



PUBLISHED DAILY AND WEEKLY BY EDWARD KILGORE.

ALEXANDRIA: MONDAY MORNING, MAY 3, 1858.

The Settlement of the Kansas Question. We announced on Saturday, the final passage through the Senate and House of Representatives, of the Report of the Committee of Conference, on the Kansas bill.

The following is the vote on agreeing to the report in the Senate:

Yeas—Messrs. Allen, Bayard, Benjamin, Biggs, Bright, Brown, Clay, Davis, Evans, Fitzpatrick, Green, Gwin, Hammond, Houston, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Tennessee, Jones, Kennedy, Mallory, Mason, Polk, Pugh, Sebastian, Slidell, Thompson of New Jersey, Toombs, Wright, and Yulee—31.

Nays—Messrs. Broderick, Cameron, Chandler, Colman, Crittenden, Dixon, Doolittle, Douglas, Durkee, Fessenden, Fox, Foster, Hale, Hamlin, Harlan, King, Seward, Simmons, Stuart, Trumbull, Wade, and Wilson—22.

We publish at length the proceedings of the House of Representatives, in reference to the report.

Mr. ENGLISH, of Indiana, called for the regular order of business.

The SPEAKER stated the question to be the report of the Conference Committee in relation to Kansas, upon which the gentleman from New York (Mr. Clark) had the floor.

Mr. CLARK, of New York, said he had intended to occupy his hour in giving his reasons why he should vote against this bill, but he found himself this morning physically unequal to the task, and would endeavor to discharge that duty at some other time.

Mr. BONHAM, of South Carolina, said he understood the honorable gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Quitman), with whom he had acted, would this morning seek the floor with a view to moving the previous question, but as that gentleman was not now in his seat he would move the previous question.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio, desired a call of the House before the vote was taken.

Mr. B. NEAM withdrew the motion at the request of Mr. BYRAN, of Texas, who promised to renew it. Mr. B. said it was due to himself and the people of his State, which had trodden the path of revolution, that her voice should be heard.

He had acted with a Stillworth, a Shorter, and other friends of Southern rights, and he had acted in accordance with the resolutions of the Legislature of Texas, which called for a Southern convention in case of a rejection of Kansas, and which were predicated upon the declaration that the will of the people of Kansas had been expressed in the Leocompton Convention, and that the refusal of a portion of the people to vote did not invalidate the action of those who did vote.

He would not enter into a discussion of the pending proposition, but intended to acquiesce in the action of the majority of the members from his section, for the reason that certain new ideas had been advanced by the great party which prevailed at the North.

He quoted from a speech of Senator Seward, of New York, in which he had held that the great battle between freedom and slavery had already been fought, and that henceforth the free laborers of the North would control the Republic. Such being the doctrine of the North he would not oppose this bill, which was calculated to oppose that doctrine; still he would not withdraw his objections to it.

Mr. SHORTER, of Alabama, also desired an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BONHAM consented to give the gentleman a few moments, as he held a peculiar position, and would then insist upon the previous question.

Mr. SHORTER desired to explain briefly the considerations which had governed his course during the past week, and to vindicate the vote he was about to give.

He had opposed the previous question, but from motives directly opposite to those which actuated the Republican side of the House. His opposition to the bill was not on account of the language employed, which either by accident or design was so ambiguous that he was afraid it would be construed one way at the South and another way at the North; as was the case with the Nebraska bill, which was both affirmed and denied to have contained the doctrine of "squatter sovereignty." If the committee of conference had intended to refer the Leocompton constitution back to the people, which was the object of the Northern men from saying to their constituents that the bill contained the doctrine of submission, while Southern men were contending that it involved no submission.

The Republicans denied that it was a submission, averring that it bade the people of Kansas to come in as a slave State or stay out of the Union, remaining a slave Territory under the Dred Scott decision, and he was satisfied with their interpretation. His object had been to ascertain how the Democratic party North and South, and how the framers of the bill understood it. He was satisfied with the avowal of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Stephens) that the bill did not refer the constitution back; if he believed it did he would vote with the Black Republicans against it, though he stood alone. The gentleman from Georgia had declared emphatically that the bill recognized the vitality and regularity of the Leocompton constitution, and he said that, in the presence of his colleague on the committee, (Mr. English), who by his silence acquiesced in the declaration.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, would like to ask a question, but his objection was made.

Mr. BONHAM suggested to the gentleman from Alabama to confine his remarks to his own views, as the line of remarks he was pursuing would otherwise constrain him (Mr. B.) to respond.

Mr. SHORTER would pursue that subject no further. He should vote for the previous question and for the bill, and renewed the motion for the previous question.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked to be allowed a hearing.

Mr. BONHAM said, as he had yielded twice to the gentleman from Ohio an opportunity, although he would have his own desire to be heard.

Mr. HORTON, of Alabama, objected to any further yielding unless he could have a chance to make a speech.

Mr. SHORTER declined to withdraw the previous question.

Mr. GOWEN, of New York, moved a call of the House, and the yeas and nays were ordered thereon.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio, appealed to gentlemen to allow the Republican side as much time as the other side had occupied.

Mr. ENGLISH hoped the gentleman from Indiana would yield for five minutes.

Mr. SHORTER would withdraw the motion with that understanding, if the gentleman from Ohio would then renew it.

Mr. CAMPBELL would only accept the floor upon the same terms accorded to gentlemen on the other side.

The motions for the previous question and for a call of the House were then withdrawn.

Mr. CAMPBELL had no disposition to prolong this unfortunate controversy. In 1854, when it was proposed to repeal a time-honored compromise on the subject of slavery, that it was resisted the measure, declaring that it was full of evil to our common country, without the promise of any good to any party or any section of it. The friends of the measure defended it as removing an odious restriction, and carrying out the great compromise of 1850, by allowing the people of the Territories, when they came to form State constitutions, to regulate their domestic affairs in their own way.

Subsequently the Supreme Court had decided the restrictive clause to be unconstitutional, and he did not therefore enter this Congress with any hope or purpose of proposing the re-enactment of that clause. But, finding that the people of the Territories had not refused the right of forming State constitutions in their own way, he readily united with the Douglas Democrats to assert their right to vote upon the constitution prior to admission. On the day they first entered that new hall, his colleague (Mr. Cox) indicated popular sovereignty in a triumphant manner, which commanded the admiration of political friends and foes, but on yesterday morning, in full view of a glorious triumph of his principles, he saw fit to be a traitor.

Mr. Cox wished to say, here and now, for himself and his colleagues on that side of the House, that they stood by the House bill no longer as they did in good faith and integrity. He thought the House bill was the best, but as there was now no chance of getting that bill again, he did the best he could under the circumstances by sustaining the conference report. He hoped his colleague would at least give him credit for honest motives.

Mr. CAMPBELL was not there to question the motives of his colleague or any one else. Mr. CLARK (Mr. Cox) occupied a high position in the Ohio delegation, and a distinguished position in the movement against the Leocompton constitution, he desired to ask him a question. In his speech, when he became the pioneer of the movement, he was understood to assert the right of the people of Kansas to vote upon their constitution before they could be admitted into the Union as a State. He now asked his colleague whether he considered the present bill reported by the committee to be a submission of the constitution to a vote of the people?

Mr. HUGHES, of Indiana, objected to any answer to that question.

Mr. Cox had heretofore endeavored to explain his views on that subject. Although the constitution itself was not submitted in so many words, yet the effect of the bill as he claimed, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Davis) had argued, and as his colleague must confess, if he read the bill, was to give the people of Kansas a chance of striking down this constitution if they did not want it. Gentlemen might differ with him on that score, but that was his understanding of the bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL said that the gentleman had not given him a direct answer. Though they might be defeated to-day upon the principle of popular sovereignty, they would hereafter appeal to that higher tribunal—the people—and be called for a direct answer.

Mr. Cox proposed to read the bill as an answer.

Mr. CAMPBELL would only yield for an answer to a question.

Some confusion here prevailed, several gentlemen calling to order.

Mr. LETCHER, of Virginia, was recognized, and said his point of order was that not more than one member had a right to address the Chair at the same time. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER said as two or three gentlemen objected to interruptions, he would enforce the rule allowing no member to interrupt except for a personal explanation.

Mr. CAMPBELL was actuated by no unkind feelings towards either of his colleagues. The same difficulty had already arisen in regard to the construction of this bill, which arose after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act, as to what was squatter sovereignty. He only desired before the vote was taken that gentlemen should understand what they did.

Mr. Cox desired to say a word.

Messrs. HUGHES, LETCHER, and other gentlemen called to order.

Mr. FOSTER, of Maine, called attention to the understanding that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Campbell) was to have the floor upon the same terms as those who preceded him. No objection was made to their being interrupted.

Mr. Cox attempted to proceed, but the objections were renewed.

Mr. CAMPBELL said as the objections prevented a full and explicit answer, he would ask to have a letter from his colleague.

The Clerk then read the letter, which was addressed by Mr. Cox to an anti-Leocompton meeting at Philadelphia, under date of February 6th, and in which he declares that he will never consent, so help him God, to waive the right of the people of Kansas to vote upon their constitution, or to see the banner of popular sovereignty entrusted to his care, dragged in the Leocompton mire.

Mr. BOWIE, of Maryland. That was on the original bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. Cox (in his seat) said he still endorsed every word of that letter.

Mr. CAMPBELL said he had here not only the gentleman from Ohio, but he had here not only the submission of the constitution to the people of Kansas, but he had that promise sworn to—"So help me God"—with the same solemnity with which he took the oath of office.

He felt bound to allude to this letter because he owed an apology to the so-called "Black Republicans" who had voted for the House bill. When that bill came from the Senate, an arrangement was entered into by men of all parties, who were anxious to remove this exciting question from the halls of Congress, to adopt in substance the amendment proposed by the patriotic Senator from Kentucky, and not less than twenty of the Douglas Democracy were then pledged, as he understood it, upon the high point of personal honor, to go for that proposition, with the amendments agreed upon, to the last extremity, and the bitter end of this controversy, and to vote for no other proposition. If he was mistaken in this allegation, gentlemen would correct him now. Both of his colleagues were in that arrangement.

Mr. GROSSBECK, of Ohio, desired to explain.

Mr. HUGHES would withdraw all objection now as he was concerned.

Mr. DAVIDSON, of Louisiana, objected.

The SPEAKER said the floor could be yielded only for a personal explanation.

Mr. GROSSBECK said his remarks would take that form. In the debate of yesterday, a similar allusion was made to an engagement on the part of all who voted for the House bill—that they pledged themselves to some one and in some way to stand by that bill to the end. He had never made such a pledge, given such an undertaking, or held any consultation with his colleague (Mr. GROSSBECK) the justice to say that he never understood him to pledge himself at all on the subject. He desired to ask him, however, whether he understood this bill to submit the Leocompton constitution to a vote of the people of Kansas.

Several gentlemen objected to any answer.

Mr. GROSSBECK was understood to reply in the affirmative.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And yet the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Stephens) says it does not. They were on the eve of passing this bill upon the idea that agitation was to cease by the votes of men some of whom construed it to mean one thing and some another thing, entirely different.

Mr. OWEN JONES, of Pennsylvania, rose to a personal explanation. In the whole course of this controversy he never gave a pledge that he would stand by the Montgomery bill or any other.

Mr. CAMPBELL inquired if he did not repeatedly meet in caucus with the anti-Leocompton men, and whether he did not consent to the appointment of a committee with power to represent and speak for him.

Mr. OWEN JONES protested that no committee was ever authorized to pledge his vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL would then inquire whether in his opinion, this bill submitted the constitution to the people of the Territories, and whether he was willing to let the people of this country construe the bill for themselves.

Mr. SEWARD objected to these interrogatories.

The SPEAKER said they were irregular, and he would endeavor to enforce the rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL did not desire to violate the rules. It could no longer be concealed that the men who within the next hour intended to vote this bill through, and send it to the North, the South, the East, and the West as a great peace measure and a final settlement of the Kansas question, put entirely different constructions upon it. It would only increase the agitation, and, as he said of the Kansas-Nebraska act, he believed it was full of evil, and without the promise of any good to any party or any section of the country. If it was not out of order he would ask the chairman of the committee of conference (Mr. English) to declare whether he agreed with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Stephens) that this bill does not submit the constitution to the people. He was waiting for a reply.

The SPEAKER said with half a dozen objections, it would not be in order for the gentleman to reply.

Mr. CAMPBELL—Then we shall "meet at Philadelphia" and discuss this question where the rules of this House do not apply. During the war of 1812, he was in arms on the Ohio frontier—in his mother's arms, he meant to be—and he has since heard and read how the gallant Kentucky hunters saved the infant settlements, and his small bones among other things, from the merciless Indians, set on by the English. The gallantry of Kentucky had again come to the rescue, as he had also the gallantry of Maryland. Kentucky aided Ohio against English movements then, and she united with Ohio to resist the English movement now. [Laughter.]

The bill he supposed would pass. Ninety-two so-called "Black Republicans" had, under a pledge of honor, voted that a slave State north of 36° 30' if she desired it, should be admitted into this Union. They had been true to their pledge, and if, for the purpose of settling this dispute, he had been the means of inducing any member to violate his pledge, or his conscience, he asked pardon for it. He was actuated solely by a desire to remove this thing forever from the halls of Congress. He warned gentlemen of the South, that, in pressing this measure, they inaugurated a new principle, which in the end would prove dangerous to their institution. It was an unjust discrimination between the two sections of the country, in that it allowed the admission of a slave State, but should not come in as a free State; and it endorsed the proposition that the people may at any time change or abrogate their constitution, regardless of its provisions. If this proposition was enforced on the North by the South, it would reach further than Kansas in the future. Under this rule, the masses of the people, including unnaturalized foreigners, might hold Conventions to change State constitutions and abolish slavery in Kansas, and elsewhere. Virginia, Kentucky, and other Southern States, might expect foreign emigrants from the North. In conclusion, he renewed the demand for the previous question.

Mr. HASKIN, of New York, desired to occupy a few minutes, but objection was made.

Tellers were ordered on the previous question.

Mr. GROW, of Pennsylvania, moved a call of the House, on which the yeas and nays were ordered, and the motion was disagreed to—yeas 85, nays 130.

The question recurred on seconding the previous question.

Mr. GROW said he rose to a privileged question.

Mr. KEITT, of South Carolina, asked his side of the House to give the gentleman from New York (Mr. Haskin) five or ten minutes. He understood that would satisfy the other side.

Mr. BURNETT, of Kentucky, and others, objected.

Mr. GROW moved that the House adjourn.

Mr. DODD, of New York, moved that when the House adjourn, it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. ABRAM, of New Jersey, said he did not desire to make a speech, though he should like to explain his vote, but he hoped the House would hear the gentleman from New York, who, he understood, would not speak five minutes, and the question would then be settled.

Mr. HUGHES objected.

Mr. STEPHENS proposed that there should be an understanding on all sides to take the vote at 3 o'clock.

Mr. CLINGMAN thought that was too long a time, as only the gentleman from New York wanted to speak.

Mr. MORGAN, of New York, objected to any limitation of time upon his colleague.

Mr. J. COCHRANE hoped the Democratic side of the House would not object to hearing his colleague.

Mr. HASKIN said he proposed to reply briefly to the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Cox).

Mr. BURNETT objected.

Mr. HARRIS, of Illinois, hoped the previous question would not be ordered as long as any gentleman desired to be heard.

Mr. BURNETT would withdraw his objection, if there could be an understanding by which they could come to a vote in from five o'clock to six o'clock, generally, they must take the responsibility.

Mr. MORGAN objected to any limitation on his colleague. Let gentlemen who talked of responsibility recollect what that side had done the past week.

Mr. HASKIN said he could have finished all he wanted to say while this talk had been going on.

Mr. CAMPBELL, having the consent of the gentleman who first moved the previous question, would withdraw it, on the condition that the gentleman from New York would renew the motion.

Mr. HASKIN had supposed his colleague (Mr. Clark) would be well enough to give the House and the country his views of the anti-Leocompton Democrats who still remained true to their position, but as he was not able, (Mr. H.) would say something in reply to the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Cox) and in relation to the letter from him which had been read. On Monday last, the gentleman from Ohio came to his (Mr. H.) desk, and read a letter, addressed, he believed, to the Ohio Statesman, denouncing the report of the committee of conference, as the most infamous that could be made, and denouncing the chairman of that committee for having made the report.

Mr. Cox denied that the letter contained such denunciations.

Mr. FLORENCE, of Pennsylvania, and others, called the gentleman from New York to order.

Mr. HASKIN said he was simply referring to facts, in order to show when the gentleman from Ohio obtained new light.

Mr. HOBSON, of Alabama, insisted that the gentleman's remarks were not pertinent to the bill before the House.

Mr. Cox hoped he would have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. HASKIN desired to say further that on Tuesday night following, he met the gentleman from Ohio, when he again denounced the conference report. [Cries of "order."]

The SPEAKER said the gentleman must see that his remarks assumed a personal character, and were not admissible.

Mr. HASKIN was not imputing motives; he was only giving facts. [Cries of "order,"] which were not heard.

Mr. HOBSON insisted upon his question of order, and that the gentleman from New York be required to take his seat.

The SPEAKER hoped the gentleman would proceed in order.

Mr. HASKIN said of the twenty-three original so-called anti-Leocompton Democrats, only about twelve—the number of the Apostles—remained, determined to insist to the last, and maintain their principles and their honor. It was due to them, and pertinent to the country that the gentleman from Ohio and some others had seen new light on the subject, and to ask him to give that light to the country.

Mr. Cox said his first impression, as he had previously stated, was against the conference report, and he did not like the bill yet in all respects. He stated his objections yesterday, just as he did in the letter the gentleman had referred to. He stated in that letter all the objections which struck him at the time, and what were the positions of gentlemen who favored the project. He gave his opinions on both sides, and was free to state that at that time his best impression was against the conference report, because he then believed it discriminated in favor of the slave States and against the free States. Since then he had a conference with Gov. Walker, of Kansas, whose opinion respecting the population of Kansas had changed his views in that regard. The gentleman from New York knew what reluctance he felt in that position, and he also knew that no man from the Administration or any other source had dared to approach him on the subject. He was free from all influences save those of an honest and pure heart, and no man who insinuated to the contrary was worthy of a place on that floor, as he would be unworthy of a place if he betrayed his conscience or the confidence of his friends. He had acted according to his best judgment, and he appealed to Heaven for the rectitude of his purpose. He believed that this constitution was substantially submitted to the people, that they had a chance to kill it, and therefore he was willing to come in with his party friends and do the best he could, though the bill was not all he could wish. He did not believe the gentleman from New York—he hoped he might still call him friend—meant to impute any thing against his integrity, and would ask him now whether he imputed to him any dishonest motives?

Mr. HASKIN would leave that to the country to decide.

Mr. Cox said if he did, he pronounced himself a liar.

The SPEAKER interrupted the sentence by loudly calling the gentleman to order, and strictly prohibiting all personality.

Mr. ABRAM, said from his acquaintance with the gentleman from Ohio, he felt bound to pronounce him a high-minded honorable gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES objected.

Mr. ABRAM said the gentleman from Indiana always objected. [Laughter.]

Mr. HASKIN would give his reasons for moving against the bill, and endeavor to vindicate the position of the anti-Leocompton Democrats. He agreed with the former statement of the gentleman from Ohio, that this proposition is the meanest bill yet proposed.

Mr. Cox (in his seat). I never made the statement.

Mr. HASKIN agreed with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Quitman) that there was a submission to the people in effect. There was an alternative proposition by which they could come in under the Leocompton, or stay out indefinitely. The submission was of a thimble-rigging character—an attempt to do by indirection what the South should only do directly, and it did not by direct means attain the end which as a Northern man he would like to have attained. But his great objection was that by the alternative proposition, the North was degraded in the climate of the South. While 10,000 men voted against Leocompton last January, he could see no reason for debarring them in the future from voting for a constitution to carry out their views. While the freemen of the North greatly outnumbered the freemen of the South, and while in the last Presidential election about three millions of votes were cast in the North to about one million in the South, he could see no reason why Northern white men, if they by any means saved, were to be just as good as Southern white men in the Territories. If this proposition was carried through, the Democratic party North was disbanding, and it was because he desired to see the party triumph in 1860 that he opposed this bill. In what he had said he had not designed to give offence to any man, but simply to state facts for the vindication of the twelve or thirteen Northern anti-Leocompton Democrats who opposed the bill. He renewed the call for the previous question.

The previous question was seconded without a division, and the main question ordered to be put.

Messrs. CAMPBELL, CLINGMAN, and others called for the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and resulted as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Abil. Anderson, Atkins, Avery, Barksdale, Bishop, Boock, Boyce, Boyce, Branch, Bryan, Burnett, Burns, Caruthers, Caskey, Clark of Missouri, Clark, Clemens, Clingman, Cobb, John Cochrane, Coker, White, 10,000 men voted against Leocompton last January, he could see no reason for debarring them in the future from voting for a constitution to carry out their views. While the freemen of the North greatly outnumbered the freemen of the South, and while in the last Presidential election about three millions of votes were cast in the North to about one million in the South, he could see no reason why Northern white men, if they by any means saved, were to be just as good as Southern white men in the Territories. If this proposition was carried through, the Democratic party North was disbanding, and it was because he desired to see the party triumph in 1860 that he opposed this bill. In what he had said he had not designed to give offence to any man, but simply to state facts for the vindication of the twelve or thirteen Northern anti-Leocompton Democrats who opposed the bill. He renewed the call for the previous question.

Among the general acts of the Legislature, at its recent session, is one conferring upon a single magistrate the power to give judgment upon an execution issued by the magistrate. The power to grant such judgments had been previously confined to the county courts.

The British Government had in commission April 1st, 1858, 278 ships mounting 4,798 guns, with 44,804 men, exclusive of marines at home and marines serving on shore in China. £1,195,000 had been expended on the purchases and repairs of steam machinery in three years. In North America, April 1st, there were stationed 22 ships, 200 guns, and 3,211 men.

Rev. Dr. McGuffey, of the University of Virginia, is to deliver the next annual address before the two Literary Societies of Hampden Sidney College.

The Southern Literary Messenger for May, has been received. It contains a variety of very interesting matter. The Messenger deserves a liberal patronage.

The proposed celebration in May, of the landing of the Pilgrims of Maryland, which was advertised to take place at the ancient city of St. Mary's, has been abandoned.

The Senate has confirmed the appointment of J. C. Vandye, as District Attorney at Philadelphia.

General Scott has established his headquarters for the Summer, at Cozzes's West Point Hotel.

The relations between Naples and Sardinia growing out of the Cagliari affair, are very threatening.

Both houses of Congress adjourned on Friday, until to-day.

The Washington correspondent of the New York Herald says, that Mr. Toombs' Bankrupt law is being actively considered by the Judiciary Committee, and will probably be presented to the Senate early this week. It is understood it will be a general bill, including individuals, corporations, chartered banks and any association of persons authorized to issue notes, bills, &c.—It will provide for involuntary bankruptcy, and will be retroactive. The retroactive feature will be guarded so as to exclude any time, have made assignments in contemplation of the passage of a bankrupt law, which gave preference to one creditor over another, and the bankrupt in such cases shall not receive a discharge unless with the consent of a majority of his creditors who have not been so preferred. The involuntary bankruptcy, applies to cases where the debts exceed two thousand dollars and the person declared bankrupt is entitled to trial by jury—all transfers of property of any kind, for the purpose of giving any creditor, or other person any preference, or priority over general creditors, to be null and void, and the parties obtaining them to be sued for such amount assets of the bankruptcy. With regard to banks and other issuers of paper money, they are to come under the head of involuntary bankrupts; and, in addition to all the liabilities which attach to individuals, they may be declared bankrupt for the non-payment for ten days after demand of any bill, note or other liability—all the expenses of proceedings to be paid by the parties interested, and under no pretence to be paid by the United States. These are the general features of the bill, we believe. It is not into effect until November, if now passed.

Under all the circumstances, it is exceedingly doubtful if it can pass at this session, but the general impression is that some bill of the character indicated will become a law this Congress.

Another horrible and mysterious murder has occurred in Philadelphia. The dead body of an Irish woman has been found in Allison's woods, in West Philadelphia. From the appearance presented by the corpse, there can be no doubt of foul play. Her arms were badly bruised, and her neck showed signs of strangulation. One of her limbs, above the knee, was much bruised, and one of her front teeth missing. It is supposed that the unfortunate woman has been the victim of an unnatural accusation, and that under this operation, she died from exhaustion. As a carriage was seen driving away from the locality where the body was discovered late on Wednesday night, and the tracks of a vehicle were discernible close about the body lay, it is supposed that, to avoid inculpation, the abortionist caused the body to be deposited where it was found.—It is a little noteworthy that when the corpse was discovered, the skirts and dress, all new were worn wrong side foremost, thus showing that they had been put on after death.—Near the body was found a rope, with a knot in it.

A discussion took place recently in the English House of Commons, on the reported intention of her Majesty's government to enlist Kroomen on the coast of Africa for the light infantry service in the Indian army.—The scheme had, it appears, been pushed so far that two officers in the Company's service were on the point of being sent out for the purpose, and it was only in consequence of its being found necessary first to effect an alteration in the Mutiny act that their journey was delayed. The arguments used in favor of the measure are that these Kroomen would stand the climate better than Europeans, and would be free from the objections which apply to the Sepoys, in regard to their peculiar feelings of caste. The objection taken to it, is that it would have the effect indirectly of encouraging the slave trade. Whatever may be the fate of the project, its serious consideration shows how modified has become the feeling in England on the subject of slavery.

The object of sending Commissioners to Utah, is not generally understood. The President, from motives of humanity, believed it to be his duty to make an effort to induce the Mormons to refrain from opposing the authority of the United States, and to give them an opportunity to retract their steps. In case they do, says the Washington correspondent of the New York Herald, all but the leaders, except, probably, Young and Kimball, will be forgiven. In the meantime, however, the most active preparations are going on to push the military movement forward, and as the Commissioners will reach there before military operations can be commenced, no time is lost by the effort to avert bloodshed. In case the Mormons refuse the propositions, the war will be prosecuted vigorously as a last resort.

The attendance of members of the Scientific Convention in Baltimore was increased on Friday by fresh arrivals. The proceedings in the sections, are very generally participated in, and when an important paper is read, or new idea started, the discussions become animated and interesting. At the close of his labors on Saturday, the Convention visited Fort McHenry, and participated in an excursion down the river.

It is rumored in shipping circles in New York that the Sumbro Islands are about to be sold to England for a very handsome sum.

The Islands consist of guano deposits, from which a good many cargoes have recently been taken to Baltimore, England and New York. The price is about \$10 per ton cheaper than the Peruvian article, owing more to the cheaper rate of transportation, however, than the original cost.

William E. Harrison, of Loudoun, has been appointed, by Gen. Rogers, Brigade Inspector of the 6th Brigade of Virginia militia, with the rank of Lieut. Colonel. The Brigade is composed of the Counties of Loudoun, Fairfax, and Alexandria. Mr. Harrison, is a graduate of our military Institute at Lexington, and is no doubt well qualified for the office.

In the Senate, on Friday, the Deficiency bill was called up and after a statement by Mr. Toombs that the managers of the two Houses could come to no agreement respecting their differences on the bill, Mr. Toombs moved that the Senate recede from its amendments; which motion was carried, yeas 26, nays 21. So the bill was passed.

The trial of W. S. Tuckerman, for mail robbery, is progressing in New Haven, but no fact of importance not before stated in previous reports of the primary examination, has been developed. About twenty witnesses, including Mr. Holbrook, have been examined. Mrs. Tuckerman is present in court.

As the passenger train of cars from Richmond was