

CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

WEEKLY.

VOL. XXI.

SALISBURY, N. C., APRIL 25, 1864.

NUMBER 48.

J. J. BRUNER,

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS OF THIS PAPER—Five dollars for six months. No subscription received for a longer time, at present.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING—\$2 per square for the first insertion and \$1 per square for each subsequent publication.

Those sending advertisements, will also send the money to pay for them. Notices of 75 words or less, will cost \$2 for the first, and \$1 for each additional publication. Notices of larger size, in the same proportion.

Excitement in the Yankee Congress.

Unsuccessful Attempt to Expel Mr. Harris, of Maryland.

In the House of Representatives at Washington, on the 9th instant, the speaker (Mr. Colfax) called Mr. Rollins, of New Hampshire, to the chair, and, rising to a question of privilege, offered a resolution to expel Hon. Alexander Long, of Ohio, on the ground that he had declared himself "in favor of recognizing the independence of the so-called Confederacy, now in arms against the Union."

Mr. Colfax submitted a few remarks in support of this resolution, and was followed by Mr. Cox, of Ohio, in a speech of some length:

Mr. Cox, in his opening remarks, said he was not in the House when his colleague made his speech, but he was informed by members around him that they would bear the interpretation put upon them. Had he been in his seat yesterday, with all due respect to his colleague, he should have disavowed, in behalf of the Ohio delegation, any remarks looking to the recognition of the rebellion as crystallized at Richmond. He did not know a single member of that delegation, excepting his colleague (Mr. Long) who was willing to recognize the Confederate Government. He spoke of this because of the attempt to make partisan capital. He believed that his colleague at the time spoke only his own sentiments, and not those of his party. Recently there was a Democratic Convention in Ohio, representing one hundred and forty-five thousand voters, and in that Convention no sentiment like that of his colleague was uttered. The Democratic people in that State rallied and sent their friends and brothers to the war, although they did not agree to the African policy.

During the debate which followed, Mr. Miller, of Pa., protested against the lecture on patriotism from his colleague (Mr. Kelly) who stands on the record as having uttered a deliberate falsehood. He was not the man to talk about perjury and fidelity to the Union.

Mr. J. C. Allen, of Illinois, knew no parallel case to this, of moving to expel a member for words uttered in debate. He had imagined that under the Constitution the Representatives on this floor had the right to express their opinions freely. He dissented from the opinion that we should recognize the Southern Confederacy; but if that was the gentleman's honest conviction, he had the right to express it. If the gentleman from Ohio had been giving aid and comfort to the enemy, others in high places had been doing the same thing. The President had not only violated the spirit but the letter of the Constitution by his repeated acts of usurpation. Much as he hated the rebellion, he loved the Constitution, because it was designed to protect all men in their liberties.

Mr. Harris, of Maryland, said he endorsed every word that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Long) had uttered, and would stand by them for weal or woe. You say the gentleman meant treason at the very moment you say he was sincere and honest. He was willing to go with his friend on that issue. Could not a man say when a war is carried on to exterminate a people, that he would rather have peace—thus saving lives on both sides, and the money of a ground down people, and especially when the sentiments came from distinguished men to back him. Not one of you can be compared with the men the gentleman quoted yesterday. He was a peace man—a radical peace man. He was for recognizing the Southern Confederacy, and for acquiescing in the doctrine of secession. He had hope, but it was not in this House. A tornado would come and sweep you from power, and give it to honest men, who have humanity and some regard for the principles of their fathers. War would never bring you a Union worth a cent. He was for peace and Union too. [Laughter.] He was a better man than any of them. [Renewed laughter.] If we cannot make peace let us have two

splendid Governments—two happy Governments.

He was a slaveholder, and was still, if all his slaves had not been stolen from him. He looked on those who opposed slavery as madmen. He compassionated them. If it was a sin he was willing to bear it. The North had been deceived by stereotyped falsehood. When this war commenced Secretary Seward said it could be put down in sixty days. Instead of seventy-five thousand men ending it you have now called for a million of soldiers. A braver set of men never existed on God's earth than exists in the South; and when you attempt to elevate the negro with the white man, you stir up strife. The Partisans saw nothing in the Bible against slavery, and when they found slavery unprofitable, they sold their slaves to the South. Having taken their gold, their descendants now turn round and attempt to dispossess the South of the property. He had voted against men and money to carry on the war; he would not consent that our money should be spent by a tyrant. Not a man on-dollar would vote for this infernal war. It was the most stupendous folly that ever disgraced any people on the face of God's earth. If this treason make the most of it. It was the right of a Congressman to say he would not entrust the means of carrying on the war to a King. Who is the war power? The South ask you to leave them in peace; but no, you say you will bring them into subjection. That is not done yet, and God Almighty grant that it may never be. I hope you will never subjugate the South. The President has proved himself unfit to be trusted with the governed power.

Mr. Tracy, of Pennsylvania, rose to ask a question, but was loudly called to order by members on the opposite side. He desired to ask whether, within these halls, the gentleman could invoke Almighty God that the American arms shall not prevail.

Mr. Harris—Is that a point of order?

Mr. Tracy again essayed to speak, and was called to order from the opposition side. Much confusion prevailed.

Mr. Tracy, elevating his voice above the din, asked whether it was in order for treason to be uttered within these halls. [Renewed cries of "Order" and "Sit down!"]

Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, rose to a point of order, and desired that the language of the gentleman from Maryland be taken down at the Clerk's desk, in accordance with the rule.

The objectionable sentence, as taken down and read, is as follows: "The South ask you to leave them in peace; but no, you say you will bring them into subjection. That is not done yet, and God Almighty grant that it may never be. I hope you will never subjugate the South."

Mr. Harris, of Maryland, exclaimed: Is that all!

Mr. Pendleton raised a question of order—when

The Speaker pro tem. pronounced Mr. Harris out of order for using that language.

Mr. Washburne—For one, I protest against any man uttering such language in this hall.

Mr. Harris—You mean you are afraid of it. (Cries of "order," from the Republican side.)

Mr. Washburne objected to the gentleman from Maryland proceeding with his remarks.

Mr. Harris resumed his seat, unanimous consent being requisite for him to continue his speech.

Mr. Fernando Wood said he would read to the House the exact language of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Long) which had not been properly stated.

Mr. Washburne—Were you present yesterday?

Mr. Wood replied he was not, but he held in his hand the identical manuscript. He thought it was due to the gentleman, before the House voted on it, that they should hear what the gentleman did say. The language is as follows: "I now believe that there are but two alternatives—either an acknowledgment of the South as an independent nation, or their complete subjugation and extermination as a people. Of these alternatives, I prefer the former."

If, said Mr. Wood, he is to be expelled for the utterance of these sentiments, you may include me for a concurrence in them.

Mr. Colfax stated what he understood Mr. Long to say yesterday.

Mr. Long said he had the manuscript now before him from which he read. He prepared his speech four weeks ago. He had not altered a word.

Mr. Colfax did not believe, after the gentleman had so long deliberated, he had changed a word. In order that members should see the printed speech, which will appear in the *Globe* of Monday next, Mr.

Colfax suggested, and there was unanimous consent, that the consideration of the pending resolution should be postponed until Monday, at two o'clock.

Mr. Washburne then offered a resolution expelling Mr. Harris, the vote upon which resulted—yeas 81, nays 58. There not being the required two-thirds vote, the resolution was declared rejected.

Mr. Schenck then offered a resolution declaring Mr. Harris, "an unworthy member of this House and is hereby severely censured." This resolution was adopted—yeas 92, nays 18.

The House soon after adjourned.

FROM THE UNITED STATES.

We make additional extracts from the latest United States papers received at this office:

THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION TO EXPEL MR. LONG, OF OHIO.

The debate on this resolution was resumed on Thursday last:

Mr. Cravens, of Indiana, said he had read Mr. Long's speech, and was unable to discover any thing in it justly subjecting him to censure or dismissal. He did not believe with the gentleman in many of his conclusions. He hoped he never would arrive at the conclusions that it was necessary to recognize the Southern Confederacy. He would not have made the declaration the gentleman did in the House, but if the issue were presented to him whether he would exterminate every man, woman and child in the Southern Confederacy, he would have come to the same conclusion. The gentleman from Ohio, as the representative of a free people, had a right to be heard.

Mr. Edridge denied the right and power of the House to expel the gentleman from Ohio under this resolution. They could not expel him for opinion's sake. He referred to the New York Times, which says that Speaker Colfax's zeal has outrun his discretion, and that his resolution is neither right nor expedient, and the Evening Post says that Mr. Long's speech was a perfectly legitimate expression. If the war was conducted on a proper policy the seceded States may be brought back; but carry it on for subjugation, and you never can accomplish your purposes. He said the republican was the revolutionary party in opinions and practices, for, in overthrowing the Constitution, they overthrew the Union.

Mr. Spaulding, of Ohio, characterized the speech of Mr. Long as "criminal licentiousness," and if it was not restrained it would do more to sap the foundations of our republic than the armed cohorts of the rebellion. His colleague had come to the conclusion that the Union is lost, never to be restored, and, according to his own language, he regarded all pains to restore the Union as worse than folly, and there was no sentiment, either North or South, on which to build a Union; and further, that every clause and letter of the Constitution has been violated. His (Mr. Long's) language was uttered within seventy miles of where the two armies are now located, and who are only waiting for a few sunny hours to solve the great mooted question.

Mr. Smith, of Kentucky, said that there was scarcely a sentiment or word in that speech he (Mr. Smith) could endorse. He then arraigned the Democratic party with being the origin and instrumental in bringing on the rebellion. In the course of his remarks he repeated what Douglas had said, that "there could be but two parties—patriots and traitors." [Applause.] Mr. Smith declared that as slavery was the cause of the war it ought to be removed, so that we might have an independent nation of freedom. [Applause.] Mr. Smith earnestly contended that we should whip down the rebellion. If we cannot do that, let us subjugate the South and populate it with a better people.

Mr. Pendleton, of Ohio, said the speech of Mr. Long was made in a calm, decorous and argumentative manner. Were gentlemen on the other side afraid of the argument of his colleague? Were they afraid to trust the country? Were they, with the power which stood behind them, afraid of an honest expression of opinion? The truth was, that the matter was entirely beyond the jurisdiction of the House.—All that the House could do was to punish for "disorderly conduct."

Mr. Amos Myers, of Pennsylvania said that all Mr. Long had to do to show himself a full rebel was to present his revolver. Our soldiers would take him by the neck and heels and throw him out of the camp for declaring such sentiments as he had done. Mr. Myers then maintained that Mr. Long had the heart of a traitor. He (Mr. Myers) should vote for

the expulsion of Mr. Long, for the reason that he believed from Mr. Long's own declaration that he preferred the recognition of the Southern Confederacy to the subjugation of the South.

Mr. Harrington, of Indiana, in alluding to the pending resolution, characterized it as a partisan proceeding and not prompted by patriotism. His colleague (Mr. Colfax) had not only descended from his high position, but had at once become the accuser and prosecutor of the gentleman from Ohio. In the course of his remarks he said the people of New England have no stomachs for fighting.

This called up Mr. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, who asked him what authority he had for his assertion.

Mr. Harrington replied, he had judged such to be the case from the fact that Massachusetts has agents in Indiana recruiting negroes to fill up the quota of that State. Indiana would have nothing to do with negroes. She sends white men into the field.

Mr. Boutwell wished to know what proof the gentleman had.

Mr. Harrington replied that there was no doubt of it. Recruiting agents had been at work in his own town, and the negroes thus gathered said that they were going to Massachusetts.

Mr. Boutwell observed that Massachusetts had less to fear from Secession than any other State, because of her isolation and having two-thirds of the maritime power of the continent. The men of that State rallied to the defence of the Republic without a second invitation. He knew of no act of her Representatives on this floor to justify the gentleman in saying that they had no stomach for prosecuting the war.

Mr. Harrington—I said stomach for fighting.

Mr. Boutwell replied that they could draft without producing a mob.

Mr. Harrington said the name of Indiana was written on every battle field.—While Mr. Harrington was speaking there was some hissing in the galleries.

Mr. Eldridge said they had suffered enough from New England men in the galleries, and their breach of order ought to be prevented. Some one asked how he knew they were New Englanders!

Mr. Holman said there was ample power for the Chair to suppress such disturbances.

Mr. Eldridge said he would move that the galleries be cleared if any further disturbance occurred.

The Speaker pro tem. (Mr. Rollins of New Hampshire) directed the doorkeepers to remove from the galleries persons who might repeat the disturbance.

Mr. Harrington resumed and concluded his remarks, advocating the right of free speech, for no force could overcome the mind, however it might oppress the body.

Mr. Broomall of Pennsylvania, offered amendment to the pending resolution, declaring Alexander Long to be an unworthy member of the House, and that the Speaker read this resolution to said Long during the session of the House.

Mr. Eldridge raised a point of order, that Mr. Long's speech was made in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and no exceptions having been taken in Committee, the proposition could not, under the rules, be entertained in the House.

The Speaker overruled the point of order, on the ground that it was proposed in the amendment not to censure Mr. Long for words spoken in debate, but for the publication of his speech in Washington and New York, and his giving evidence of disloyalty, and aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. Eldridge appealed from the decision.

Mr. Holman also raised a point of order that Mr. Broomall's substitute was not germane to the original proposition.

These questions were reserved for future action.

Mr. Broomall said he offered his resolution of censure because, from what had already taken place, they could not obtain the requisite constitutional two-thirds to expel the member; and as he could not be gratified in having him expelled, must be content to get a resolution of censure.

Mr. Winfield, of New York, said there always had been and always would be Way Democrats. When assailed in the past they had always been on the side of the country to the extent of the last dollar and the last available means. This war had not been precipitated on the country by the Democratic party or any of its members. The Democrats had stood by the country's honor by precept and practice. He spoke of the rebellion as unjustifiable, unlawful, and unwholy. Considering the readiness with which Demo-

crats had rallied to the cause, it was too late to say there were no War Democrats. It was right to resort to arms to bring back the rebellious citizens to their allegiance to the Constitution. If he thought there was a prospect of peace by negotiation, he would leave no means untried to bring it about. But before he would agree to sending commissioners it must first be shown that peace overtures would meet with a corresponding spirit, and because he would not pursue this false light he was to be told by his colleague (Fernando Wood) that he had ceased to be a Democrat.

Mr. Grinnell, of Iowa, repelled the base slanders on New England; and remarked that the Western soldiers think that the soldiers from that section fight well as any other. He referred to the action of the House in 1842, when Joshua R. Giddings was censured for offering resolution, declaring that the slaves of the Creole had a right to raise and assert their native freedom. The Democrats voted in a solid body for it, and he re-produced the case as a Democratic precedent in regard to an Abolitionist. We do not hear so much of the crack of the slaveholder's whip as we did four years ago. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Harris) said that he was willing to take all the sins of slavery. Every one of the slaves of the member had a note against him with compound interest. Mr. Lovejoy, the Abolitionist, had his seat in Heaven, but the gentleman from Maryland would not have one near him. I would, remarked Mr. Grinnell, rather say a thousand-times let the country be divided, the South go their way, all slave, and the North, all free, than to see the country once more under Democratic rule.

Mr. Holman demanded this sentence should be taken down by the Clerk.

There was much merriment on the Democratic side, when

Mr. Smith of Kentucky, expressed the hope that the House would keep quiet. [Cries of "Order!"]

Mr. Eldridge trusted the House would hear the gentleman from Kentucky. [Cries of "Order!"]

After some further noisy proceedings, Mr. Grinnell said he was merely attempting to quote the remarks of Representative Coway.

The Speaker pro tem. said, under these circumstances, the gentleman from Iowa was in order.

Mr. Grinnell concluded his remarks.

Mr. Rollins, of Missouri, said his heart had been filled with sadness at the notes of party sounding here. It seemed that all was for party and nothing for the country. But for the resolution introduced by the Speaker of this House, the speech of the gentleman from Ohio would have been forgotten like many others; now, however, it would be read by thousands who otherwise would never have heard of it. He relied on the discriminating sense of the country, and did not apprehend the speech would produce harm. If the country was to be stricken down by such a speech as that, it ought to perish. While he disavowed the sentiment in that speech, thinking it was improper, if not impolitic, at a time like this, he would not censure the gentleman for its delivery, being in favor of the freedom of speech. He concluded by making strongly patriotic remarks, and at 11:20 P. M., the House adjourned till Thursday.

THE HOLDEN TRUCK.

It is due to Mr. Holden—Mr. Candidate Holden—to say, that from the Newbern Times of a late date, we learn that the "Holden Truck" was not named in honor of our Mr. Holden, but of a Capt. Holden, A. Q. M., U. S. A. So Joy says, and we are inclined to believe him.—One could not well have supposed that there were two Mr. Holdens; and then the "Silver-Gray Fox," an emblem, in a political point of view, so peculiarly adapted to our candidate, that the resemblance would have deceived a world. In disavowing the application to our Mr. Holden, Joy says they never would have named it after a "Traitor and renegade." This is the highest compliment Mr. Holden has had for many a day: the only drawback to it is, that in a later sheet it speaks of him as "an independent outspoken friend of the people, suppressed by Jeff Davis' bayonets." The snubbing of Mr. Holden by Joy, is dissipated by this involuntary tribute of admiration, and fixes Joy as the organ of the "self-made candidate."—*Rail. Confederates.*