regency and Richmond Junto favoritism.—The "sweet little fellow" who was to annihilate the hero of "Tippecanoe, and Tyler too," was about as badly beaten as if he had run upon only three legs; and the great democratic party had to chew for a season about the bitterest cud that their grinders were ever tormented with—for it was their first defeat after their organization into a party under the name which they assumed.—Years rolled on. At length came the contest between Gen. Taylor and Cass in 1848. They had pitched the "sweet little fellow" overboard, like another Jonas, not choosing to risk their fortunes upon a third trial of his speed, after so disastrous a failure in the second. Well, under their new standard bearer they picked up their courage, and became again irresistable and invincible,—Gen. Cass's nomination was pronounced by their presses from Passamaquoddy to the Rio Grande, to be the same thing as his election. The latter was to follow the former as surely as day follows night. These presses, conspicuous amongst which was the Richmond Enquirer, soon began their old game of braggadocio. The most inflated calculations of the worthy old Michigander's strength were strewd over the land through their columns. His election was to be a mere formality, his nomination having effectually done the business. On the other hand, old Rough-and-Ready was mocked for his presumption in entering the lists—his pretensions were every where greeted by the democracy with sneers and taunts. Even the Buffalo bolt, which drew off so large a column of the faithful in the Empire State, could not check the exuberant and ever-weening arrogance of "the unterrified." The Enquirer revelled in its victorious anticipations, and poured forth nothing but the most exhilerating evidences of the immense majority which was to send Cass to the White House. If a whig paper dared to assert, or even to intimate, that General Taylor would receive a single electoral vote, it was laughed at. There were no bounds to the extravagant parade of confidence which the Cass press generally, and the Enquirer particularly, made during that memorable contest of 1848.—The day of conflict came at length, and General Taylor achieved a political victory no less signal and brilliant than his greatest military one. The Democratic candidate was beaten, and thus again was illustrated the vanity of democratic figures by which that party has so often triumphed in advance of the battle. We indulge in these retrospective glances at the past to show how little cause there is for the friends of Fillmore to be disturbed or troubled by the incessant vauntings of the democracy about their overwhelming strength in the approaching contest. It is their old expedient to bluff off their adversary by a bold stand upon very doubtful cards. They have been twice losers by this device, and really when we consider the actual condition of their affairs at present, which is certainly far less flattering than it was in either of the cases we have just referred to, we can scarcely repress a smile at the towering estimates in favor of their nominee, that is to be, which we daily see in the columns of their journals. They treat Mr. Fillmore as they treated Gens. Harrison and Taylor. According to their representations it is little short of lunacy to suppose that he stands the smallest chance of success. They have elected their candidate before his nomination. The vote in November will be but a necessary formality with which to give effect to the already ascertained will of the people—as it was in 1840 and 1848, when Van Buren and Cass were the laurelled conquerors of Harrison and Taylor! When Democracy so gloriously triumphed over all opposition!

Seriously speaking, we perceive nothing whatever in the present attitude and strength of our "Spoils" adversary to justify a fear about the issue of the coming canvass. Mr. Fillmore will grow in popular favor the more his valuable services to the country are considered. Although assailed by the Black Republicans on one side and by the democracy on the other, he will repel both and be master of the field. His supporters will swell to a host sufficient to overcome his leagued enemies and to instal him the chief Magistrate of these United States for the ensuing term of four years—Democratic and Black Republican predictions and exertions to the contrary, notwithstanding.

MADAME CHEGARY'S Boarding and Day School for Young Ladies.—A report having become current that Mme. Chegary was about to give up her School, she respectfully informs her friends and the public, that it is her intention to continue her establishment, with its present organization. Mme. C.'s niece, Mme. Prevost, (formerly Mlle. Louise Beranit) will reside with her and take an active part in the direction and supervision of the establishments. Mme. C. is prepared to receive pupils during the Summer. Those whose parents reside at a distance will pass the vacation at Mme. C.'s country residence, situated in one of the healthiest and most pleasant parts of New Jersey. The school will close July 1st and will re-open, as usual, on Thursday, 11th of September.

May 12, 1856. 20—4t

Dr. Spring's New Work.

THE contrast between good and bad men, by Gardner Spring, D. D. Received and for sale by W. L. POMEROY.

October 13, 1855. 126—

TEAS.—A superior assortment of Green and Black Teas, expressly for family use, can be found at BROWNLEY & HICKS, No. 88, Sycamore st. Petersburg, Va.

August 18, 1855.

NAILS.—100 kegs Cumberland and Avalon Nails in store and for sale by

Petersburg, Nov. 7 [43] BROWNLEY & HICKS.