

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN A. GILMER OF NORTH CAROLINA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 24, 1858.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. GILMER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I desire to say a few words in reply to the speech made by my colleague (Mr. Shaw) on the 23rd of April last, and during my absence I have not had time to prepare what I have to say in reply to that extraordinary speech, and to do so even in his absence. I had just finished in doing so, on Saturday, when he was present, and he gave notice of his intention to speak at the earliest opportunity. That remark was published in the papers this morning, and therefore his absence is no fault of mine.

Mr. Chairman, I think that that speech was an unfair one; unjust, untrue, and unbecomingly the gentleman to whom it was addressed, and I have read it over, and I have read it carefully. I have looked into it in the view of a statesman, I have looked into it in the view of a citizen, and I have looked into it in the view of a man. Yes, sir, I am troubled to give to the character which it deserves. It was not this evening only that a witness in court to tell what I thought was its character, my answer would be like that of a witness examined in respect to the character of a simple old lady, who, when asked if she knew her general character, said, "I think I do. I think I do. I know her general character, and I know it well."—"Please go on, then, and tell what it is."—"Yes, sir, I know her general character, and it is generally believed in the neighborhood where she resides that she is a woman of courtesy of amiable nature, and polite of disposition."—

My colleague waited from the 20th of March to the 23rd of April to reply to me, and in commencing his remarks he made an apology that he could not come to the floor. I conceive there was no extraordinary anxiety on the part of my colleague to reply, or he would have done so time and again before the day he spoke. My colleague's friend from Virginia, [Letcher], in a portion of my speech being a reply to his report on the question of population in the Territory of Kansas, remained and very easily got an opportunity to reply to what I had said in relation to his report. He remained and made an opportunity to reply to what I had said, and he made a speech which I think, in the extraordinary circumstances that surrounded his extraordinary speech, was the most successful of getting rid of this extraordinary statement.

My colleague charges me with having demanded the Green amendment, and then having voted for it. He improperly charges that I maintained the same doctrine in the North Carolina State in voting for Gov. Graham's bill, and he comes forward and himself demands the views of the Executive that very subject which this Green amendment was intended to carry and sustain. How much justice is there in his charge when we note to examine it? Did my colleague vote to strike out the Green amendment? He says that he did not. Did the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Crittenden] vote to strike out the Green amendment? He never did.

Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi. When the bill came from the Senate, General Crittenden moved to strike out the Green amendment; and those of us who believed with him voted for it.

Mr. GILMER. I will show that he did not do it.

Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi. Do it.

Mr. GILMER. If his amendment had been drawn out in writing, as it ought to have been, nothing about the Green amendment would be in it. Why did he not vote to strike the Green amendment from the Senate bill? Why did he move a substitute? If there was a purpose, he was able to get rid of the Green amendment, why was not a motion made to strike it from the Senate bill before the vote was taken on the Crittenden-Montgomery amendment? Did he not have the Green amendment voted out, had he offered any motion to strike it from the Senate bill? If every American would have voted to strike it out. Most of the Opposition members would have voted to strike it out. Would it not have gone out, then, if the motion had been properly made? No, sir; not then, do the thing in a simple manner, so that the House and the Senate should be brought to the House in a direct vote on the Green amendment, and not at the same time against the Crittenden bill? I respectfully express my opinion that it was done in the way in which it was, that certain gentlemen might indirectly get their vote against the amendment, when they knew that the motion could not be carried, or, if it was carried, they knew that it would be nullified by the Crittenden-Montgomery amendment.

Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi. Will the gentleman mind the difference between moving to amend a bill without the particular section to which he refers, and moving to strike that section out?

Mr. GILMER. If the question had been presented in the latter shape it would have received a majority of the votes of this House; but presented as it was it could not have received such a majority because an amendment was offered to the Crittenden-Montgomery amendment, and it would have been nullified by the Crittenden-Montgomery amendment.

Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi. Why not if the effect was the same?

Mr. GILMER. For this reason (the plainest possible) that it was well understood that certain gentlemen were supporting the Crittenden bill because it nullified the doctrine of the Green amendment, who would not vote for it if that was done, and therefore they did not want the Green amendment to be carried out, and they would like to see the Crittenden bill.

Mr. MARSHALL, of Kentucky. The amendment proposed to the Senate bill was the Crittenden-Montgomery amendment. The Senate bill contained the Green amendment. The amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi to the Senate bill without the Green amendment, offered as an amendment to the Crittenden-Montgomery amendment. Had the proposition of the gentleman from Mississippi been accepted at the time, it would have nullified the

Crittenden-Montgomery amendment and left to choose between the Senate bill with the Green amendment and the Senate bill without the Green amendment. The effect of it was never to say "yes" to the Crittenden-Montgomery amendment.

Mr. GILMER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi. I desire to say that the system assigned by the gentleman from North Carolina for not voting for the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi, is quite different from that given by the gentleman from Kentucky. Yet both of those gentlemen vote alike, both voting against the proposition of the gentleman from Mississippi. [Mr. Crittenden.] One says that if it had been simply to strike out the Green amendment he would have voted for it.

Mr. GILMER. I did say that exactly.

Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi. The gentleman from Kentucky said he would not have voted for it in the form in which it was presented by the gentleman from Mississippi, while the gentleman from North Carolina says he would, and his party would; yet the gentleman from Kentucky is one of his party.

Mr. MARSHALL, of Kentucky. The gentleman from Mississippi will do me the justice to say that the reason why I would not have voted for the proposition of the gentleman from Mississippi, was that the effect of that proposition would have been to kill that very amendment of which I was in favor; and we could not have got a vote upon it at all.

Mr. GILMER. If the Crittenden amendment had been simply to strike from the Senate bill the Green amendment, I together with a large majority of the House, would have voted for it. This was the fair, regular way to do it. Then the next vote would have been a fair and plain one, to wit: The Senate bill without the Green amendment on one side, and the Crittenden bill on the other. The Crittenden amendment seemed to be the result of the study, and evidently it was offered in such a double and duplicitous manner; that, under the rule of the House, those of us who would vote with conservative gentlemen against the Green amendment, would have to vote at the same time against the whole Crittenden bill, which we most approved. In short, the Crittenden amendment said to me, "you shall not vote against the Green amendment, without voting at the same time against the Crittenden bill." I repeat, had the motion been made to strike out the Green amendment from the Senate bill, it would have been a bill; then the next choice would have been the Senate bill with the Green amendment out, or the Crittenden-Montgomery bill. Does the gentleman say that?

Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi. You would have had your choice. But, would you have voted for the Senate bill with the Green amendment struck out?

Mr. GILMER. My colleague (Mr. Shaw) reads from the Lecompton constitution to show that it prescribes a proper qualification for voters, and shows in that connection speaks of the Missouri constitution, notice of which appeared in the papers long after my speech was made. Was that treating my views fairly? What had the Missouri constitution, irregularly formed and void, to do with the subject under discussion? And I suppose my colleague intended by that sort of statement to have it go ahead that the Crittenden-Montgomery bill did not provide exactly the same safeguards as to the qualification of voters. I can see no other purpose. An examination of the two bills will expose this injustice.

He says further, erroneously, that I took the ground that the people of Kansas would vote down the Lecompton constitution; and that when they came to make a new constitution, they would have the power to vote and take away from the United States eight million acres of public lands. And he said as follows: "State 2. And if it further created, that the State of Kansas is admitted into the Union upon the express condition that said State shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the public lands, or with any regulations which Congress may find necessary for securing the title in said lands to the bona fide purchasers and grant thereof, or impose or levy any tax, assessment, or imposition of any description, whether on, upon them or other property of the United States within the limits of said State."

And then he says I voted against this first and necessary measure of security. Is that true? Did not the Crittenden-Montgomery bill leave precisely the same safeguards intact, when I voted for one bill in preference to another, both having the same provision in this respect, did I vote against these necessary safeguards? This is another among the many attempts made by my colleague to do me injustice in my absence.

But what did my colleague do? What provision is there for the protection of the rights of the United States in the public lands in the bill admitting Minnesota? Minnesota has also the same millions of acres of public lands in her limits, of more value, too. Is there any provision in that bill which secures the title in her public lands in Minnesota, such as there is in her public lands in Missouri, such as there is in the Senate bill? No, sir, none. I will strictly copy this bill to my speech. It is a bill simply admitting Minnesota as a State into the Union, and not a single word is contained in it about securing the right of the United States to the public domain in the Territory of Minnesota. My colleague voted for that bill—I voted against it.

Now, I wish to show to the committee what a distinguished gentleman from the State of my friend (Mr. Davis, of Mississippi) says as to the effect of admitting a new State, without the bill admitting the State, providing for the security of the Government's title to the public lands, refer to the Hon. Jeremiah DAVIS. In a recent letter to his constituents, he uses the language:

"The consequences of admitting a State without a recognized precedent of the rights of the United States to the public domain, are, in my opinion, the transfer of the title, with the eminent domain, to the people of the State thus admitted without restriction."

If this view, entertained by the Senator from Mississippi be true, then our friends who voted for the bill admitting Minnesota, who voted for the provision, which my colleague from North Carolina conceives to be so important to preserve our interest in the public lands, have done the very same thing which he undertakes, as I think unjustly and unfairly, to charge me with.

But that is not all, Mr. Chairman. I voted against the Minnesota bill for this reason, among others, that it contained this extraordinary provision, to wit:

"Sec. 1. Every male person of the age of twenty-one years or upwards, belonging to either of the following classes, who shall have resided in the Territory of Minnesota, without this State for six months next preceding any election, shall be entitled to vote at such election, in the election district of which he shall at the time have been for ten days a resident, for all offices that may be, or hereafter may be, created by the people:

"1. White citizens of the United States.

"2. White persons of foreign birth, who shall have declared their intention to become citizens, conformably to the laws of the United States upon the subject of naturalization.

"3. Persons of mixed white and Indian blood, who have adopted the customs and habits of civilization.

"4. Persons of Indian blood residing in this State, who have adopted the language, customs, and habits of civilization, after an examination

before any district court of the State, in such manner as may be provided by law, and shall have been pronounced by said court capable of enjoying the rights of citizenship within the State."

My colleague may account to his constituents for his vote in favor of this constitutional provision.

My colleague only voted for this, but, according to his own doctrine, voted for a bill the provisions of which give up millions of the public lands.

My colleague draws a picture, and gives his statement to his own constituents, and he says to Kansas. He says, "I have not said how or for what our southern friends also want them. As in this I had said nothing, it was not my purpose to justify myself to get people into Kansas unadvisedly and prematurely by cities. My purpose here and elsewhere has been to do all in my power to lay out the most judicious and profitable subject of slavery, and in the country, in all sections, to leave this whole question to the result of the moral and natural immigration, and the citizens of the United States—those actually settled in the Territory—fairly and justly to decide this question at the proper time and in the proper way."

[TO BE CONTINUED IN OUR NEXT.]

GREAT EXCITEMENT IN PETERSBURG.

On last Monday, Petersburg was the theatre of an excitement, such as has never been known in that place for many years. We learn by the papers received this morning that our Saturday night last, two slaves of T. W. Eppes, Esq., Proprietor of Powell's Hotel, and a house servant (belonging to Andrew Kevan, Esq., were among the missing. From circumstances attending the case, it was ascertained that they had started on a trip North, and on making enquiry, it was ascertained that the Schir. Kevan, Captain Baylis, of Brandywine, Del., had, since the time of their disappearance, sailed from City Point, on James River, with a load of wheat for Brandywine Mills.

Suspecting that they had taken passage in her, dispatches were sent to Norfolk to have the vessel stopped; and, to make the matter sure, a steamer was chartered to follow and overtake her, if possible.

On the steamer's coming up with the vessel, Capt. Baylis denied having any negroes on board, and very readily consented to have his vessel searched.

On going into the cabin and raising the floor, Mr. Eppes' negro girl was found stretched out at full length, with barely room to breathe. At first Mr. Eppes did not recognize her, as she was dressed in man's clothing. Continuing the search in the hold, under a bridge space, over which the wheat had been stowed, four other negroes were found, all men. Mr. Eppes' Frederick, Mr. Kevan's, John Bell, Mr. John Harv's, Joe, and another man belonging to Mr. Oliver Hamilton. The captain, after the finding of the negroes, owned up, and said that he had been negotiating with their passage by a negro man.

The steamer took the schooner in tow, and carried her back to the city, where, on her arrival, it was as much as the police could do to keep the crowd from lynching the Captain and Mate. They were conducted safely to jail; however, and, upon trial, no doubt will get their deserts.

The Express says that the schooner Kevan is owned by Wm. Danbury, Norfolk, the suspected slave-stealer, who was driven from that city on Friday night last. Baylis, by connection with recent developments in Norfolk, is already implicated in some most villainous underground operations.

The Kevan is valued at \$800. It is a small, low looking two-masted affair, capable of holding about twelve hundred bushels. By the laws of the State, the vessel is confiscated, and the Captain and Mate, if found guilty, compelled to pay a fine of \$500, and be sent to the penitentiary, on each indictment, for a term of not less than three nor more than ten years.

There appears to be a kind of systematic arrangement going on in Petersburg and Norfolk. Last week, the Captain and crew of the schooner Fanny French were arrested and lodged in jail for having concealed on board a negro man, who was attempting to make his escape North; and now, little over a week after, another vessel is caught with five negroes concealed on board, with, of course, the same object in view.

We hope and trust that the severest penalties of the law will be visited upon these negro-stealing villains, at least, so severe as to deter others from the future pursuit of this nefarious business.

Wilmington Herald.

OUR TROUBLES AFLOAT AND ASHORE.

It appears that the difficulties arising out of the late unjustifiable outrages upon our commerce by that imp of darkness, the British steamer Styx, which is now cruising about the Gulf, and amassing herself by encroaching away at our unsuspecting coasters, is not the only subject of importance which has occupied the attention of the authorities at Washington of late. A misunderstanding has long existed between this country and Venezuela, concerning this island and its valuable Guano deposits. A party of Americans stationed on this island to collect Guano was driven away by military force, and the act being considered a flagrant outrage by our government, the Department at Washington has repeatedly demanded indemnity, but has always been evaded by long winded dispatches and diplomatic trickery, and the Venezuelan envoy, Mr. Heecker, who arrived in this country last fall has been guilty of such indecorous behavior that he was immediately dismissed by the President. Subsequently, however, on offering apology for his indecorous conduct, he was restored to his position, and stands at present, and it is thought that if Venezuela does not immediately pay up, Laguerre will be sent to the island to receive the required indemnity. The Guano islands, to which the right of Venezuela is undisputed, are very valuable, and, it is said, will be seized by the United States should the passage of Mr. Heecker be effected. It is understood that Mr. James, of New York, will be recalled, and that Mr. Tappin, of Indiana, has been appointed Minister.

Verily Mr. Buchanan's administration, in the fulfillment of its peace policy, appears destined to carry out the prophesy contained in the Irishman's dream, which Pat says "all ways go by contraries ye

know." What with the "Belgium" war, the "Hawaii" war, the "Sax" war, and the "Greece" war with which Uncle Sam now has his hands full, we rather think that the old fellow's pocket will rapidly recover from its recent attack of plethoria.—*Washington Herald.*

THE CANVAAS—DISCUSSION IN DUPLIN.

From the Duplin Standard.

Durham Co., May 25, 1858.

News Editor.—I attended at Kannaville on the 24th inst., for the purpose of hearing the discussion there between Messrs. McRae and Ellis, candidates for the gubernatorial chair. There was a large collection of the citizens of the country on the occasion, all apparently anxious for the discussion to commence. About 11 o'clock I saw the crowd making for the court room; I hastened up myself, and found the house as crowded, even at that early hour, that it was impossible for me to obtain a seat, so I necessarily had to take my stand, and listened for two hours to the remarks of Judge Ellis. I was of course interested, at the topics discussed referred to the prosperity, financial condition, &c., of my native State.—He spoke of the great enhancement in value of our lands, the improved condition of the poor children of the State as to education, several salutes at the position of his native State, &c., &c.

Mr. McRae then rose, calm and collected, and commenced his rejoinder in a beautiful and impressive manner, which at once riveted the attention of his hearers and kept them rapt for two hours without the least manifestation of fatigue. He told his audience that he well knew his surroundings, and if they supposed that he had come amongst them for the purpose of begging their votes, they were mistaken; but said that he would be less than a man did he not appreciate the office of Chief Magistrate of his native and beloved State. He told us that he came amongst us for the purpose of giving to some information relative to matters which immediately interested or concerned us all, and which was of vital importance to our property and success as a State. He told us that his competitor had spoken of the great prosperity of the State, the enhanced value of her lands, but failed to speak at the same time of the great increase of taxes under which we labored. Mr. McRae evidently proved that while the lands had advanced in value, our taxes had increased more than a hundred fold. He completely demolished the Judge's position on that portion of the debate. He next showed evidently and conclusively to every unprejudiced mind, that the improved condition of the poor children of the State, to which Judge Ellis had so triumphantly called our attention as one of the evidences of the State's progress, was mainly attributable to the money which our State received from the general government in 1842; in fact, nothing more nor less than distribution, and given to the State by a democratic Congress.

I could give you a further synopsis of the debate if I thought it all necessary; but deem it entirely superfluous. I will merely say that Mr. McRae clearly and satisfactorily proved to every unbiased mind, the necessity and propriety of North Carolina's calling for and receiving her portion of the public domain, while it is being given up gratuitously to other States, which position he maintained with a match sound logic and good reason. I cannot believe otherwise than that I must have convinced every mind. He made one of the best and most argumentative speeches that I ever had the pleasure of hearing at a political discussion, which certainly produced quite a sensation, and left a very pleasing impression on his hearers. I feel assured that Mr. McRae's prospects in Duplin are far more encouraging than they were previous to the 24th inst.; and if he could be heard at every precinct in the State, he would be elected by an overwhelming majority. All the people need, is proper information on the subject, and then there would be little doubt as to the complexion of their views or the result of their decision.

DUPLIN.

Murder in Harris.—We learn from a gentleman from Harris county, that on Tuesday last week, a difficulty occurred at Whitaker's Cross Roads, between Harris county, between John W. Myland and Barton A. Brooks, which resulted in the death, on Saturday last, of the former. The circumstances as related to me were substantially as follows: A dispute had arisen between the parties, in which some pretty hard words were used on either side, but by the interference of friends, they were prevented from coming to blows, after which Myland walked off, when Brooks picked up a club near by, and concealing it beneath his coat, followed in pursuit, and while Myland was standing talking with some gentlemen near by, Brooks came up and drew the club from beneath his coat and struck Myland a blow over the side of the forehead, severely fracturing his skull, and causing death as above stated. Brooks has been arrested and is now in jail.—*Chatham Sun.*

Wonderful Discovery of Gold.—The Richmond Whig, of the 12th inst., says:—"We learn from a reliable gentleman, recently arrived from the South, that in the last few weeks there has been opened at what is known as the Pickens Gold Mine, about two and a quarter miles from Altoona Ga., a vein of gold of rich quality, not superior to any ever discovered in this country. The vein has been penetrated at three different points, and exhibits the most astonishing richness. He promises to leave with us as a specimen as soon as he obtained a parcel promised to be forwarded by the owners."

Central American Difficulties Settled.

Washington, May 21.—Some official information received here, says that a treaty has been concluded for the settlement of all differences between Costa Rica and Nicaragua, including the boundary between these countries. It is also said that San Salvador has entered into a treaty of amity and alliance. It is believed that Honduras and Guatemala will also come in.

CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

SALISBURY, N. C.

TUESDAY EVENING, JUNE 8, 1858.

TERMS OF THIS PAPER PER ANNUM.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

No name of a new subscriber will be entered on our list, without payment in advance; nor will the paper be sent to subscribers for a longer time than they have paid for.

The red X mark indicates that your subscription year has nearly expired, and is notice for a renewal, if you desire the paper continued.

CLUB RATES.

Without, we have offered to the public no prospect of "shilling" because under the cheap plan, we had found clubs a source of more trouble than profit. But "shilling" has become so common, and we are so often spoken to by our subscribers, that we have concluded to offer the following club rates.

Five copies, \$5.00
Ten copies, \$10.00
Club extending ten, in the same proportion, \$2.50 each.
Payment always in advance. A few copies given to those who send clubs of ten. A free copy, and a book worth \$2. (to be selected by the subscriber) to those who send clubs of 20.

EPW are authorized to announce Mr. J. C. Bannister, as a candidate for the office of Sheriff for this County, at the ensuing election.

APPOINTMENTS FOR MESSRS. ELLIS & McRAE.

The following have been agreed upon between these gentlemen, with the understanding that when they separate, they do so that each one may take the places where he thinks it most important for him to be:

For R. K. McRae.
Weldon, Halifax, Friday, June 11th.
Wilmington, Warren, Monday, June 14th.
For J. W. Ellis.
Wilmington, New Hanover, Friday, June 11th.
Oakland, Granville, Monday, June 14th.
For J. C. Bannister.
Kathlamet, Ferns, Wednesday, June 16th.
Yanceyville, Currituck, Friday, June 18th.
Watersville, Rockingham, Saturday, June 19th.

The 6th of October.—Notwithstanding Mr. Gilmer's speech in favor of his friend, Mr. Campbell, Black Republican, that gentleman (if it be possible) will call Black Republican a gentleman, has been committed to Mr. Vallandigham, Democrat, has been delivered entitled to the seat. Campbell will be re-elected, secured his election by legal free negro votes. Such is the man Mr. Gilmer chose to defend. Verily the low rank holders of our State is growing darker and darker.—*Ed. Standard.*

One of the wickedest things attempted by democratic editors in North Carolina, is that of making out that Hon. JOHN A. GILMER is false to the South. They know, perfectly well, that there is not one particle of truth upon which to lodge such an imputation. The above paragraph from the Standard, illustrates the mode in which these unjustifiable assaults have been made upon him; and here, in this case, the highest virtue of the public respect—honesty—is made the ground work of a most base and false insinuation. Mr. Gilmer, as a committee man to whom the contested election case was referred, had, and could have had, no motive in the world for defending the claims of Campbell, except from the conviction of his being clearly entitled to the contested seat, and this conviction he obtained from an investigation of the recorded facts set up for the examination of Congress. Campbell is an abolitionist, Mr. Gilmer, a slaveholder. If Campbell's principles in regard to slavery were carried out, they would deprive Gilmer of his property. Now, then, can it be supposed that Mr. G. would be more likely to favor Campbell than Vallandigham, who is said to entertain pro-slavery sentiments? Mr. G. occupies, politically, an antagonistic position in reference both to Campbell and Vallandigham, and was therefore, in the best possible position to give an impartial and unprejudiced decision in the case submitted to him. He did this, and decided in favor of the man, for whom, naturally, he could have no partiality. He must have been influenced by the facts alone in the case; and because he had the independence to defend his honest conviction, against the democratic claims, the Standard, who knows, we suppose, little or nothing of these facts, would insinuate Mr. Gilmer as corruptly siding with abolitionists! If such treatment is not enough to disgust honest men and send them into private life, then we should like to know what. Few men of real worth and honesty, with sufficient ability, can ever be induced to accept a seat in Congress, and so false insinuation and slander becomes the reward of public virtue, we may look for the country to fall into the hands of villains.

Strawberries and Ice.—After all, it is not so bad to be an editor. He enjoys some advantages by virtue of his position, and they are therefore peculiar; and not the least of these are the presents which clever and well-doing folk sometimes send into his office. He never gets

much from donors either in patronage or presents, for the best of all reasons—they have nothing to buy. But we are dignified. Our acknowledgments are but for another dish of most delicious strawberries, (with sugar on them,) the time from Mrs. D. A. Davis. They were the product of her garden, of large size (the largest 3 1/2 inches in circumference), and of excellent flavor. Also, to A. T. JAMES, Esq., of Newbern, for a magnificent block of ice, sent up on Monday's train.

We thought, when we first heard of the arrival of this ice, that it was Judge Ellis' doing. He is an exceedingly polite man, and it occurred to us that this was a cunning trick of his to keep us cool, in the West, whilst he was laboring in the East to warm up the democracy; who, it is but natural to suppose, require his most ardent efforts to induce them to stick to him as the nominee of the party. But we were mistaken. The Judge had nothing to do with it; McRae keeps him entirely too busy to admit of his practicing such small arts with which he is so well acquainted, and usually yields with comports skill. He is raising a war whip and spur, and carrying dead weights. The treatment of citizen Holden, by the Charlotte Convention, is a wearisome, vexatious and long, that is calling him at every jump. And then there are those pesky, stinking, rascals Whigs, who figured so conspicuously in the management of the Convention which gave him his nomination! The respectable, old-line democrats, can't help turning up their noses at the idea of having fallen into the hands of such a pack!

Tut! Tut! What have those mean things got to do with our text!—We beg your pardon friends! The strawberries were truer and more natural than any political creed in the world; and A. T. JAMES' ice was pure that either Judge Ellis or McRae—a great deal purer—especially than Judge Ellis. Fortunately, we can get certificates to this assertion, if they are required; for we sent chips from our "block" to some ten or a dozen friends, who will back us up, if necessary.

"Kin kin Giddings."—Have any of the democratic press who recently assailed Mr. Gilmer, teaching certain alleged conversations given him by Mr. Giddings, on the making of his speech against the Lecompton Constitution, fallen back that greedily announced slander? Will they do so, when convinced that they have done Mr. Gilmer injustice? In alluding to this subject, a few days ago in the House, Mr. G. said—"I say here, with solemn regard to truth; that no such thing as a conversation by Mr. Giddings, of Ohio, did occur, such as stated by him, (Mr. Shaw) and none of any kind to the best of my recollection." Mr. G. also announced that he will, on the first opportunity, make a suitable reply to the speech of his colleague, (Mr. Shaw), in which this charge was iterated.

British outrages on American vessels in the Gulf of Mexico, is the topic of conversation now, especially at Washington and in the large cities; and it is an exciting one; for the indignation of the Country has been aroused. Can it be that the officers in command of these aggressive war steamers have been acting under instructions from the British government? And if so, has that government deliberately resolved upon provoking a war with the United States? It is hardly possible that these numerous outrages were perpetrated without instructions from proper responsible officers acting under instructions. Hence, a humiliating apology on the part of England, or a war, seems inevitable. Our Government has sent out vessels to arrest these lawless proceedings and to protect American ships. Of course their commanders are clothed with authority to use the force under their command, should it be necessary to accomplish the objects of their mission. Should the "Wabash" or the "Savannah" come up with the notorious "Styx," in the act of searching an American vessel, it is more than likely there will be some pretty high talking, to say the least.

The North Carolina Planter, for June, A. M. GORMAN, publisher, Raleigh, N. C., is on our table. It bears several marks indicative of value. The proprietor is expending money and labor to make it useful, and it is therefore worthy of patronage. Price \$1 a year.

Tournament.—Weldon, N. C., was the scene of high excitement on the 21st May, giving out of the contest for knightly honors in the tournament arranged for that day. Sir J. T. Evans, and Sir A. Russ, both of Weldon, were the two most successfully knights. Miss Cornelia Happer, of Weldon, was selected queen of Love and Beauty. The ceremony of crowning the queen, and her three maids of honor, Misses Harriet Day, Alice Miles, and Fanny Ellis, took place at 6 o'clock, P. M. The ball commenced at 9 o'clock.

The Tri-weekly Mocksville mail (3 hours back) went into operation on Friday last. The route selected, is via Ford's Mill and Jerusalem P. O. Arrives here at 11 o'clock, Monday, Wednesday and Friday. Departs same day after the arrival of the Northern mail in the afternoon, 4 1/2 o'clock. Running time, from point to point, 3 hours. The contractor, Col. H. B. Arrens, is making ar-

rangements for the transportation of travellers who may desire to try beyond Mocksville.

Free Barges a part of the Constitution.—A friend writes to know if Free Barges is a part of the Constitution. It is. Having passed the Legislature by a vote of a three-fifths vote, and at the next by a two-thirds vote, and having been submitted to the people at the ballot-box and ratified by them, the Governor of the State by proclamation proclaimed the fact. Every native or naturalized citizen, who has paid his taxes, is now entitled to vote for members of the Senate as well as of the Commons. This is a great Constitutional right, and it has been secured to the people by the Democratic party of the State.—*Raleigh Standard.*

Conventions.—The Washington Union of Saturday last says:

"The House of Representatives yesterday passed eighty-five bills, seventeen of which were Senate bills. It is understood they ran through the private calendar, and gave a complete manifestation of devotion to the public interest as to leave little room to doubt the final adjournment of Congress on the day fixed. The House passed the army, the steamer, and Post Office appropriation bill. A good day's work."

It may be taken for granted, therefore, that Congress will adjourn on the day heretofore fixed, the 7th of June.

THE SUPREME COURT

Will commence the Summer Term, in this City, on the second Monday in June. Cases will be called, as follows:

June 15, three from the 1st Circuit.
" 16, " " " 5th " "
" 28, " " " 9th " "
July 5, " " " 3d " "
" 13, " " " 6th " "
" 19, " " " 8th & 7th "

Indignation Meeting in New Orleans.

New Orleans, May 20.

An indignation meeting, composed of 5,000 persons, was held this afternoon, Gen. Palfrey presiding. Resolutions were passed recommending the equipment of an armed vessel for the purpose of resisting British aggression. The greatest enthusiasm prevailed.

Resolutions have also been offered in the Common Council of the city, authorizing the Mayor to equip and send an armed vessel against the British cruisers in the Gulf.

Washington, May 20.

The sale of the military reservation at Rock Island, Illinois, has been postponed by the Secretary of War for the present. The ordnance ship Plymouth, Capt. Dahlgreen, left here this morning for the Gulf. She has an armament of one eleven inch and four nine inch shell guns, and a crew of two hundred and twelve men. She is in a high state of efficiency and all hands are in high spirits.

Three Signs.—The Baltimore Republican notices "three things which have just now come to hand that are strong signs that sectional agitation upon the slavery question has had its day!"

1. The speeches of Mr. Frye and others in the Southern Convention against the revival of the slave trade.

2. The refusal of the National Free Society to lend itself, through its publications, to the objects of Abolitionists.

3. The refusal of the California Legislature to receive free negroes within the limits of that State.

Several Tennessee papers are discussing the propriety of reconstructing the State of Frankland. The Memphis Bulletin favors a division of Tennessee, and the formation of a new State from the Western portion with North Mississippi and the Western corner of Kentucky.

The Lecompton Constitution Approved.

St. Louis, May 25.—Incomplete returns from the election in Kansas indicate a majority of 750 in favor of the Lecompton constitution. The utmost equity was manifested in regard to its vote, and the pro-slavery vote very small.

Convicted of Bigamy.—We learn from the Fayetteville Carolinian that at the Cumberland Superior Court, week before last—Judge Manly presiding—Hugh Barclay, alias H. C. Bartlett, was tried upon the charge of bigamy, found guilty, and sentenced to be branded on the left cheek with the letter B, to receive 29 lashes on his bare back, to be imprisoned thirty days, then to receive 20 lashes more, and to be let loose. Bartlett, no doubt, is a great villain, and every punishment is well deserved. He had married three or four women, one of whom is a resident of Fayetteville. We think he was arrested in one of the counties west of this place.—*Charlotte Democrat.*

NOTICE.

The remains of the late Dr. Mitchell will be removed from Asheville to the top of the Black Mountain for final interment, on Wednesday the 16th of June. The procession will leave Asheville at Tuesday morning in charge of the body, and all persons desiring to attend are invited to join at that time. The country at large are invited to participate in the proceedings, and as several distinguished gentlemen from abroad have been invited, one or more addresses may be expected.—*Asheville Spectator.*

Relief to be Lighted on Sea.—We are glad to have it in our power to state that a company for lighting this City with gas has been formed, and will at once go to work, as is desirable on early in October to see "Raleigh by gas light."—*Raleigh Register.*

The Crops.—A letter in the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette, from Fairfax Court House, says "that the crops in all parts of Fairfax are looking uncommonly well."