THE NEW YORK HERALD.

WHOLE NO. 6516. MORNING EDITION—TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 1854. PRICE TWO CENTS.

NEWS BY TELEGRAPH.

HIGHLY INTERESTING FROM WASHINGTON.

THE TERRITORIAL APPOINTMENTS.

Discussion on the Slavery Question in the Senate.

Debate on the $10,000,000 Bill in the House.

THE SPEECH OF MR. BENTON.

LATER INTELLIGENCE FROM MEXICO.

Death of Madame Sontag, the Vocalist, &c., &c., &c.

THIRTY-THIRD CONGRESS.
FIRST SESSION.

Senate.

WASHINGTON, June 26, 1854.

REPEAL OF DUTY ON RAILROAD IRON—MR. BELL'S BUDGET.

Mr. Bell, (whig) of Tenn., presented a series of resolutions of the Legislature of Tennessee, in favor of a repeal of the duty on railroad iron; in favor of the Pacific Railroad; in favor of constructing a levee on the east bank of the Mississippi; in favor of granting pensions to the surviving soldiers of the war of 1812; in favor of granting land to the Tennessee mounted volunteers of the war of 1812, and in favor of making the same allowances for the lost in the Mexican war as in other wars. Also in favor of cheap ocean postage.

THE SLAVE TRADE AND SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. Clayton, (whig), of Del., from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported a bill for the more effectual suppression of the slave trade in American built vessels.

The bill provides that whenever any American registered ship or vessel shall, in whole or part, be sold to a citizen of the United States at any foreign port or place in North or South America, in West Indies in Cape de Verde Islands, or on or near the Coast of Africa, the bill of sale shall be utterly void, unless it shall be executed in the presence of the Minister or Consul of the United States, and shall contain an express condition that such sale shall not be valid in case such vessel shall make a voyage to Africa before returning to the United States and obtaining a new register. Any citizen of the United States who shall sell any such vessel, knowing that she is to be employed in the African slave trade, or that she is to visit the coast of Africa before returning to the United States, or shall charter such a vessel for such a voyage, shall, on conviction thereof in any United States court, be fined ten thousand dollars and be imprisoned for three years. Every charter of an American vessel at any such foreign port with the intent that such vessel shall be employed in the slave trade, and every sale of an American vessel on the coast of Africa, unless she be duly condemned as unseaworthy shall be illegal and void. Section two provides that upon any information being given as to the violation of this act, the District Attorney to prosecute the offenders; the informer to receive one-half of such fine as may be recovered. All vessels engaged in violation of this act to be forfeited and sold, and the proceeds to be given to whosoever may have lodged the information leading to the condemnation.

Section three provides that every owner or agent of an American vessel selling the same, and every purchaser thereof, shall, at the time of the execution of such an instrument of sale, make oath before the United States Minister or Consul that said vessel is not to be engaged in the African slave trade, which oath shall be transmitted to the State Department; and if any such person shall swear falsely, he shall be deemed guilty of perjury, and be liable to all its pains and penalties.

Mr. Clayton explained the bill, and said it had received the unanimous approval of the committee.

Mr. Chase (free soil) of Ohio, gave notice that to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a bill to prohibit slavery in the Territories of the United States.

The motion to refer the petition presented by Mr. Rockwell, from citizens of Boston, for a repeal of the Fugitive Slave law, was taken up.

Mr. Jones, (whig) of Tenn., said that he had no design to call in question the motives of the Senator who had presented the petition. He had no fault to find with the exercise of the right of petition. It was the right of every citizen, and to which he would give every latitude. He would go so far as to say that he believed it was the right of his Satanic Majesty even to send up a petition to that Court which he had insulted, and from which he had been hurled. But it was by motives and objects that petitions were to be judged. So if, in sending up that petition, he was actuated by a purpose of mischief or was hypocritical in his prayer, he deserved a deeper infamy than that to which he had already been consigned. If this petition now before the Senate be sent thither from proper motives and for proper purposes, it is entitled to all respect. If it be sent hither for the purpose of mischief and to produce strife, then it deserves the contempt of every good man. This was not the first petition of this character sent here; and had this come unattended with striking circumstances, giving it the color of treason, he would not have noticed it. But it came here with all the circumstances tending to show that it is part of the plan of operations of those with whom agitation and repeal are watchwords. He had seen already one attempt made to give practical effect to the prayer of this petition, and it had only found four Senators who would give the sanction of their names to its unholy purpose. It was said that these petitions were the result of the passage of the Nebraska bill and the repeal of the Missouri compromise. He did not believe it. It was the result of a combination of those willing to take part in any scheme to break down the constitution of the United States, and place the South under degradation and humiliation. It came from a city where the laws were openly set at defiance—where the temple of justice was surrounded by an armed mob to prevent the execution of constitutional duty—where treason stalked broadly through the streets at noonday, and where the officers of the law were butchered. The petition came from such a people and from such a place, following immediately upon these events. Was he not right in supposing this petition, got up at such a time, had in view no consideration of public interest. It came from Boston, where the dust of the first and the last martyrs in the country's cause, Warren and Patchelder, were now mingled together. He then called attention to an address, published in the *Intelligencer* of the 22d instant, said to have been adopted at a meeting of the members of Congress opposed to the Nebraska bill. The simultaneous appearance of this document with this petition might induce the belief that like birds of omen and perturbed spirits, they desired companionship in publicity as well as in sentiment. The meeting which adopted this extraordinary address was most irregular. It was secret, and no man save the three whose names were attached to the address had been bold enough to avow their connection with it. He would rejoice if they had the manliness to come forward and let the country know who they were who had given sanction to this paper. It was to be expected they would do so, and that no man would be dastard enough to screen himself from responsibility by avoiding any publicity of his connection with the meeting. It was a most carefully prepared paper. It did not say the members of Congress opposed to the Nebraska bill, nor did it say a part of them, but it said a meeting composed of the members of Congress. Who were they? How many were they? The address was signed by three persons. It may be said that these were all who were there. He had known meetings heralded to the country as large and respectable, composed only of a chairman and secretaries, and whose only claim to largeness consisted in the physical proportions of the chairman. So far as the chairman of this meeting was considered, it might be considered a large meeting. He could not believe that any one member from the South would give the sanction of his name to the statements contained in that address. He read the address and its arguments upon the encroachments by the slave power, by its acquisitions, and the designed extension of its area upon the adoption of the Missouri compromise, and the compromise of 1850, and the repeal of the former, &c., &c., &c. He commented upon the same with great severity of language. He said he was happy in the belief that not one Southern man attended that meeting. After reading the address he suggested to its unknown author to abandon the barren field of political literature, and turn his thoughts to the richer field of the works of fiction. The author of this address bids fair to rival the writer of the Arabian Nights entertainments, Eugene Sue, Paul de Kock and many others who were so prolific in works of fiction. He had never seen a production which contained in so few words so much fiction and pure imagination as this address. The address charged the South with passing the Nebraska bill, with a covered design of making the Territories slave States, with annexing half a dozen states of Mexico, and making them slave, with planting slavery on the Amazon, with augmenting its powers by the acquisition of Cuba and Dominica, and in time reducing the North to abject submission. He called for the author of this accusation. It was a serious one, and which no gentlemen should make behind the masked battery of a secret meeting. The author of it knew very well that had every Southern Southern Senator been in his grave the Nebraska bill could have passed. It would have passed if no Southern Senator had voted for it. The whole charge was a falsehood. It was wickedly, maliciously false. He could see no difference between the petition for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave law and the dissolution of the Union. There was no man that believed the Union could be preserved one day after the repeal of the Fugitive Slave law. The South asked to do no wrong to the North. All it asked was to preserve the constitution and give us our equality of right. He had been a whig all his life. He was told now by the Northern wing of that party, that hereafter the test to be applied to all whigs was the repeal of the Nebraska act, repeal of guarantees and equality to all States given by the constitution. If this was to be the test given of orthodoxy in the whig party, then he avowed himself a heretic, and suggested that against him now at once might be prepared the edict of excommunication. If to trample on the rights of any section or State was necessary to be a whig, he had to say to his former friends and associates good bye. He would rather die than follow them in any such rule of action.

Mr. Rockwell said he regretted that the duty had fallen upon him to defend the State of which he was a representative. He regretted that his predecessor was not here to discharge that duty rather than himself. This memorial was signed by over twenty-one hundred of the men of Boston. Its signers were the bone and sinew of the active business men of that city. He saw nothing in their petition either extraordinary or wrong. They simply asked for the repeal of an act of Congress only four years old, which act was in addition to the one which had been in force over fifty years. Was there treason in this? Was it treason to ask Congress to repeal an act of its own making? It was said that there were circumstances attending it which gave to it greater importance. It was signed by men who had acquiesced in the compromise measures of 1850, of which this act was one, but who were moved to ask for the repeal of this obnoxious law because Congress had repealed a previous and long standing compromise. The repeal of the Missouri compromise, he begged to assure the gentleman, had created a depth of feeling in the free States entirely unprecedented, and which would continue for years to come. It was true that in Boston, under this law, recently an arrest was made, that an affray or riot took place and a homicide committed, but it should be remembered that the constitutional authorities of Massachusetts and Boston took that matter in hand and disposed of it. Sudden tumults and affrays and violence had occurred in other places than in Boston. This petition was got up for no purpose of printing bloodshed, riots or treason. It was not got up recently. Had its signers such objects in view they would not have left their petition open to the public gaze at the Merchants' Exchange exposed to examination by the friends and the opponents of its prayer. The feeling now existing at the North was such as never had been witnessed before. It was wide spread and universal. It pervaded all professions and occupations of life. The action of Congress at this session had produced the feeling. Whole classes of men had been openly denounced in Congress for petitioning against the repeal of the Missouri compromise. He would say to Senators, with all respect, that in denouncing the clergy for petitioning against that act they had gone too far, for the clergy of New England spoke the sentiments of the whole people they lived among. Public sentiment was against this law, and the cry was for its repeal. He supposed there would always be found a party in Massachusetts ready and willing to execute it, but its execution was against the sentiments of the people. He would say to the Senator that the time had gone by when any threat of a dissolution of the Union, consequent upon the action of the people of the free States upon any measure, would deter them from doing what they conceived to be right. Threats of disunion has ceased to be an argument with them either for or against any measure. The North was devoted to the Union. They would adhere to it. They would go with it to whatsoever extent it was extended; but they did not believe that this Union could be dissolved. Disunion was an impossible thing. Why was it that Congress, while extending the Union in all directions, had neglected the great binding ligament of a railroad to the Pacific? He urged the construction of that great work, and said that he had no connection with the meeting which had adopted the address, though he fully agreed with the sentiments it uttered.

Mr. Jones asked the Senator to say how many of these signers, who were said to be the bone and sinew of Boston, had aided in executing the law lately in Boston. Was not a large number of them, with treason in their hearts and knives in hand, engaged in the recent mob to resist the constitution and the laws?

Mr. Rockwell—I do not know that one was so engaged.

Mr. Jones asked if Wendell Phillips and Theodore Parker, who had incited an ignorant and infatuated people to resist the law and the constitution, which they had not courage or manliness enough to do in person, had they nothing to do with these riots and these cry for repeal? As to the clergymen of New England he had nothing to say. He never quarrelled with women or clergymen. He transferred the fight with them to the Senator of Illinois. But he asked the Senator if he believed the Union could last one day after the repeal of the fugitive slave law?

Mr. Rockwell—I have said already that disunion was an impossible thing.

Mr. Jones—If the Senator supposes that the South will stand like cravens and submit to have their property taken from them, in violation of the constitution, he is much mistaken, and knows very little of their character. The Union, without the constitution, would be worse than slavery. Sooner than submit to such degradation and humiliation he would himself apply the torch to the temple of our union, and perish in the ruins. If the Senator expected to see the fugitive slave law repealed or the Missouri compromise restored, he might expect to enjoy a long lifetime. Neither one or the other act would the Senator ever see.

Mr. Brodhead, (dem.) of Ga., said he did not know whether this quarrel between old friends ought to go on or to stop. For twenty years Tennessee and Massachusetts had been politically associated in all Presidential elections. Tennessee had refused to vote for Gen. Cass, who opposed the Wilmot proviso, and voted for Gen. Taylor, who refused to pledge himself against it, that he might secure Massachusetts. If this quarrel was to end in their parting company, it had better go on; if not, the Senate ought to take up other business.

Mr. Sumner, (free soil) of Mass., said that he would begin by answering the question whether the Union can exist. [illegible] Union could not exist without an act—law he could not call it—which outrages all principles of humanity and right, as did the Fugitive Slave law, then the Union ought not to exist. He would not follow the Senator from Tennessee, for, like a hero of antiquity, it could be said of that Senator, "thrice had he slain his foes and thrice he slew the slain." He sincerely hoped the people of the North were not to be intimidated or cajoled into an abandonment of those great principles of freedom which they had so long been devoted to. He hoped there would be a backbone preserved to the North. He entirely agreed with his colleague as to the character of the memorialists. Among them were those who had acquiesced in the compromise measures of 1850; there were there also those engaged in great mercantile interests. It was their great interest, which, in the history of England, twice checked the humane efforts of Wilberforce to break up the African slave trade. It was the same great interest which, from sordid motives, had, in the constitution of the United States, kept, for twenty years, the same heaven-offending traffic from the judgement of the American people. He had spoken against the Fugitive Slave law here and elsewhere. He was free to avow it. For so doing he would not throw himself upon the judgment of a Senate fresh from the passage of the Nebraska act, but would throw himself upon the judgment of his country and his God. He then read numerous extracts from his former speeches on this law, and avowed again the sentiments therein expressed. He referred to the sentiments expressed in Faneuil Hall by Otis, Adams and others, preceding the revolution, in which they held that resistance to slavery was obedience to God. A short distance from that sacred edifice, said he, and between it and the court house where the disgusting rites of sacrificing a human being to slavery was lately performed, was the spot which was first moistened by American blood in resisting slavery, and among the first victims was a colored person. Near Boston are Concord and Lexington where that resistance was repeated, and it received its crowning glory at Bunker Hill. He then run a parallel between the resistance to the stamp act in 1766 and the fugitive slave act of 1850. He further contended that the former was a harmless measure when compared with the latter.

Mr. Butler, (dem.) of S. C., said that his idea on this question was, that there ought not to be any necessity for a fugitive slave law. Under the constitution, each State of itself ought to provide for the rendition of all fugitives from labor to their masters. This was certainly the design of the constitution. He had listened to the Senator who had presented the memorial, and was pleased with his manner. There was a calmness and sincerity about his remarks which required for them the highest respect. He regretted to hear him say that there was an intense feeling at the North on this subject. While he had no objection to a reference of the memorial, he, in all frankness, desired to ask the Senator if the fires, which he says are burning at the North, are not to be extinguished, what good is to be accomplished by a report of a committee? If they report that the law ought not to be repealed, that will not satisfy any person who demands its repeal. He was surprised to hear the other Senator, Mr. Sumner, indulge in such rhetorical displays and bad taste, doing no credit to his own, or that of the Senate. His speech was unworthy of the Senate and of a scholar. If he had kept it a while longer, and dressed it up a little, it might have answered for a Fourth of July oration in some localities. He would remind the Senator when Otis spoke in Faneuil Hall, when Hancock acted, and when Adams wrote, they did so as the representatives of a slaveholding State. The appeals made in those days of Boston and Massachusetts, were addressed to slaveholding States. The men of Massachusetts of that day were slaveholders and gentlemen. He regretted much the character of the Senator's speech. There was a great difference between it and that of his colleague. One was a calm, honest, sincere expression of belief and opinion—the other was false rhetoric declamation, and an incentive to rouse the worst passions of the infatuated people of certain localities. If the issue was to come, as was indicated, and the contest was to be between the North and the South, let it come and be divided at once. Let it be considered, argued, and disposed of, calmly and without exciting appeals, dressed and rhetorical display, such as was made by the Senator to-day. He would like to ask the Senator if Congress repealed the fugitive slave law?—would Massachusetts execute the Constitutional requirements, and send back to the South the absconding slaves?

Mr. Sumner—Do you ask me if I would send back a slave?

Mr. Butler—Why, yes.

Mr. Sumner—"Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?"

Mr. Butler—There he is again, with a quotation already prepared. He gets up here and spouts it out with, as he doubtless supposes, more than Demosthenean eloquence and beauty; but he is mistaken. (Laughter.) What have dogs got to do with the constitution? (Laughter.) The Senator declares that he would not execute the constitution, which he has sworn to support. The Senator openly declares that it is a dog's duty to obey and execute the constitution. The Senator has sworn to support it, and declares to do so is a dog's duty.

Mr. Sumner—I recognise no such obligations upon me.

Mr. Butler—Well, I suppose it makes but little difference what you consider obligatory upon you.

Mr. Mason, (dem.) of Va., followed, defending the Fugitive Slave law. He denied that it suspended the Habeas Corpus act, as asserted, either ignorantly or corruptly, by the Senator from Massachusetts. He said that it was Massachusetts and the other New England States which had forced into the constitution the prohibition upon Congress repealing the slave trade for twenty years. This was done that in that time these States might do do the carrying trade in that traffic.

Mr. Pettit, (dem.) of Ind., said that he had lived to hear upon the floor of the Senate an avowal which he never expected to have heard anywhere, that a Senator sworn to support the constitution owed no obligation to that instrument. He believed in the right of petition. He would vote to receive any that was respectful in its character, and to refer it. Should a petition come here from Massachusetts or elsewhere asking the Senate to expel any Senator who should disavow any obligation to the constitution, he would vote to receive and refer it, though he would not at present say how he would vote upon it finally. The Senator had sworn openly to support the constitution in all its parts. He made no reservation. He could not take his seat if he had, and he ought not to hold his seat after making it. He again referred to that part of the Declaration of Independence, which says "all men are created equal," and held that if these words were used in the sense placed upon them by the abolitionists, they were a self-evident lie. He discussed this matter for half an hour. He denied that men were created equal, either physically, morally, politically, or mentally. He denied that the Senator who had sworn to support the constitution, and who to-day sat upon that oath, was equal to his Revolutionary ancestors.

Mr. Sumner—Never sir, never.

Mr. Pettit—You denied that the constitution had placed any obligation upon you which you were bound by. Was such a senator equal to Webster? The one had earned the title of the expounder of the constitution—the other deserved that of the contemner and despiser of that instrument. If the Almighty intended to have created the senator equal to Webster, then that great power had created a great blunder and failure. He did not think the searcher after an equality in morals could find any one more degraded than the senator who, after having called God to witness his declaration to support the constitution, had, with that fact fresh in the minds of his fellow-senators, openly avowed that he recognized no obligation imposed by that sacred oath.

Mr. Dixon got the floor, and at half past four o'clock the Senate adjourned.

House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, June 26, 1854.

THE MARTHA WASHINGTON CONSPIRATORS.

The House refused to suspend the rules so to enable Mr. Bliss, (dem.) of Ohio, to introduce a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint an agent to investigate and bring to justice certain offenders against the United States laws, and appropriating $15,000 for that purpose. He alluded to the Martha Washington conspirators, and those who recently robbed the Pittsburg Custom House.

THE GADSDEN TREATY.

Mr Houston, (dem.), of Ala., moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole on the bill appropriating $10,000,000 for carrying the recent treaty with Mexico into effect.

Mr. Peckham, (dem.) of N. Y., wished to offer a resolution, which was merely read for information, calling on the President, if not inconsistent with the public interests, to communicate copies of all correspondence touching or concerning the treaty concluded between this government and Mexico on the 30th of December last, and all subject matters thereon.

Mr. Benton, (dem.) of Mo.—I have a question to make, which I think will take precedence of both motions. I propose now to make the motion of which I gave notice some days ago, of the privileges of this House. It is one which, I apprehend, takes precedence of all other motions, and especially does it take precedence of that now made to go into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of taking up this bill. If I am right in my apprehension of the dignity and of the obligations which attach to the privilege I shall plead, I will go on and state my motion.

The Speaker—The Chair will hear the gentleman's motion before he decides as to the question of privilege.

Mr. Benton—I have reduced to writing the points of privilege which I make to the House, in order to avoid any misconception or misapprehension:—

Resolved, That the House will not consider the question of appropriating $10 000 000 to carry into effect the Mexican treaty of December 30, 1853, for the acquisition of foreign territory, until it first shall have considered whether there was a breach of the privileges of this House in negotiating and concluding said treaty, nor until after the House shall have obtained full information on the negotiation and conclusion of said treaty.

Resolved, That the said treaty depending for its execution on a law of Congress to be passed on a subject submitted by the constitution to the power of Congress, it is the constitutional right and duty of the House of Representatives to deliberate on the expediency or inexpediency of carrying such treaty into effect, and to determine and act thereon as in their judgment may be most conducive to the public good.

That is copied from the resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives in the year 1796, after President Washington had refused to communicate papers to the House on that subject.

Mr. Houston—If the gentleman is through with his question of privilege——

Cries of "Wait until he is heard on it."

Mr. Houston—As far as the gentleman has gone, I desire the decision of the Chair. (Cries of "order.") I am in order, and I know what I am doing. I have a right to state my point to the chair.

Mr. Benton—Certainly.

Mr. Houston—Well, sir, I want the decision of the Speaker whether the question of the gentleman from Missouri is such a question of privilege as will arrest the question which I have submitted for the adoption of the House.

The Speaker—The Chair prefers first to hear the additional resolution; there were three of them, as the gentleman from Missouri announced. The Chair will then be able to decide at once. Under the circumstances, the gentleman from Missouri will excuse the chair for indicating that remarks should be dispensed with until the question of order or privilege is presented.

Mr. Benton—Yes, sir; the third resolution is as follows:—

Resolved, That the admission of new States into the Union being a question exclusively granted to Congress by the constitution, any treaty stipulation for the acquisition of foreign territory, with a right to be admitted as a State, without authorization from Congress, is a breach of the privileges of that body, a violation of the constitution, and illegal and void.

Resolved, That a purchase of foreign territory by the federal government not having been provided for in the constitution, a concurrence in this legislative and executive exercise of power by the government—the former by an act of Congress, the latter by a treaty stipulation—is necessary to the consummation of the act, and has been so held in the purchase of Louisiana, Florida, and California.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives has a right to the information which would enable it to judge the merits of the Mexican treaty in its legislative construction thereof, and that the President be respectfully requested to furnish to the House of Representatives a copy of the instructions under which the same was negotiated, and of papers connected with the subject; the said copies to be communicated confidentially, if in the opinion of the President the public good may not admit of their publication.

These are the points Mr.——

The Speaker.—The Chair thinks the matter introduced by the gentleman from Missouri, is rather for the consideration of the body, in connection with the bill referred to, than for the decision of the Chair as a question of privilege. If, for any reason, the gentleman from Missouri should propose to impeach the President of the United States, or any other officer, it would not be for the Chair to enquire into the validity of the reasons given, but the proposition itself would involve a question of high privilege, and would take precedence. The Chair, therefore, overrules the question of privilege made by the gentleman, being unable to see, in the papers presented, any question of privilege as the gentleman from Missouri has done. The question now recurs upon the motion made by the gentleman from Alabama, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.

Mr. Campbell, (free soil) of Ohio.—Would it be in order to move a suspension of the rules, in order to enable the honorable gentleman from Missouri to submit his question of privilege?

The Speaker.—There is already pending a motion to suspend the rules, which will take precedence of any motion to suspend for another purpose.

Mr. Campbell—I suggest, then, that after that motion is disposed of, a motion be made to suspend the rules, to enable the gentleman from Missouri to submit his question of privilege.

Mr. Washburn, (whig) of Me.—I would inquire whether it would not be in order to move to suspend the rules, to enable the House to consider a resolution which may be offered.

The Speaker—It would not be in order. The Chair, upon a former occasion, stated that a motion to suspend the rules to go into Committee of the Whole, and a motion to suspend the rules for the introduction of a bill, or for any other purpose, were of equal dignity, and would be so considered by the Chair, and put in the order of time in which they were made.

Mr. Washburn—I would ask the Chair if he did not decide that, inasmuch as the rules of the House could not be suspended, except upon Monday, a motion for that purpose would take precedence?

The Speaker—The Chair only indicated at the moment such a view of the subject, but corrected it very soon after he made the decision.

Mr. Peckham—I would ask the Chair whether, after we have got into Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, either of these resolutions offered by the gentleman from Missouri and myself can be introduced or adopted?

The Speaker—Neither of them can be adopted after the House has gone into the committee.

The question was then taken on the motion of Mr. Houston, and it was agreed to.

The House thereupon resolved itself into Committee of the Whole—Mr. Disney, (dem.) of Ohio, in the chair.

Mr. Houston—I move to amend the bill, by striking out all after the word treaty, in the eleventh line, as follows: "And the remaining $3,000,000 as soon as the boundary line shall be surveyed, marked and established." I offer this amendment for the purpose of opening up the bill in the proper form of discussion. The bill which has just been read, as well as the message of the President accompanying the treaty, were laid upon the tables of the members of the House on Friday or Saturday last, and therefore it would be useless for me to remind the committee that according to the stipulations of the treaty itself, the ratifications have to be exchanged by the 30th of this month, thus leaving but a very few days for the action of this House in making the appropriation proposed in this bill, if the House intend to make it at all. I offer these remarks for the purpose of claiming the indulgence of the House for a speedy action on the bill. If they propose to make the appropriation it must be made before the 30th of June. I have the right, under the rules, to open the debate on this bill, as well as to close it, but, considering the circumstances, and as I desire to make an appeal to the House, to terminate general discussion on the measure as early as to-morrow morning, I shall forbear any remark now, in the commencement of any investigation which may grow out of this appropriation, intending to reply at the close of the debate to such objections as may be presented by gentlemen opposed to the bill. I have moved the amendment; it is now in order to debate the bill, and I yield the floor to other gentlemen.

Mr. Jones, (dem.) of Tenn.—I want to make one motion. I do not expect to make a speech on the bill, but I now submit the motion to strike out the enacting clause of it, not with any view of defeating the measure, for I expect to vote for it, but in order that no other motions may be made until we get through with it. I said that I expected to vote for this bill, not, however, because I believe that I am bound to vote the money because the President and Senate of the United States have made a treaty with Mexico, in which it is promised to be paid that nation. I entertain no such doctrines. I hold that I am as free, that every member of this body, and that the House itself is as free in voting on this bill, to reject it if the treaty does not meet their approbation, as to reject the most trifling and ordinary appropriation which may be brought into Congress. I shall vote for it, not in consideration of the small amount of land that we are to get, but because the treaty abrogates the eleventh article of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, of February, 1848, and releases us from all the obligations, real and supposed, and all the applications and harrassments for depredations committed by the Indians from our side of the line. It is to get clear of our obligations under the eleventh article of that treaty of 1848, that I shall vote for this bill, and not because I feel myself at all bound to do it because the treaty has been made.

Mr. Benton observed—When the federal government was framed, Patrick Henry objected to the constitution on the ground that the powers of the purse and sword were given to the executive. He meant the unlimited power of raising money, and navies and armies, and felt alarmed for the possible consequences. If these two great powers are to slip away from the many to the few, and to go into the hands of the President, then there is danger of Henry's apprehensions being realized. He had been accustomed to hear it said by aged men that it was an illusory power granted to Congress; that the real power was granted to the executive, who conducts our foreign negotiations—who quarrels, or not—and, when he does quarrel, our people will fight—so that we consider the power of the sword which Patrick Henry dreaded, as having passed away from Congress. With respect to the power of the purse, we have a constitutional clause which confines to this body the power to originate burdens on the people. Where did we get it? From the British constitution? From Magna Charta? No. The British government got it from their Saxon ancestors, who carried it to Britain from Germany. The English have venerated this privilege, and their House of Commons alone has imposed burdens on the people. It is the pride, boast, and glory of England that she has always preserved it. Mr. Benton referred to history in proof of this fact, and then said, so help him God, he knew nothing worth saving in the constitution, if the President and Senate can take, when they please, money from the people, as they propose by this bill. If anything he could say could induce the representatives of the people to think on this subject, he should consider it one of the most glorious days of his political life, and should rejoice in the circumstance which brought him here this day to plead the privileges of the people and the constitution—to plead for the only thing which, being lost, there was nothing in the constitution worth preserving. The contest of 1640, between Charles the First and the British Parliament, which brought on the overthrow of the monarchy, was the identical cause which we now have before us. Mr. B. referred to treaties in former days, to show the action of the House on such subjects, contending that when a treaty acts on matters within the legislative power of the House, that very moment the right of the house attaches, and which has the authority, and it becomes its duty, to examine into all the circumstances, and consider the expediency or inexpediency of the treaty itself, precisely as the public good requires. The less power the President and Senate have, and the more power the people have, the better, Jefferson thought, for the government and the people. The message of the President, lately communicated, precludes the House from the power of acting on the treaty. The message was nothing in the world but a demand for our check for ten million dollars, and that on brief notice, and without any days of grace. Give me the money by to-morrow. This is like the highwayman's command—"Stand and deliver!" The President says he must have the money soon, without giving us a reason, or reasons. We are to go it blind, and do what he calls on us to do, because he says it is necessary. Mr. Benton considered this a high invasion of the privileges of the House. The President first undertakes to negotiate a treaty, without consulting the House as to the burdens to be imposed on the people; and having done this, to deprive them of the power of saying yes or nay as to the admission of new States, he sends here a treaty—and such a treaty as it is! It gives $10,000,000 for a mere selvage of territory. Robert J. Walker has just informed the world that, before he heard of the Gadsden treaty, he paid only $6,500 for the privilege of making a railroad through Chihuahua and Sonora, while we are to pay $10,000,000. It would be a curse to us to have such territory. A man resided on a poor piece of ground; a friend who stayed all nigh with him, next day seeing him looking on the poverty-stricken country, thought he could define what was passing in his mind. But the proprietor said, "I am not so poor as you think I am. I don't own all this poor land." (Laughter.) And this is what we may say of that God stricken country through which the treaty proposes the railroad shall pass. Kit Carson says a wolf cannot make his meat there. (Laughter.) The recall a scientific corps of military speculation, by what they for who else could think of [illegible] it must be West Point science outside of the country, of getting a national railroad quite an army to protect [illegible] it belongs, so as to [illegible] United States, so that the enemy may cut it up [illegible] pleases? (Laughter.) As to the Mesilla Valley, that question was decided under President Fillmore's administration. He then commented on several points in the new treaty, saying, by it we are to get rid of the eleventh article of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo; but we are not bound to pay one farthing under that. When he was in the Senate he voted to strike it out, because he foresaw it would give rise to quarrels; he had no idea, however, that a bill would be rendered against us for expenses. We were only to use force, if necessary, to prevent Indian incursions from on our side of the line. He was against giving $10,000,000 for a route for a railroad outside of the United States, and against involving ourselves with private railroad speculators.

Mr. Campbell raised a question of order—that Mr. Jones, of Tennessee, could not move to strike out the enacting clause of the bill; and, during the debate on this point, several gentlemen argued as if a snap judgment was to be taken on the opponents of the measure, as in the case of the Nebraska-Kansas bill. The point was withdrawn, with a notice that it should be renewed in case of necessity.

Mr. Bayly, (dem.) of Va., remarked, when he obtained the floor, he felt like the ancient navigator, crying out "Italia;" but what was his surprise when he thought he was in sight of land—he was met by some small obstacles in his path, including the point of order. The gentleman from Missouri had referred to England and France, and to the practice of other Powers on the continent of Europe, relative to treaty making. The gentleman, however, with all his learning and intelligence, had fallen into great inconsistencies. He said the English crown never undertakes to burden the people without consulting the Commons; and so as to France. The gentleman would recollect the treaty which Mr. Rives negotiated with France, where the crown agreed to pay this government certain moneys without consulting the Chamber of Deputies. Jackson made a point with the French government, and on that occasion he had no abler defender than the gentleman from Missouri, that the Chamber of Deputies was bound to make the appropriations, though it was not consulted in advance. Yet the gentleman comes here, and in the fulness of the information which he possesses, tells us that appropriations are made in advance of the execution of treaties. Mr Bayly referred to, and answered other parts of Mr. Benton's speech. He ventured to say Jefferson never thought an appropriation by Congress enlarged his powers under the constitution to treat for the acquisition of Louisiana. He thought within the sphere of their respective orbits, each department of this government can act without reference to the other. Congress has the power to withold appropriations. As to whether it shall be done, depends on circumstances. When a treaty has been made by the President and two thirds of the Senate, the appropriation ought not to be withheld except in case of palpable and traitorous disregard of the rights of the nation. This brought him to the inquiry whether this treaty was in such palpable derogation of the rights of this nation, that losing sight of all deference to the treaty making power, the money necessary to carry it out should be withheld. What difference, he asked, was there in asking money in advance, or at the conclusion of a treaty? Was not the effect the same? The appropriation was a precedent contingent on the conclusion of the treaty. The treaty provided for a Southern Pacific Railroad, and he conceived the opposition of the gentleman from Missouri arose from the fact that it interfered with a bantling of his own. He further advocated the treaty and bill; and in relation to the eleventh article in the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which this proposes to abrogate, said he had learned that claims amounting to $40,000,000, whether just or not, had already been preferred against us by Mexico, owing to its alleged non-fulfilment by the United States. In conclusion, he combatted the argument of Mr. Benton, that in the negotiation of this treaty the privileges of the House have been violated.

Without concluding the subject, the committee rose, and the House adjourned.

Canal Meeting at Rochester.

ROCHESTER, June 26, 1854.

A canal meeting has been called here for to-morrow evening. It will be addressed by the Hon. S. B. Ruggles, of New York. The meeting has reference to the enlargement of the canal west of this city, in accordance with the original plan.

Markets.

NEW ORLEANS, June 24, 1854.

COTTON.—Our market continues firm, at the previous advance. Sales to-day foot up 2,500 bales; middling 8½c. The stock in port amounts to 175,000 bales. The receipts at all Southern ports, less than last year at this time, are estimated at 387,000 bales. Flour—The market is dull, at $6 50 for Ohio. Corn is inactive at 48c. a 50c. Mess pork sells slowly at $19 75. Bacon is more active and prices are very firm: sides 5½c. Freights are unchanged. Sterling exchange 8¾ prem.

CHARLESTON, June 26, 1854.

COTTON.—The sales to-day were 500 bales, at unchanged prices—say 9¾ for good middling.

BALTIMORE, June 26, 1854.

At our cattle market prices continue to decline, the average sales to-day being 50c. lower than last week. The offerings were 1,000 head of beef cattle, of which 550 were sold at prices ranging from $3 to $5 25 a $4 50, on the hoof. Hogs were in large supply, and sales were made at $6 a $6 50 per 100 lbs.

From Washington.

MR. BENTON'S SPEECH—THE TERRITORIAL APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

WASHINGTON, June 26, 1854.

Mr. Benton's speech is the theme of conversation, and produced quite a sensation in the House. He does not stand alone in his opposition to the treat, appropriation, but it will pass notwithstanding.

The territorial appointments will stick a little. The rumor that one of the nominees for Kansas is free soilish is gaining credence among Southern Senators. Senator Douglas urged the appointment of a particular friend and was denied. Some trouble in that quarter may also be expected.

Later from Mexico.

DEATH OF MADAME SONTAG BY CHOLERA—THE REBELLION, ETC.

NEW ORLEANS, June 26, 1854.

By the steamer Orizaba we have Vera Cruz dates of the 22d inst.

Madame Sontag was attacked by cholera whilst on her way back to the United States, and died on the 16th inst. after a short illness.

We have no important intelligence from the insurgents under Alvarez. A small engagement had taken place between the insurgents and the government troops, in which the latter were victorious.

Santa Anna's birthday was celebrated with great rejoicings, but the empire was not declared.

Manuel Olarzazne has been appointed Minister of the Treasury.

Later from Havana and Key West.

ARRIVAL OF THE ISABEL AT CHARLESTON—THE SHIP NORTHERN EAGLE ASHORE ON THE BAHAMAS.

CHARLESTON, June 26, 1854.

The steamship Isabel arrived here this morning, with dates from Havana and Key West to the 22d inst.

We have no political news of interest from Havana. The sugar market had somewhat improved.

The ship Northern Eagle, from Boston, had been ashore on the Bahamas, but was got off by the aid of wreckers, having thrown overboard two hundred and fifty tons of ice. She sustained but little injury. She paid the wreckers, under protest, $5,000. The vessel passed Key West on the 16th, with a light but fair wind, for New Orleans.

No other disasters are reported from Key West.

Judge of the Supreme Court.

ALBANY, June 26, 1854.

Governor Seymour has appointed the Hon. Gilbert Dean, member of Congress from Dutchess county, Judge of the Supreme Court, in place of Judge Barculo, deceased.

The Cholera at the West.

CINCINNATI, June 24, 1854.

Cholera has broken out at Independence, Missouri. A letter dated the 20th, to the St. Louis *Intelligencer*, states that the deaths in three days at Independence reached 25, and several fatal cases had occurred at Weston and St. Joseph; also six or eight on the steamers Clara and Sam Cloon.

Navigation of the Ohio.

PITTSBURG, June 26, 1854.

There has been a fine rise in the Ohio since yesterday. It now measures eight feet ten inches in the channel.

Railroad Accident.

CHARLESTON, June 25, 1854.

The mail train from Charleston ran off the track within four miles of Augusta, on Saturday afternoon. The baggage and negro cars were complete wrecks; but no passengers were hurt. A brakeman, named Hogan, was wounded in the head, but not seriously.

The weather here is excessively hot.

Departure of California Steamers.

NEW ORLEANS, June 23, 1854.

The steamships El Dorado, for Aspinwall, and Daniel Webster, for San Juan, sailed yesterday, with fair complements of California passengers.

The weather here is very hot, but the city is unusually healthy.

Murder Trial.

OXFORD, June 26, 1853.

The jury in the case of Carson, on trial for the murder of his wife, could not agree upon a verdict, and were discharged yesterday morning.

Personal Intelligence.

Judge Hart, Payton, Ohio, Hon. D. S. Myer, Indiana, T. B. Patterson, Louisville, Ky., Hon. Cristopher Morgan, Auburn, N. Y., H. Levy,