against recommending any appropriation for new buildings. His efforts and argument induced them to report the bill back unanimously to the House, without any recommendation, leaving it to exercise its own discression. But for the rule heretofore adopted—against undertaking new works—a majority of the Committee would have favored this bill.

To the Associated Press.

WASHINGTON, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

The Covode Committee are still engaged in investigating what appliances, if any, were employed to effect the passage of the Lecompton bill. It is said Attorney-General Black will be examined to-morrow.

T. W. Walker of Brooklyn testified to-day that Mr. Wendell never made a contract or agreement with him as has been charged, to assist in passing that or the English bill, although Mr. Wendell paid him $500 at the close of last session, for what purpose does not appear.

The House Committee on Post-Offices and Post Roads, to-day decided in favor of Col. Butterfield's route, and instructed a bill to be reported granting him the postal contract. He designs touching at twelve ports on the Mexican Gulf. The bill will provide for a weekly mail, at $200,000 per year.

The Committee also took up Mr. Humphrey's bill, appropriating $150,000 for a post-office and site in Brooklyn, and unanimously instructed the Chairman to report it to the House without recommendation on the subject—the Committee being divided.

The following-named gentlemen voted with the Republicans, ousting Mr. Cooper (Dem.) from his seat, which was afterward given to Mr. Howard (Rep.):

Messrs. Adams and Anderson of Kentucky, Davis and Harris of Maryland, Etheridge and Maynard of Tennessee, Hickman and Schwartz of Pennsylvania, and Gilmer of North Carolina.

This is the first contested case decided this session.

For more than an hour to-day the House has been nearly deserted, owing to the members going to the Senate to hear Mr. Douglas. Every seat in the spacious galleries was occupied, while the floor of the chambers was crowded with those having the privilege of admission, including the Foreign Ministers.

Methodist Episcopal General Conference.

THIRTEENTH DAY.

BUFFALO, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

The Rev. Dr. Nathan Bangs of New-York was introduced to the Conference, and invited to a seat on the platform.

A great number of petitions and memorials, generally of an uninteresting character, were presented and properly referred.

The Committee on Itinerancy reported against a change of the rule in relation to the election of deacons to orders. The report was adopted.

The Committee to try Appeals reported that in the case of the Rev. Mr. Holmes, of the Rock River Conference, they had reversed the decision of the annual Conference, depriving him of his credentials, and had returned him to full communion.

Dr. Haven, from the special Committee on Methodism, reported that the testimony is conclusive in regard to the fact that Methodism had its commencement in this country in 1760, and recommended that the annual Conferences celebrate the event during the present year; the Bishops to appoint a Committee of seven who shall fix upon a place and make suitable arrangements for the occasion. The report was tabled, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Slicer, from the Special Committee to whom was referred the communication of Dr. Luckey, reported in favor of substantially adopting the plan recommended for an executive or biennial conference. The report was tabled, and ordered to be printed.

The invitation of the Central Railroad to the Conference to visit Niagara Falls was extended to all the ministers and their wives in attendance on the Conference and all resident ministers.

An invitation to visit Goat Island was accepted, and one from the Cataract House, offering to furnish dinners to the excursionists at fifty cents apiece.

Mr. Munsell of Peoria called up the resolution presented by him yesterday, and undisposed of at the hour of adjournment. The object of the resolution was to establish the rule that actions which are Constitutionally wrong and not forbidden by the Discipline shall not be tolerated, or acquire any rights or privileges in consequence of the silence of the Discipline in regard to them. He proceeded to explain the nature of the resolution.

Dr. Hodgson objected to the discussion. The resolution evidently was designed to have a bearing upon the Slavery question, and the proper time for the discussion of that question had not come.

The Chair (Bishop Scott) overruled the objection, and

Mr. Munsell proceeded, and was continually interrupted by points of order until his time expired, and the resolution was tabled.

The design was evidently to stave off the discussion of the Slavery question till a more convenient season.

A resolution instructing the Committee on Boundaries to inquire into the expediency of a union of the Arkansas and Missouri Conferences, occasioned some debate, in the course of which the troubles in Texas were alluded to.

Mr. Slem of Baltimore hoped that if the Pro-Slavery conferences designed to mob, &c., this conference would be careful how it increased their powers for mischief.

The resolution was finally tabled.

The Bishops, by resolution, were requested to inform the conference whether any additional number of Bishops are required by the Board.

The Book Agents were instructed to take proper steps to procure an act of incorporation for the Book concern.

The Committee on Correspondence was instructed to inquire into the expediency of preparing a suitable address to the Methodist Episcopal Church South, with a view to the establishment and maintainance of fraternal relations between the two bodies along the borders.

Mr. Colchaser, in explaining his resolution, said that it was designed to cover such action as is necessary to be taken in regard to the persecution to which the church is subjected in the Border States. Since his arrival here he had received an account of the mobbing of a church in Eastern Virginia. A state of war existed, and there was no use in attempting to reply with bowie knives. He believed that a proper address to the brethren of the South would meet with a proper response, and that measures would be taken by them to put a stop to these border difficulties, and restore peace and harmony to the church.

Dr. Floy of New-York thought he had heard strange things here to-day. He had heard of bowie-knives, war and bloodshed—strange things to be heard of in a body like this, composed of the ministers of the Church of Christ. He had heard strange propositions before, but the proposition to send a fraternal letter to a body which we have never recognized, asking them to put a stop to outrages, was the most astonishing of all.

The resolution was tabled by a decisive vote.

Mr. Conkhill offered a resolution directing that a Committee of Five be appointed, to memorialize the Governors of Southern States, asking that our people be allowed the privilege of worshipping God, in accordance with the spirit of our institutions. Adopted.

The session to-day has been rather stormy and gave the first real indications of the feeling existing between the extremes on the subject of Slavery.

Arizona News.

ST. LOUIS, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

The Arizona correspondent of *The Republican* says instructions have been received at Fort Buchanan from the War Department directing the letting of all contracts for supplies, amounting to nearly $750,000, to a certain party of favorites, without advertising for bids.

The Provisional Government is meeting with great favor in all parts of the Territory.

Crime is diminishing, and the thieves and murderers are leaving the country. A company of rangers is organizing at Messila to take the field against the Apaches under the command of Gen. Owing in person.

Fire at Rahway, N. J.

NEWARK, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

Messrs. John C. Denman & Co.'s extensive carriage manufactory at Rahway, N. J., the largest in the State, was destroyed by fire last night. The building contained about sixty carriages ready for shipment. Loss $50,000. Insurance $60,000. The fire was the work of an incendiary.

A large new building, just erected by Mr. Denman, and partially occupied by C. D. Morraran, as a saddlery and hardware store, in this city, was set on fire early this morning. An unsuccessful attempt was made to fire another establishment of Mr. Denman at Rahway at the same time.

Movements of the Hon. John Bell.

BALTIMORE, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

The Hon. John Bell and family came passengers by the yesterday afternoon train from Philadelphia, en route to the West. The train arrived too late to connect, and he took the late way-train, and stopped for the night at the Relay House, nine miles from this city. He goes West this morning over the Baltimore and Ohio Road, in a special car provided by the Company.

Ratification Meeting.

PHILADELPHIA, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

A grand meeting to ratify the nomination of Bell and Everett will be held on Thursday evening, in Penn square. Distinguished speakers are promised, including a grandson of Patrick Henry.

THE CHICAGO CONVENTION.

THE CANVASS FOR CANDIDATES.

Preferences of Various States.

THE PROSPECTS OF MR. SEWARD.

Special Dispatch to The N. Y. Tribune.

CHICAGO, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

Delegations are organizing, and canvassing is going on, amid much excitement. The opponents of Seward are confident of defeating him, but his friends have greater confidence of securing his nomination. They expect from 80 to 90 votes on the first ballot, and then perhaps the support of portions of all opposing States when they break from local candidates. Efforts are making to adopt the unit rule in doubtful delegations; if these are successful Seward will be defeated. Everything depends upon the obstinacy and union of Pennsylvania, Ohio, New-Jersey, Indiana, and Illinois.

If they show any signs of wavering, Seward will be successful. The Indiana delegation will vote on the first ballot solid for Bates; Illinois for Lincoln; Ohio for Chase, afterward dividing between Bates and Lincoln. Only three or four Ohioans are for Seward.

Virginia is reported to have gone over to Seward, but will give a majority vote to Bates. Kentucky is divided between Lincoln and Bates.

Lincoln may get Wisconsin and Minnesota early, and he threatens Bates in Indiana, and elsewhere. The vote of Connecticut will be eight for Bates, four for Chase. The shrewdest and most impartial observers predict Seward's success.

12 o'clock, m.—The Presidency of the Convention is still unsettled. Messrs. Ashmun, Boutwell, and Corwin are talked of. Mr. Salter is the Seward candidate, for which they expect a return of some votes.

The aspects this evening are less favorable to Mr. Seward. It is believed nothing but Mr. Cameron's influence can nominate him. Leading opponents of Mr. Seward say confidentially he has gone up, but this is too strong. His friends are hardly less confident. Gov. Morgan considers it settled for Mr. S., but it is clear that he is not so strong as this morning.

Virginia is now not inclined to vote at all, but a majority are against Mr. Seward.

Kentucky is trying to nominate Cassius M. Clay for Vice-President.

Indiana is vascillating between Messrs. Bates and Lincoln, but will probably vote as a unit.

Vermont is hesitating, and is likely to leave Mr. Seward. Maine is unsettled, Massachusetts is half for Mr. Seward, certain. The rest are unsettled. Indiana visits Massachusetts to-night to plead against Mr. Seward. So does Connecticut, which is firm against him, as is also Rhode Island.

A proposition which meets with favor will be submitted that 152 votes, or a majority of the whole Electoral College instead of 119, be required to nominate. If this is carried it will defeat Mr. Seward.

There is not much said about other candidates. Mr. Bates's friends are firm and hopeful.

Frank P. Blair and Gratz Brown came over from St. Louis to-day. John B. Haskin is here. There is hard talk against Mr. Seward, and his friends make threats of a discussion in Convention upon his merits as a candidate.

Including Texas and Kansas there will be 237 electoral votes represented in the Convention. Probably every Delegate will be allowed to vote, making 474.

The only sure electoral votes for Mr. Seward are: New-York, 35; Michigan, 6; Wisconsin, 5; Minnesota, 4; Texas, 4—total, 54.

California will probably vote for him first, but only one-fourth of the delegation can be held or are certain at all. New-Hampshire and California are hoping for an opportunity to vote for Fremont.

To the Associated Press.

CHICAGO, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

Large additions to the numbers in the city are made by the arrival of every train, and the Convention bids fair to be the largest ever congregated together.

The circular issued last night, about a column in length, giving the reasons why Mr. Seward should be rejected and Mr. Bates nominated, and which is signed by Horace Greeley, Francis P. Blair, and the Missouri delegates, has been decidedly detrimental to the fortunes of Mr. Bates, and creates some reaction in favor of Mr. Seward.

Some reliable and sterling Republicans express doubts as to the policy of nominating Mr. Seward, and his success is by no means certain; but the main body of the delegates and outsiders are decidedly in his favor, and the chances favor his nomination after a brief struggle.

Messrs. Bates and McLean are evidently out of the field.

Mr. Wade is now mentioned as a candidate, with prospect of success should Mr. Seward be beaten.

Ice Off Cape Race.

ST. JOHN'S, N. F., Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

Several icebergs have for some days been in sight off Cape Race, causing the European steamers to go too far south to be intercepted. They are, however, disappearing, and it is hoped news will soon and regularly be obtained off the Cape.

The wind here yesterday and to-day has been from N. E., and the weather cloudy and cold. Thermometer to-day 43°.

Georgia Politics.

AUGUSTA, Ga., Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

Gov. Johnson, Judges Nisbet and Warner, and other prominent Georgians have written letters, which are published, condemning the seceders at Charleston, and favoring the Baltimore Convention. The Hon. A. H. Stephens is appointed a delegate to the State Convention.

Alabama Politics.

MOBILE, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

A large Democratic meeting was held last night, denouncing the secession at Charleston, and passing a resolution that Alabama be represented at the Baltimore Convention. Delegates were appointed to the Selma Convention on the 4th of June.

Obituary.

BALTIMORE, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

The venerable Thomas Murphy, formerly for forty years one of the proprietors of *The Baltimore American*, from which he retired about seven years since, died at his residence in this city this morning, in the 81st year of his age. He was connected with the first paper published in Baltimore. He was widely known and highly respected and esteemed.

Burning of a Western Steamer.

LOUISVILLE, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

The steamer Silver Star, from Evansville to Paducah, burned to the water's edge Saturday evening, at Curlew Coal Mines. Five lives were lost. The boat and cargo are a total loss. Insured for two-thirds their value in Pittsburgh offices.

The Canadian Parliament.

QUEBEC, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

The Government announced last night that Parliament would probably adjourn at the latter end of the present week.

National Exhibition of Horses.

SPRINGFIELD, Mass., Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

The Fourth National Exhibition of Horses will be held in this city the first week in September.

XXXVIth CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

SENATE....WASHINGTON, May 15, 1860.

Certain departmental communications were received.

Mr. PUGH (Dem., Ohio) introduced a bill in addition to the acts for the punishment of crime against the United States. Referred.

The noise and confusion in the galleries, which are crowded, is so great that scarcely anything can be heard.

On motion of Mr. PUGH the bill amendatory of the act to establish a Territorial Government in Utah was taken up.

After some discussion, the subject was postponed until Monday next.

The bill for the relief of Anson Dart, Superintendent of Indian Affairs in Oregon, was taken up.

Mr. LANE (Dem., Oregon) explained the bill.

Without action, the special order (Mr. Davis's resolutions) was taken up.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Dem., Ill.)—Mr. President, I have no respect for that species of discussion which consists in assaults upon the personal character of any Senator. I have no desire to elevate my own position by attempting to pull down others, or to place any Senator in a false position before his constituents. I have no assaults to make upon any one, and no impeachment of the record. I am willing that each Senator should stand before the country and his own constituency upon the record as made for himself. I do not complain of so much of the speech of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Davis) as arraigns my political position, for it seems to have been necessary for him to draw a parallel between his opinions and my own. In self-defense, it may be necessary for me also to refer to the position of that Senator, by way of contrast to my own, with a view to illustrate my own opinions. I shall not indulge to-day in the discussion of any abstract theory of government, much less go into the discussion of the legal issue which has lately been attempted to be forced on the Democratic party as a judicial issue. Upon a former occasion, when forced into a discussion with the Attorney-General of the United States, I did amuse myself with the discussion of certain legal propositions, not because they had anything to do with the political issues before the country, but because that law officer seemed to have no official duties to occupy his time, and I had the leisure to reply to him. The principal points to which I shall direct my remarks to-day, and the sole cause why I am delivering any speech, will be found in certain extracts from the speech of the Senator from Mississippi (Davis). [The Clerk read several extracts from Mr. Davis's speech, denouncing the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty].

Mr. DAVIS (Dem., Miss.) made an explanation to the effect that had he known, he might have made some verbal correction, and also stating that Mr. Cass was no longer a believer in the doctrine, but had yielded to the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. DOUGLAS stated that he had taken the speech as he found it in *The Globe*, and wished it understood that he desired not to be interrupted, and continued: I intend to treat him (Mr. Davis) fairly and kindly, as I doubt not it has been his intention to treat me. The facts stated in these extracts conclusively show that this doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty, or non-intervention, as the Senator has indifferently used the terms, did not originate with me in its application to the Territories of the United States, but that it was distinctly proclaimed by Gen. Cass in his Nicholson letter. He became the nominee of the Democratic party with a full knowledge of his opinions with regard to non-intervention, and was supported by that party on that issue. The same doctrine was incorporated in the Compromise measures of 1850, in opposition to the efforts of the Senator from Mississippi, and in harmony with the views and efforts of myself, and reaffirmed by the Baltimore Convention of 1852, and Gen. Pierce was elected President of the United States upon this same doctrine, and it was again affirmed by the Congress of the United States in the Kansas and Nebraska bill of 1850, and had its first trial and yielded its first fruits upon the plains of Kansas in 1855 and 1856. These facts are substantially and positively affirmed by the Senator from Mississippi, and these facts disprove and refute the charge so often made in the last year, that I have changed my opinions with regard to this question since 1856. The Senator from Mississippi has done me a service, has searched the records for me with a view to my condemnation, and the result of his search is to produce the most conclusive and incontestible evidence, that his charge of my having changed my opinions, which was the pretext for my removal from the Committee on Territories, was not true. He tells you frankly what the world knew before, that he has always opposed this doctrine of non-intervention. And he claims, after it has yielded its blighting effects on the plains of Kansas, the Supreme Court has come to his rescue, and he is now triumphantly sustained in his opposition to this doctrine in 1848, 1850, and 1851. Sir, whether he is sustained or not, in the views which he then held, and which I then combated, is not so material as to find out which is right in the point at issue then and now, by the Senator from Mississippi and myself. I propose, in the first place, to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that this doctrine of non-intervention by Congress with Slavery in the Territories of the United States was brought distinctly before the American people, and the Democratic party, in 1847, with a view to its decision by the Convention of 1848. The Senator has referred to a letter of Gen. Cass, which bears date Dec. 27, 1847, and tells the Senate, what all of us knew before, that that letter, in manuscript, prior to its publication, was passed around among Southern and North-Western Democrats to receive their sanction. The latter was prepared and was in private circulation for days and weeks before the date it now bears of its public issue. The Senator informs us that he, at the time, dissented from the doctrine of non-intervention as stated in the Nicholson letter, but other Southern Senators now opposed to me, or at any rate, other leading politicians, would not be able to say, when submitted to them, they condemned it as frankly as the Senator from Mississippi did during that period while this letter was being circulated. The especial friend and right-hand bower of Mr. Cass (Mr. Daniel S. Dickinson) presented two resolutions to the Senate, embodying the same doctrine.

Mr. PUGH read the resolutions referred to.

Mr. DOUGLAS—It will be observed these resolutions, presented in December, 1847, assert distinctly the doctrine which the Senator from Mississippi then and now denounces. I am not aware that Mr. Dickinson and Gen. Cass have ever disclaimed their views, much less the doctrine of these resolutions and the Nicholson letter; yet my record on this question is held up to the world and to the country as if I stood alone in the Democratic party, a heretic then and a heretic now, and therefore I am not entitled to fellowship in the regular Democratic organization. I am aware that some other people and some States of this Union held this doctrine of non-intervention, or regular Squatter Sovereignty, if you please—for they are correlative terms. I will call attention to the resolutions adopted by the Legislature of Florida, which passed the Senate of that State on Dec. 28, 1847, and the House of Representatives on Dec. 29, and were approved by the Gov. on Dec. 30. I am aware that Florida subsequently passed resolutions asserting doctrines inconsistent with these, and I state this as evidence that this doctrine, for which I am now arraigned, was not deemed to be political heresy at that day. It may not be improper here to remark that, during this session of Congress, I received a letter from a State Senator of Florida, inclosing resolutions which he had introduced for the repeal of those resolutions which I have read, as being unsound, and unconstitutional, and dangerous to the rights of the South, and denouncing me by name as the great author of all this mischief, which is to strike down Southern rights. [Mr. Pugh (Dem., Ohio) read the resolutions.] It will be observed that in their resolutions the State of Florida had declared that the Territorial Legislature, while in a Territorial condition, had the exclusive right to determine for itself whether Slavery shall or shall not exist within the limits of such Territory. As I have remarked, Florida changed her policy, but if she solemnly proclaimed that doctrine to the world as a sovereign State of this Union, I should think she could forgive us for remaining faithful to her creed, if we can forgive her for abandoning it. I, Sir, arraign no man, and much less a sovereign State. She had the right to proclaim her opinions, and if she afterward believed they were wrong she ought to have changed them. But, Sir, having proclaimed them, and then changed, it seems to me that even quarter should be granted to those who stand by Florida's original position; and Florida was not the only State that held these doctrines at that time. I have here some resolutions adopted by the Democratic State Convention of Georgia in 1847, and I have seen it asserted in newspapers that they were copied into several other Southern Conventions.

Mr. PUGH read the resolutions, Mr. L. Q. C. Lamar's name being among the signers.

Mr. DOUGLAS proceeded. Here, Sir, we find this doctrine of non-intervention distinctly defined by the Democratic State Convention of Georgia. Two things are affirmed: that Congress has no constitutional power to legislate on the subject of Slavery in the Territories. One would think that was pretty good non-intervention. Cannot legislate to establish, to reject, or to protect it; cannot legislate at all on the subject in the Territories. It may be, and unquestionably is, true that some of the eminent men who participated in that Convention have since changed their opinions, and now believe it is both within the power and duty of Congress to legislate for the protection of Slavery in the Territories, just as they then believed it unconstitutional. All I have to say to these men, for whose talent I have great respect, is, that I can forgive them for having changed from the doctrines which they invited us of the North to rally in support of, and I think they could pardon us for remaining faithful to that doctrine which we and they agreed to stand upon. In pursuing this subject I fear I may become tedious, but I feel it my duty to present the evidence that the Democratic party stood plain on this cardinal doctrine of non-intervention. I can show, on high Southern authority, that the Convention which assembled in 1848 to nominate a candidate for President and lay down a platform for the party, affirmed the doctrine of non-intervention. The attention of the country and of the party had been specially called to this doctrine of non-intervention by Congress with Slavery in the Territories. Hence the nomination of Gen. Cass, with his opinions as expressed in the Nicholson letter, was not the result of accident, but he was chosen because he spoke the sentiments of a majority of the Democratic party at the North. In that Convention, in the Committee, on the first ballot, Gen. Cass received sixty-six votes from the slaveholding States; Mr. Buchanan, nineteen; Mr. Woodbury, eighteen, &c.—the votes being given by Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri. These States did not think Non-Intervention, or Squatter Sovereignty, as it is now called, was a heresy which furnished sufficient cause for disrupting the Democratic party, much less dissolving the Union. They voted for Gen. Cass with a knowledge of his opinions on this question; he was their first choice. Old Virginia did not take him as a choice of evils. She had an opportunity of voting for a Southern man, holding the same views which are now expressed by the minority of the Democratic party, as shown by their repeated votes at Charleston. She could have voted for Mr. Calhoun; but old Virginia believed that intervention on the subject of Slavery meant disunion. Hence, she gave her vote first, last, and all the time for Gen. Cass, the great expounder and embodiment of non-intervention. The same is true of Mississippi, represented here ever so ably by the Senator who arraigned me. He tells us he has ever fought this doctrine, but at that time he had not so much power in the State, and hence he was then unable to seduce Mississippi away from this doctrine, and Louisiana, then true to the Democratic creed, true to the doctrine of non-intervention, true to the maintenance of the Union, hostile to intervention because it led directly to disunion, she rallied around Gen. Cass as the standard-bearer in 1848, first, last, and all the time. So with other States. Then on the fourth ballot Gen. Cass received from the slaveholding States ninety-four votes, Mr. Buchanan seven, &c.; and even South Carolina, when she found her favorite had no chance—so soon as she found Gen. Cass was the choice of a majority of the party—she wheeled into line, and declared for the champion of Squatter Sovereignty, or Popular Sovereignty, or Non-intervention, or whatever you choose to call it. She did not then think this doctrine was sufficient cause either to dissolve the Union or disrupt the Democratic party. On the first ballot Gen. Cass received only fifty-nine votes from the North, while he received sixty-six from the South, being a majority of the whole number. These facts show that he was not the choice of a majority of the Northern Democracy, but was the choice of a majority of the Southern Democracy. I will now proceed to show that these votes were cast with reference to the distinct question of non-intervention, as now supported by myself, and affirmed by the Democratic party at Charleston, and as resisted by the Senator from Mississippi and those who seceded from that Convention. After Gen. Cass had received the nomination, the following facts appeared: He had received two hundred and fifty votes; necessary to a choice, one hundred and seventy. Thereupon the record says: "Lewis Cass of Michigan, having received two-thirds of the votes cast, "is"—here an interruption took place to allow the other States to make it unanimous. But they were proceeding to declare him elected on a two-thirds vote of those present and voting, but not two-thirds of the Electoral College, New-York not voting because she had a double delegation. The speeches were made in favor of making it unanimous. Mr. Yancey and Mr. Winslow of Alabama pledged the people of that State to support the nominee; also Sydenham Moore and others united in the pledge. There were some ancient names there who did not think this doctrine to be such a fatal heresy as to form a sufficient cause for disrupting the Democratic party at the hazard of disunion. Gov. Winslow pledged the people of Alabama for Gen. Cass on this doctrine, and carrying the Nicholson letter in his hand as the compass by which his political action should be governed. Sydenham Moore is not a name unknown to fame, and he did not think this doctrine such a fatal blow to Southern rights. Also, gentlemen from Kentucky and Tennessee pledged the support of their States. The next day the platform was adopted in which this doctrine of non-intervention was affirmed.

Mr. PUGH read the seventh resolution of the platform.

Mr. DOUGLAS resumed—In 1848 the Democratic party thought interference was unconstitutional, and would not permit it by Abolitionists or any others. They did not regard an Interventionist as any better than an Abolitionist. They said that Congress must not interfere at all, nor others. What others? Why those men who want a Slave Code. Southern Interventionists and Northern Interventionists were, by that platform, put on an equality. After that Mr. Yancey felt it his duty to record his solemn protest against this dangerous heresy, and he came to the Convention next day with a long protest, accompanied with a resolution. I shall ask the Senate to listen to the whole of that entire report of Mr. Yancey, for it embraces every thought, idea, principle, and every pretext assigned at Charleston for withdrawing from the Convention. I may here be permitted to remark that in whatever I may say I mean no personal disrespect to Mr. Yancey. We are old personal friends. We met as members of Congress seventeen years ago, and our social relations have always been kind and uninterrupted. I have as much admiration as any man living, for his unsurpassed ability and high social qualities, and the boldness and nerve with which he avows his principles, although I shrink with horror from the consequences to which his principles would lead the Republic. [Mr. Pugh read the report of Mr. Yancey, and resolutions.] It will be observed in this report there is the whole argument in favor of intervention, or protection, or for any other purpose which we have heard repeated over and over again for so many years. I doubt if any Senator can take his own speech, and find any one idea in favor of that doctrine that is not embodied in that report of Mr. Yancey. It was not denied that Gen. Cass held this doctrine, and was nominated because he held that the people of the Territories might either introduce or exclude, permit or prohibit, Slavery at their pleasure; and for that reason Mr. Yancey and his colleagues protested. The argument of the equality of States is used, and also that Territories are the common property of all, and that it is not creditable to the Democratic party to go before the country and dodge the question of the rights of the South in the Territories. He said the Convention had refused to express an opinion on the question of whether the Territorial Legislature could prohibit Slavery or not, and it was not creditable to avoid expressing an opinion. It convicted the Democratic party of double-dealing; and what rendered it more necessary to express an opinion was that the candidate held the opinion that the Territories could exclude Slavery. He then concluded with a resolution. This proposition was submitted to the Convention and rejected, 36 to 216.

Mr. PUGH read the vote by States:

YEAS—Maryland, 1; South Carolina, 9; Georgia, 9; Florida, 3; Alabama, 9; Arkansas, 3; Tennessee, 1; Kentucky, 1.

NAYS—Maine, 9; New-Hampshire, 6; Massachusetts, 12; Vermont, 6; Rhode Island, 4; Connecticut, 6; New-Jersey, 7; New-York, 35; Pennsylvania, 26; Delaware, 3; Maryland, 6; Virginia, 17; North Carolina, 11; Mississippi, 6; Texas, 4; Tennessee, 12; Kentucky, 11; Ohio, 23; Indiana, 13; Illinois, 9; Michigan, 5; Iowa, 4; Missouri, 7; Wisconsin, 4.

Mr. DOUGLAS resumed: Here we find these Slaveholding States voting against the incorporation of the doctrine of intervention for the protection of Slavery into the platform. They voted against the doctrine of Mr. Yancey's report and resolutions. These States then had an opportunity of affirming this doctrine, if they thought it ought to be any portion of the Democratic creed. You will find votes against this doctrine from Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, the very States that have now seceded from the Charleston Convention, for the reason that the same doctrine was not incorporated in 1848, voting against it in 1860, their delegations bolting the Convention because it was not put into the platform. The Senate and the country can judge who has changed on this question. Now, I think, I have shown conclusively that the Democratic creed in 1848 was non-intervention by Congress with Slavery in the Territory, either for it or against it, that Congress should not interfere either to establish, to abolish, to protect, or to maintain but unqualified non-intervention. The Democratic party was committed to the doctrine. It is true there were individual exceptions. The Senator from Mississippi was one of them. He supported Gen. Cass under protest, making speeches for him, and protesting against his Nicholson letter and the doctrines contained in it. The Senator had a clean record, but a record outside of the Democratic Party, and a record at war with the Democratic Platform, rebelling against its principles, but acquiescing in its views. The Senator then, as he does now, granted no quarter to Squatter Sovereignty, but he made speeches for the Squatter Sovereignty chief.

Now I pass to 1850, in order to show clearly that this same doctrine of non-intervention was incorporated in the Compromise measures of that year against the will of the Senator, and on my motion. We did differ then as we do differ now—he against them, and I for them. I deem it my duty to show that this doctrine was fully discussed and affirmed by a vote of nearly two to one, in the Compromise measures of 1850. Mr. Douglas referred to the bringing in of the Territorial bills and the bills themselves, and to the "Omnibus" bill of Mr. Clay. The bills, as reported from the Committee on Territories, were silent on the subject of Slavery, but the Committee of Thirteen reported an amendment against the Territorial Legislature passing any law in respect to African Slavery. Mr. Clay said this was against his vote and his judgment, and Gen. Cass made a similar statement. [Mr. Pugh read extracts from Mr. Davis's speeches at the time against the bill.] Thus it will be seen the Senator from Mississippi objected to the bill because it did not contain a prohibition in the Territory against their legislating adversely to Slavery. He wished the Territorial Legislature to have power to protect, but not to prohibit. That was his position, and he (Mr. Douglas) gave him credit for consistency. He (Mr. Douglas) wished to give the Territorial Legislature power to legislate, leaving all kinds of property on an equal footing; but the Senator from Mississippi desired an exception as to Slavery, to the effect that they might protect, but should not adopt unfriendly legislation. [Mr. Pugh then read Mr. Clay's reply to Mr. Davis.] There it will be found that the issue was made between Mr. Clay and the Senator from Mississippi, the latter claiming that Congress should provide for the slaveholders to go into the Territory, and hold his property in defiance of the local law. Mr. Clay said he would never agree to the recommendation of such a doctrine. He was against the repeal of the Mexican laws against Slavery, and was against any act that would deprive the people of the Territory of the right of deciding for themselves whether they would have Slavery or not. In other words, Mr. Clay supported and sustained every act which the Senator from Mississippi brings in judgment against me now, except one vote which I gave under instructions. This debate shows clearly that the Compromise measures of 1850 were intended to assert the doctrine of non-intervention, leaving the people to do as they pleased, so they did not violate the Constitution.

Mr. PUGH read further from the debates.

Mr. DOUGLAS proceeded: These extracts will show that the issue was precisely as I have stated. Mr. Clay answered the objection about there being two constructions to this doctrine of non-intervention. He was for non-intervention by Congress, and no restriction upon the Territorial Legislature, then leaving it to the Court to decide whether the Territorial enactments were constitutional or not. That was the position of Mr. Clay, the champion of those measures. The Senator from Mississippi asserted his right to go, in violation of the local law. The Senator modified his amendment, but did not change the principle, and it was rejected. Then Mr. Chase offered the counterpart, that while the Territories might prohibit they could not protect or tolerate. That was rejected by precisely the same number of votes as the proposition of the Senator from Mississippi. I am compelled to do in this connection something I dislike, to quote from my own speech, to show I held the same position then as now.

Mr. PUGH read extracts from the speeches of Mr. Douglas, also extracts from the speech of Gen. Cass in opposition to the amendments of Messrs. Davis and Chase.

Mr. DOUGLAS resumed. Having thus rejected the two propositions, that record shows that Mr. Douglas moved to strike out all in the bill concerning Slavery, so the people of the Territory might do as they pleased. That was voted down. But when made subsequently, at the suggestion of Mr. Clay, by Mr. Norris of New-Hampshire it was carried by a vote of 39 to 19, thus rejecting the doctrine of the Senator from Mississippi, and sustaining the proposition advocated by myself. We differed then, as we do now. I sustained it then, as I do now; and he fought it gallantly, but he was defeated, and my proposition became the basis of these measures. Congress adjourned immediately after the passage of those measures, in the midst of a terrific excitement, North and South. Northern editors inflamed the passions of the people by making them believe these measures were for the extension of Slavery, and Southern men inflamed the passions of the people there, making them think they were a sacrifice of Southern honor. I went to my own State to make my vindication to my people. The country knows that history as recorded, and the mode in which I was received. The City Council of Chicago, which was filled with Abolitionists, had passed resolutions annulling the Fugitive Slave Law. The standard of rebellion was raised; public passion was inflamed, and civil war was anticipated by every man. It was not a pleasant task for me to go into a public meeting thus inflamed, and tell those people that they had been deceived about the character of these measures; to tell them that the Fugitive Slave Law was right—required by the Constitution, and ought to be supported; that the Compromise measures were founded upon correct principles. History records the fact that I met that infuriated populace of honest and intelligent, but misled and misguided men, and I defended each and every one of these measures before that people, and procured from them a resolution that the Fugitive Slave law should be executed, and the Compromise measures stand. This was done under circumstances when my best friends warned me that my life would pay the forfeit.

Mr. PUGH read from Mr. Douglas's Chicago speech.

Mr. DOUGLAS—I submit that that speech, made under those circumstances, half a million copies of which were circulated, and which received a wider circulation than any speech made in my whole life—I submit whether it is right to charge me with having asserted for the first time at Freeport, in 1858, that the people of a Territory ought to decide this question for themselves. I told the people of Chicago then that every people ought to possess the right to manage their own domestic concerns, in their own way. The people of the State possessed the power, and the people of the Territory ought to have it. The Legislature of Illinois was elected a few weeks afterward, and when they assembled they passed resolutions approving these Compromise measures of 1850. Thus, sir, I was sustained in my appeal to my own people, in justification of my position, and the views of the Senator from Mississippi. How was it with his appeal to his people? The country has not forgotten, and will not forget, with what anxiety all Americans looked to Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina, to know whether or not these submissions were to be sustained and the Union caved, or whether the idea then proclaimed and now held by the Senator from Mississippi would become the rule of action in the Southern States. I knew not what he meant, but the country believed that the fate of the Union depended on the result in those States. I do not doubt the attachment of the Senator to the Union, or his devotion to his country, but I believe had he been sustained in his appeal to the people, the Union could not have been preserved. Gen. Foot was the standard-bearer of the friends of the Compromise measures, and the world knows the result. Mississippi decided against the Senator. She rebuked this doctrine, and placed her foot upon it. In Alabama, Mr. Yancey led off, sustained by the same body of men who so lately attempted to break up the Charleston Convention, and Alabama, like Mississippi, told Mr. Yates to obey the laws and acquiesce in their great principles. In Georgia the battle raged fiercely, and the Senator from that State (Mr. Toombs) will bear testimony he had to form a union of Union men against the opponents of these measures, and when the election came, Georgia decided in favor of the compromise measures by about 21,000 majority. The opponents themselves became submissionists in turn, but they submitted by compulsion of their people. So in South Carolina, the Rhetts led the forces against these measures, and the gallant and patriotic Butler, although he opposed the measures here, felt it his duty to sustain the authorities, and South Carolina decided against these men who are going to break parties and Unions on this question of intervention. Here you have the verdict of the American people North and South in favor of this doctrine of non-intervention, and the Southern interventionists, who had been defeated and overthrown, came to the conclusion they would submit. We said to them, "Although you have erred on this question, we will forgive you." We received the Senator from Mississippi, and granted him quarter, after he had been condemned.

Mr. DAVIS (in his seat)—I scorned it.

Mr. DOUGLAS—Yes, Sir, as I scorned his quarter the other day, and I like the spirit in which he scorns it. But, Sir, the Convention at Baltimore ratified and decided in favor of these Compromise measures. Gen. Pierce was on that issue, and was elected, and the Senator from Mississippi became Secretary of War by virtue of that same issue. These are stubborn facts. When the party came together the friends of the Compromise measures made no issue. We were generous, and did not remind them of their defeat and humiliation, but recognized them as our own equals, and never expected to be told that we were to be pursued to the death, and no quarter granted whenever they accidentally got the power. We are tolerant, and if we succeed now, we don't propose to proscribe any man, so long as he remains in the Democratic organization and supports its nominees. Mr. Douglas then asserted that his principle was carried out in the Kansas and Nebraska bill. At that time the Senate had a Chairman of the Committee on Territories who did unquestionably reflect the sentiments of the body, and of the Democratic party. It having become necessary to organize the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, the Committee reported a bill on the 4th of January, which set forth distinctly the principles on which they proposed to organize these Territories. It was then distinctly proposed that the question of Slavery should forever be banished from the halls of Congress, and be remanded to the people of the Territories. No man could be excused for not knowing the true meaning of that bill. It was that Congress renounce for ever all right or pretext to interfere with Slavery in the Territories, either to protect or prohibit. The report of the Committee was perfectly clear, and the terms of the bill still more explicit.

Southern men then objected to putting this in the bill; it was a rather bitter pill for them, but he insisted on their swallowing it, as necessary to the passage of the measure—for the bill declared that the people of the Territories should be left free to do as they pleased under the Constitution—the Courts to determine the meaning of the Constitution. Non-intervention by Congress was the doctrine of the bill; that Congress should never interfere for any purpose whatever, either to introduce, prohibit, or protect Slavery; and expressly stipulated that the old French law protecting Slavery should not be revived. Mr. Badger's amendment was put in for this express purpose. The only point of difference at that time was as to the extent of the limitation imposed by the Constitution on the authority of the Territorial Legislature, and it was agreed that the Courts should determine that, and the question never come again into the Senate. He quoted from Mr. Hunter's speech to sustain this view. He then proceeded to show that the Southern people understood the matter at the time just as he did. He read the resolutions of the Georgia Legislature of 1854, after the passage of the Kansas bill, indorsing that legislation, to support this statement. Those resolutions were as good a platform as he wanted. He was willing to accept them, without dotting an *i* or crossing a *t*. The country then understood the measure as he understood it. The House of Representatives understood it in the same way. Mr. Richardson, who reported the bill in the House, was made the Democratic candidate for Speaker, at the next session, against Banks. He was opposed on the ground of being a Squatter Sovereignty man, and wrote a letter in which he clearly announced the doctrine of the absolute power of the people of a Territory over Slavery. Yet after that he received the vote of the Southern Democracy, with one or two exceptions. A distinguished gentleman of South Carolina, who, up to the time of writing this letter, had refused to vote for Mr. Richardson, now came to his support on the 108th ballot. [Laughter.] He believed he was as sound on the question as Mr. Richardson. Who had changed since then? Was it he? No. If Southern men changed their opinions, he had no fault to find, but if they had done so they ought honestly to avow it. If he could forgive them for changing, could they not magnanimously forgive him for adhering consistently to their former doctrines? In 1856 Alabama also insisted upon the declaration at Cincinnati of the doctrine of non-intervention. She sympathised with Mr. Richardson, the leader of the Kansas bill in the House, and indorsed the support given him by the Democratic members of Congress. The Alabama Convention of 1856 construed the Kansas-Nebraska bill just as he did, and instructed the delegates to Cincinnati to withdraw unless a platform were adopted in consonance with this view. He stood on that platform now, yet Alabama now seceded because the majority of the Charleston Convention adopted the Alabama resolutions of 1856. He did not believe the Democracy of Alabama approved this action, and would follow the lead of Mr. Yancey any more than she did in 1848.

Mr. PUGH read extracts from the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS resumed: They repealed the Missouri Compromise because it was inconsistent with the non-intervention doctrine, and for the purpose of applying that principle, and banishing the Slavery question from Congress, and remanding it to the people of the Territories. That was the only object. Every Senator who voted for it so declared that non-intervention was the rule of the Compromise measure of 1850.

Here Mr. Douglas became so much exhausted that he gave way to an adjournment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The House met at 11 o'clock.

Mr. BOTELER (S. A., Va.), from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill to remove the United States Arsenal from St. Louis, and establish the same and an armory at Jefferson Barracks.

Mr. SHERMAN (Rep., O.) offered a resolution that the Japanese Embassy be invited to visit the House of Representatives, and that a Committee of five members be appointed to convey to them this invitation and make suitable arrangements.

Mr. HOUSTON (Dem., Ala.) said the gallery was the proper place for them.

Mr. SHERMAN replied that the Speaker would no doubt appoint a sensible Committee, who would invite the Japanese to seats in the gallery to witness the proceedings.

Mr. SMITH (Dem., Va.) said they could go there anyhow.

Mr. HOUSTON'S motion to table the resolution was voted down by a large majority, and the resolution was passed.

The House resumed the consideration of the Michigan contested election case.

Mr. GARTRELL (Dem., Ga.) argued in favor of Mr. Cooper, the sitting member, and Messrs. STRATTON and GILMER against him.

The House passed the resolution by 97 against 77, declaring Mr. Cooper not entitled to a seat.

The House then passed the second resolution reported by the Committee on Elections, that Mr. Howard is entitled to a seat, by 92 against 77.

On motion of Mr. DAWES, Mr. Howard was sworn in and took his seat.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union on the bill to supply deficiencies in the Post-Office Department for the year ending the 30th of June.

It appropriates thirteen millions and a half, seven millions six hundred and ninety-four thousand of which is for inland mail service. The Postmaster-General is to restore the service on all the routes under the contract of March 4, 1859.

This was debated at length, when the Committee rose without concluding the subject, and the House adjourned.

THE TROUBLES AT ST. GEORGE'S-IN-THE-EAST.—The troubles of this unhappy London Church seemed destined never to end. Here is a sketch of one forenoon's performance:

"As usual there was a great crowd in Cannon street prior to the opening of the gates for the 7 o'clock service, and when they were admitted, they indulged themselves by making the most hideous noises of which they were capable. Five priests and about twenty choristers came from the vestry in procession, and were violently hissed as they took their places within the rails of the communion table. The Rev. Bryan King (the rector) and the Rev. T. D. Dove (the curate) ascended the reading desks, Mr. King saying the prayers amid constant interruptions. During the hymn, which was sung after prayers, a gentleman ascended the pulpit, who had a mustache and a huge beard. He was received with a loud shout of derisive laughter, loud cries of "Nanny," and imitations of the cry of a goat. The rev. gentleman appeared to be astonished at this strange reception, and evidently did not understand it. He is the Rev. John David Jenkins, M. A., Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, Canon of Cape Town Cathedral. Scarcely a sentence of the sermon was distinctly heard."

THE LOSS OF THE R. F. SASS.—The following is a corrected list of the persons known to have been lost by the sinking of the R. F. Sass:

Mrs. JAMES V. LINDSAY, New-Orleans.
Mrs. KATE WHITTEN and son, 15 years old, Lafayette, Ind.
Mrs. H. C. NEAL and daughter, 4 years old, Parkersburg, Va.
Mr. WM. HARRIS, Parkersburg, Va.
JOHN PANKEY, Illinois.
O. KLINGAMAN, Iowa.
WM. WILSON, Cincinnati.
CHAS. ALLENDALE, Syracuse, Ohio.
FRANCES EAVITT and WM. EAVITT, one 12 and the other 9 years of age, daughter and son of Mrs. Cavanah of Louisiana, going to Indiana.
WM. HENRY DEWITT, colored fireman, Cincinnati.
GOFF, porter of the boat, Cincinnati.
Two servants of Dr. Robertson of Nashville.
ROSA, servant of Mrs. Corey, New-Orleans.

MILITARY.—The 69th Regiment, under command of Col. Corcoran, assembled at the new Arsenal last evening, for drill and military instruction. About 800 spectators were present, most of whom were accommodated with seats on the northerly side of the hall. The regiment mustered about 400 men, including officers, and their drill of last night showed a very marked improvement throughout the ranks. The "double quick" was, after one or two trials, well executed, and elicited loud applause. Everybody seemed pleased.

CITY LIBRARY ASSOCIATION.—The annual election for officers of this Association, to serve for the ensuing year, was held during yesterday, at the Library rooms, No. 3 Abingdon square. The election passed off quietly, although a pretty full vote was cast. There were two tickets in the field, each presenting a different set of names for the Board of Directors. At the counting of the votes last night, Mr. Sinclair Tousey was declared elected President; Matthew Kane, Vice-President; E. H. Spooner, Recording Secretary; J. W. Griffith, Corresponding Secretary, and Isaac H. Moore, Treasurer. The Board of Directors is composed of fifty persons.

—Charles Hughes, of the Vine, Bishopgate street, London, and Walter Wesley of Ramsgate, played a game of billiards in the former city. The game was a thousand points; the play commenced at 6½ o'clock, and was finished by Hughes at 10:40, who beat his opponent by 276 points.