NATIONAL ERA.

L. P. NOBLE, PUBLISHER. G. BAILEY, JUN., EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR; J. G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR. BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS.

VOL. II. WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1848. NO. 74.

The National Era is Published Weekly, on Seventh Street, opposite the Patent Office.

TERMS.

Two dollars per annum, *payable in advance.*

Advertisements not exceeding ten lines inserted three times for one dollar; every subsequent insertion, twenty-five cents.

BUSINESS NOTICES.

☞All communications relating to the *business matters* of the paper, &c., and particularly the names of subscribers, remittances, &c., should be addressed to L. P. Noble, Publisher.

☞As this paper is not sent to any new subscriber, unless paid for in advance, the reception of it will be a sufficient receipt.

☞Agents and others, in sending names, are requested to be very particular, and have each letter distinct. Give the name of the *Post Office*, the *County*, and the *State*.

☞Orders are coming in daily for papers without the pay. No paper will be sent except the pay accompany the order. *Pooh! may be sent at our risk, by mail, taking care to have the letter put in an envelope, and well sealed*, directed, post paid, to the Publisher.

☞Any clergyman who will procure four subscribers, and send us eight dollars, may have a fifth copy gratis for one year.

☞Twenty cents are kept with *each subscriber*, and when we receive money from him on his subscription, it is immediately passed to his credit.

☞Agents will notice that we keep an account with each subscriber. Hence no accounts will be kept with the agents; and in transmitting money on which they are entitled to a commission, they will retain the amount of their commission, and, *in all cases*, forward the money with the names, so as to make the account even at each remittance.

☞Agents and others will do well to send us fractional parts of a dollar, can now do so without increasing the postage, by remitting *pre-paid post office stamps*, which can now be obtained at any post office.

☞Agents or others having funds to forward are desired, if the amount be sufficient, to the expense of some bank a draft on New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore. Smaller amounts may be transmitted by mail, observing, when convenient, to send large bills on New England, New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore banks. Do not send certificates of deposite.

☞Mr. V. B. Palmer, at his newspaper agency, New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore, is duly authorized to procure advertisements for this paper.

☞Within the last week we have received two or three requests to have the direction of papers changed, without informing us to what post office, county, or State, the papers have heretofore been sent. Without these, we cannot change the direction.

☞We invite the attention of those who are remitting moneys to the publisher of this paper to the following table, showing the rate of discount on uncurrent money in this city. We carefully hope that those who remit money will endeavor to send such bank bills as are at the lowest discount:

Washington, D. C. -	-	Par.
Baltimore - - -	-	Par.
Philadelphia - -	-	Par.
New York city - -	-	Par.
New York State - -	-	¾ per ct. dis.
New England- - -	-	½ do.
New Jersey - - -	-	¾ do.
Eastern Pennsylvania	-	¾ do.
Western Pennsylvania	-	1¼ do.
Maryland - - -	-	½ do.
Virginia - - -	-	¾ do.
Western Virginia -	-	1¼ do.
Ohio - - - -	-	2¼ do.
Indiana - - -	-	2¼ do.
Kintucky - - -	-	2¼ do.
Tennessee - - -	-	3¼ do.
Michigan - - -	-	3 do.
Canada - - -	-	5 do.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, MAY 29, 1848.

THE HORRORS OF FANATICISM.

There are occasionally deeds committed almost too horrible and revolting for publication. The tongue falters in giving them utterance; the pen trembles that records them. Such is the ghastly horror of a late tragedy in Edgecomb, in the State of Maine. A respectable and thriving citizen and his wife had been for some years very unprofitably engaged in brooding over the mysteries of the Apocalypse, and speculations upon the personal coming of Christ, and the millennial reign of the Saints on earth—a sect of Mahommedan Paradise, which has as little warrant in scripture as in reason. Their minds of necessity became unsettled; they meditated self-destruction, and, as it appears by a paper left behind, in the handwriting of both, came to an agreement that the husband should first kill his wife and their four children, and then put an end to his own existence. This was literally executed—the miserable man striking off the heads of his wife and children with his axe, and then cutting his own throat.

Alas for man, when he turns from the light of reason, and from the simple and clearly-defined duties of the present life, and undertakes to pry into the mysteries of the Future, bewildering himself with uncertain and vague prophecies from Oriental imagery and obscure Hebrew texts! Simple cheerful faith in God as our Great and Good Father, and love of His children as our own brethren, acted out in all relations and duties, is certainly best for this world, and we believe also the best preparation for that which is to be possessed with the falsity that God's design is that man should be wretched and gloomy here, in order to obtain rest and happiness hereafter—that the mental agonies and bodily tortures of His creatures are pleasant to Him—that, after bestowing upon us reason for our guidance, He makes it of no avail by interposing contradictory revelations and arbitrary commands—that, wishing to prevent one of a melancholic and excitable temperament from excesses as horrible as that we have just recorded.

Charles Brockden Brown—a writer whose merits have not yet been sufficiently acknowledged—has given a powerful and philosophical analysis of this morbid state of mind—this diseased consciousness, obeying the impulsive action of a disordered brain as the injunctions of Divinity—in his remarkable story of Wieland. The hero of this strange and solemn romance, inheriting a melancholy and superstitious mental constitution, becomes, in middle age, the victim of a deep, and tranquil because deep, fanaticism. A demon in human form, perceiving his state of mind, wantonly experiments upon it, deepening and intensifying it by a fearful series of illusions of sight and sound. Tricks of jugglery and ventriloquism seem to his feverish fancies miracles and encase the eye and the voice of the Almighty piercing the atmosphere of supernatural mystery in which he had long dwelt. He believes that he is called upon to sacrifice the beloved wife of his bosom, as a testimony of the entire subjugation of his carnal reason, and earthly affections, to the Divine Will. In the entire range of English literature there is no more thrilling passage than that which describes the execution of this baleful suggestion. The colouring of the picture is an intermingling of the lights of Heaven and Hell—soft shades of tenderest pity, and warm tints of unextinguishable love, contrasting with the terrible outlines of an insane and cruel purpose, traced with the bleed of murder. The masters of the old Greek tragedy have scarcely exceeded the sublime horror of this scene from the American novelist. The murderer confronted with his victim and loving victim in her chamber—her anxious solicitude for his health and quiet—her affectionate caress of welcome—his own relentings and natural shrinking from his dreadful purpose—and the terrible strength which he supposes is lent him of Heaven, by which he puts down the promptings and yearnings of his human heart, and is enabled to execute the mandate of an inexorable Being, are described with an intensity which almost stops the heart of the reader. When the deed is done, a frightful conflict of passions takes place, which can only be told in the words of the author:

"I lifted the corpse in my arms, and laid it on the bed. I gazed upon it with delight. Such was my elation, that I could have burst into laughter, I clapped my hands and exclaimed 'It is done! My sacred duty is fulfilled! To that I have sacrificed, oh God! thy last and best gift, my wife!'

"For a while I thus soared above frality. I imagined I had set myself forever beyond the reach of sin. Such and such my sublime views false. This rapture quickly subsided. I looked again at my wife. My joyous exultations vanished. I asked myself who it was whom I slew. Methought it could not be my Catharine! It could not be the woman who had lodged for years in my heart, who had slept nightly in my bosom; who had borne in her wounds and fostered at her breast the beings who called me father; whom I had watched over with delight, and cherished with a fondness ever new and perpetually growing. It could not be the same!

"The breath of Heaven that sustained me was withdrawn, and I sunk into *more sure*. I leaped from the floor; I dashed my head against the wall. I uttered screams of horror; I panted after torment and pain. Eternal fire and the blackenings of hell, contrasted with what I felt, were music and a bed of rose.

"I think my God that this was transient. That He blessed me afterwards with peace. I thought upon what I had done as a sacrifice to duty, and was calm. My wife was dead, but I reflected, that although this source of human consolation was closed, others still remained. The transports of the husband were no more, the feelings of the father had still scope for exercise. When reunited to my children, my heart could erect too keen a pang, I would look upon my children and be comforted.

"While I received these things, new warmth flowed in upon my heart. I was wrong. These feelings were the growth of selfishness. Of this I was not aware, and, to dispel the mist that obscured my perceptions, needed a new light and a new mandate were necessary.

"From these thoughts I was recalled up a ray which was shed on my darkness. A voice spoke like that I had before heard: 'Thou hast done well; but all is not done—the sacrifice is incomplete—the victim has made disposal by the full consciousness of his folly and crime, ends the terrible drama by suicide.

Wieland is not a pleasant book. In one respect it resembles the new English tale of "Wuthering Heights," it has great strength and power, but no beauty. Unlike that, however, it has an important and salutary moral. It is a warning to all who tamper with the mind, and rashly venture upon its religious element. As such, its perusal by the sectarian zealots of all classes would, perhaps, be quite as profitable as much of their present studies. J. G. W.

For the National Era.

SKETCHES OF MODERN REFORMS AND REFORMERS,

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

No. 8.—*Law Reform—Jeremy Bentham—his opinion of the Common Law—his "Felicity" projected—his universal code—his works—the fruits of his labors—his talents and character.*

Bentham brought to his work reasoning faculties of the highest order, and most prolific subjects to the bottom, or begin there, and work upwards to their surface—a prodigious amount of mental drudgery could weary—a taste whose light reading was Bacon and Beccaria—a memory retentive as tablets of brass—a boldness which shrunk from no conclusion, however startling, and yet a judgment so cautious and cautious, so well balanced, so clear, so cold, so free from the influence of the passions, so free from the influence of the passions, so free from the influence of the passions

Several propositions were made, but these, together with the report of the committee and the motion to recommit, were laid upon the table, and the following resolution, submitted by Mr. Hubbard, of New Hampshire, was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the contesting delegations from the State of New York be heard before the Convention, through two speakers on each side—the speakers not to consume more than one hour each, in addressing the Convention."

THIRD DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

The Convention met at nine o'clock in the morning. Mr. Meade moved that the Democratic members of Congress who were present be granted the privilege of seats. Opposition was made. Let there be no discrimination between Congressmen and People. The motion, being so modified as to include revolutionary soldiers and soldiers from Mexico, was adopted. The resolution entitling the two delegations to be heard by the Convention was then taken up. Mr. Dickinson spoke in behalf of the Syracuse delegates.

Mr. Smith, in behalf of the Utica delegates, gave a history of the difficulties in New York, their origin, progress, &c., and maintained the claim of those delegates to be admitted into the Convention. They might be excluded from the hall, he said, but they could not be conquered. They had been called abolitionists, but the political abolitionists were their worst foes. They were uncompromising friends of State Rights, but were also uncompromising friends of the ordinance of 1787.

Mr. Foster followed, in support of the claims of the Syracuse delegates. He would not bandy epithets, or appeal to the passions of the Convention. He gave the other side of the question. He spoke of the introduction of the Wilmot Proviso.

What right had any man to introduce such an abstraction, prohibiting the owner of a slave from taking that slave into any part of the Union, in a Convention assembled for local purposes entirely? He cared not whether he was called "Hunker" or "Conservative," so long as he moved with the masses, bringing power wherever he went, rather than taking it to a distance from them. [Applause.]

Mr. Preston King next addressed the Convention. It was upon an issue of principle that they were to be excluded or admitted. The question was, are we Democrats or not? Even if willing to submit to any pledges which the Convention might choose to prescribe, still they were not entitled to their seats, unless they were authorized by the action of the Democratic party they represented. They were determined to abide by the Constitution; but if they were to be excluded on the ground of the difference between them and their opponents on the question of principle, he would ask the Convention what they meant to do with the representatives of the Democracy of Ohio, who had in their Annual Convention passed resolutions about as strong as those of the State of New York? Was the Convention prepared to call the laboring men of the country, going into the territories or the Union, to assemble with the slaves which might be carried there? If so, let the announcement be made.

What did they intend to do, also, with the Democracy of New Hampshire, who never could have attained their present position unless they had faithfully stood by the principles of the Democracy of New York? Would the Convention repudiate the Democracy of New York, because they occupied that position? If they did, he would tell gentlemen that they were taking a most mistaken course. The Democracy of New York *did* never failed, on any occasion, to discharge their duty; but it was not in the power of any Convention, or of any other body of men, to control their opinions or action. The impulses of the honest hearts of the masses of New York could not be restrained. He thanked the gentleman from Alabama for his frankness in declaring that it was an indispensable condition that the candidate of that Convention must be in favor of introducing slavery into newly acquired territory. And, under that assumed political necessity, the New York delegation was called on to pledge themselves to sustain the nomination! Whatever might be said about degradation—and he would not apply the term to any gentleman—he must be allowed to state that no such pledge had ever disgraced New York! She would never take it—never listen to it. Let who would take such a pledge, New York never would—never! [Applause and disapprobation.] If all the other States were prepared to make the Democratic party the carrier of slavery over this Continent, the Democracy of New York would take no part in such a proceeding—such an object. The Legislature of New York, with almost entire unanimity, have declared their firm resolve upon this subject. Let not the Convention be deceived. Two sovereign States of the Confederacy had declared the same opinion. He would take no part in such a project to the People, and tell the honest laboring men of the country, whose hands were hardened by toil, that they were to be associated with slaves, the answer would be given in tones of thunder. The universal response would be, "No!" The Democratic party of this country is not to be made the carrier of slavery all over the land. Those who thought so was the author of the "Wilmot Proviso," and his principles had taken root in the land. Mr. Wilmot took the principle from the Ordinance of 1787. It was a section of the law which had made the States of Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois, what they were. Would they carry slavery into the States west of them, from which it had been excluded people have excluded that institution? New York would stand faithfully by the Constitution, and maintain all the rights which it guaranteed. She would never invade the rights of another State. She admitted that, on this subject, each State was sovereign and independent, and must respected its own limits. New York had heretofore stood by the South in defence of its constitutional rights. Beyond that, she could not go. She was in earnest about this matter. He would tell the Convention that they meant to carry out their views, and they would do it! Whatever might be the decision of this Convention, New York would abide by their resolution on this subject. Alone, or in company, they would fight this battle of freedom from beginning to end! [Applause and disapprobation.]

Messrs. Doolittle and Cambreleng followed, on the part of the Utica delegation.

Mr. Yancey then addressed the Chair. He said that there was one principle avowed by a gentleman representing the Utica and Herkimer delegations, to which he wished to direct the attention of the Convention. The gentleman desired to have the question decided on principle. He was willing to meet him on that issue, and thus decide whether the gentlemen present were Democrats, or Abolitionists, or factious Whigs in disguise. [Applause and hisses.] Let gentlemen who had not intelligence enough to express themselves, hiss.

[Cries of "Order."]

The Chair had not heard hisses, or he certainly would have interposed.

Mr. Steele, of New Hampshire, asked the gentleman from Alabama whether Congress—or, in other words, the General Government—had the power to establish slavery anywhere?

Mr Yancey would answer the gentleman with pleasure. The Government of the United States had no right to establish slavery in any single inch of the territory of the Union. [Applause.] The people of the South did not demand that the General Government should be clothed with the power on that question. [Applause.] It was a slander to say that the South desired the acquisition of territory, in order that it might be slave territory. They desired the acquisition of territory to pay for the expenses of the war, and for the extension of the blessings of freedom, in order to give a home to all the oppressed nations of the earth. [Loud applause.] They were for acquiring that territory as the common territory of the Union—territory into which the people of the North and of the South would be alike free to carry their property—territory to which the people of New York might go, occupy, and be free; to which the people whom he represented might go, occupy, and be free—territory in which every citizen of the Union should have a community of interests and equal political rights. And then were sufficient people there to form a State, it would be for them to say whether there should be slaves there or not. [Applause.] But the institution of slavery was one of the fundamental pillars of the Constitution, and it had been so recognized alike by New York and South Carolina. Who at that day could say that what their fathers established was contrary to the laws of God and man? But, if the Utica and Herkimer Conventions had adopted the new doctrine of the Abolitionists and Whigs, in the name of common sense, in what was the difference between them? They called it their "corner stone." It was their grand, leading doctrine, to which they would adhere, after all others were abandoned. He concluded by withdrawing the amendment which he had offered, and presented the following substitute, on which he demanded the previous question:

"*Resolved*, by the Democratic National Convention, after hearing the arguments of the respective delegations from New York, That the members appointed by the Syracuse and Albany State Conventions be admitted, as the regularly constituted Democratic delegates, to seats as members of this Convention."

Mr. Meade, of Virginia, offered a substitute, declaring the Syracuse delegation the legitimate one: ruled out of order.

Mr. McAllister, of Georgia, made a speech in support of the claims of the same delegates.

Mr. R. P. Thompson, of New Jersey, said he had always listened with unusual satisfaction to the remarks made by the talented member from Georgia, and should always regard it as a pleasure that he had made his acquaintance; but he confessed his remarks of this morning did strike him with astonishment. He had hoped (he continued) that I was *surprised* when that chivalrous Southrons made his motion, or at the reason on which he rested it. But I, as one of the representatives of a Northern State, do feel bound to enter my protest against the course proposed by the gentleman from Alabama. What is the question, in short? It is, Shall the Barnburners (so called) are to be sent home—denied admittance into this Convention. Not because their credentials are defective, but because they have no title to seat is defective; but because they are in favor of a principle *which is at war with the institutions of the South*. This is the plain meaning of the gentleman, and I fear that before this time the lightning messenger has borne to the East and North this important and mischievous information. New York, by resolution, has utterly opposed to the Wilmot Proviso, and so is every delegate from New Jersey. I have always regarded its introduction as an act of wicked folly, similar to the man who poisons the fountain, and pretends ignorance of the thousand deaths he may send down the streams to his neighbors. I have always sympathized with the South in the eternal trouble which misguided fanatics are causing her; and I abhor abolitionism, which, like dishonesty, is always the concomitant of modern reformers. I love the sunny South—her warm-hearted and noble people—her chivalry and her devotion to the constitution. Mr. President, should this monstrous proposition of the gentleman from Alabama prevail, I do very much fear that the efforts of this Convention will be unprofitable and fruitless. I fear that the Democracy of the North be told that their delegates are sent home for *that cause*, and what will be their response? Why, that from the oldest portion of the Northwestern boundary to the Macon and Dixon line, will the thrill of horror course through every Democratic vein. Its indignant murmurs, so unanimous, will awaken every sympathy that is sleeping, and they and their course will be opposed. Will it not excite still more, Mr. President, this unhappy feeling that has existed between the North and South? A feeling which every Northern man regrets, and which, I must be pardoned for saying, would die out in the North, if our Southern friends would not so often manifest undue excitement, and permit their zeal to hurry them into indiscretion.

Mr. Strange, of North Carolina, defended the action of the committee of which he had been a member. That committee had been raised for the purpose of ascertaining which of the two delegations was entitled to seats. He reminded the House that they did not meet to try issues. How were they to ascertain which set of delegates were entitled to a seat? Had the committee not a right to apply a test? Had not the gentlemen themselves accused each other of not being true men? We had a right to call on the States, that they could not complain of being suspected, as they had suspected themselves. How were they to be tried? By the principle of the resolution of the question. Could they take the Barnburners? Could they take the Hunkers? Of course not. Could they take the Whigs? Why, they were not credible witnesses. [Loud laughter and applause.] The only mode left was to ask those men a few plain questions. He asked them—Do you believe in the right of the People to govern? One set refused to answer, the other did. The case was then in a very simple form. But there they ascended to other and difficult questions. The first, to admit both classes of gentlemen. That might have been done yesterday. He had intended to support that plan; but it could not be done. The woman's chastity has been sullied, and she could not take her place in society. Men from the South could not now receive the Barnburners. What they had said they could not take back. If they voted for the nominee, it would ruin him in the South. It would be like the Jew Jonathan's gift—a lie. If they voted against him, they must meet the case as they could. There was, he argued, a county line between the Democracy and the committee. It would be injustice to reject the Syracuse delegation after taking the test of the committee. Would the Convention fail to sustain the committee? If the Convention could not be admitted, The Hunkers could not be excluded. The Barnburners could not be admitted. The question that remained was, Shall the Syracuse delegation be admitted? As to the slavery question, it was one of life and death to the South. But it was impolitic for the South to raise issues on that subject, which they were now in a decided minority, not only in this country, but in the world.

These remarks led to some explanations between Messrs. Strange, Yancey, King, Cambreleng, and Bayly. After Mr. Strange had closed, there was a great struggle for the floor. It was assigned to Mr. Hampton, who amended the previous question, but yielded it to Mr. Turney, on condition that he would renew the demand at the close of his remarks.

Mr. Turney acquiesced, and addressed the Chair. He said he desired to submit briefly the views which had led him to the effect of the decision of this case upon the country. He had opposed the test resolution in the committee. He regarded the committee as a tribunal for the sole purpose of inquiring into the credentials of the delegations. The committee was not the high priest of Democracy, to inquire into the genuineness of the Democracy of any gentleman. He had contended that they ought to be received on the same terms as others. What would any other State have said, had such a test been proposed? The committee possessed no such power; and if they had such a course was calculated to defeat the party in the approaching election. It is an idea so obvious distinction, to which honorable men could not submit. Disguise it as they might, they had now the question before them, whether a man could be received in a Democratic Convention who in principles of the Wilmot Proviso. If it were so, what was to be done with the Democracy of the Keystone State? It was idle to talk of any expect to get votes for their nominee? [Applause.] If it was the object of the resolution of the gentleman from Alabama to establish that principle, and to apply it to the delegates in the Union, he was prepared to vote for it. In that case they were to reject Wilmot Proviso men from Michigan, and Pennsylvania, and Ohio, and all the other States. But it was said that the Barnburners did not desire to be admitted. If so, he wished to disappoint them. He would not arm them with a weapon to destroy the party. If they wished to become foes, let them take another course. They would not be excluded by his vote, in order that they might do that which it was said they desired to accomplish.

Mr. Cambreleng said he was authorized to disclaim such a design.

Mr. Turney did not believe that that gentleman, whom he well knew, could entertain such a design. But there was one gentleman in the delegation whose name was not in the resolution, who might be suspected of such a design. He was willing to exclude all who entertained the opinions of the Barnburners on the question of slavery. Was the Convention ready to unite with him in reorganizing the party on that principle? If not, do not let them make that invidious distinction. He was a Democrat in New York, implored the Convention to beware of the mischievous results which would follow from the adoption of the resolution of the Barnburners. He was of opinion that they could elect their nominee without any aid from New York. That he desired, indeed, was, to dispose of the question, so that it could not affect any other State but New York. He would confine that political small-pox to New York. [A laugh.] His sympathy was with the Hunkers, but he was unwilling to jeopard the election by yielding to any personal feelings. He then renewed the demand for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. Mr. Bartley modified his amendment, so as to admit both New York delegations, with only the State vote in the electoral college. This amendment was adopted—yeas 126, nays 125—ninety-one of the nays being from the slaveholding States. Texas voted yes, Kentucky gave 10 of her 12 votes, and Tennessee 9 of her 13, in the affirmative.

The vote was then taken, by States.

Mr. Commander, of South Carolina, said that there had been a mistake in recording the vote of Texas, and he asked time to enable the delegation to consult.

A member from Texas. The gentleman is not a Texan, and has no right to speak for Texas. The vote was rightly recorded.

The vote was then announced, 126 to 125, amid great confusion.

The Convention adjourned.

SOUND VISIBLE!—In this age of wonders, what will the world think when we assure it that a sound has been so condensed as to be visible, by which sound will be made visible to the human eye, its various forms and waves demonstrated to sight, and the power to discriminate between the tones of one musical instrument and another be as complete as to observe the action of water when disturbed by any material cause. The experiment, we understand, is to be or has been exhibited in the Royal Society. The exhibition of effects on fine sand has probably led to this astonishing issue.—*Literary Gazette.*

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, JUNE 1, 1848

☞ Mr. Tuck's speech, on the Slave Claim, is published on our fourth page. The speech of Mr. Giddings, on the same subject, we shall give next week. The former was reported for the *Era*; the latter we find in the Congressional Globe.

☞ We again take pleasure in calling attention to the admirable sketches on our first page, on the Reformers of England. Inquiry has been repeatedly made as to the authorship, but we do not yet feel at liberty to do more than refer to the signature.

☞ REV. CHARLES SPEAR, editor of *Prisoners' Friend*, Boston, will address the citizens of Washington on the subject of the Abolition of Capital Punishment, in Temperance Hall, on Wednesday evening, at eight o'clock. The meeting will be open for free discussion.

☞ "JOHN SMITH THE YOUNGER" is severe upon some things about the Convention at Baltimore, but the Democrats will excuse him, if he will but report the Whig Convention at Philadelphia. "Equal and exact justice," mind.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION.

We have prepared from Houston's reports, and other sources, as full an account of the proceedings of the Democratic Convention as can find room in the *Era*. It will be seen that its deliberations were controlled, and its decisions determined, by Slavery. The temporary and permanent Presidents and principal Secretaries, the prominent actors in the organization of the Convention and in its leading measures, the chief speakers and managers, were from the slaveholding States. Northern members were used as instruments, and, if prominent at all, made themselves so by subservience to the slaveholders. The Convention was packed with delegates from Virginia and adjoining slave States. The former State had more delegates upon the floor, than all the free States of the West put together. It is easy to see the power this secured to the South. Nevertheless, there are more ways of carrying a point than by voting. The seventy-five or one hundred members of Virginia had just so many voices, although but seventeen votes; their cries of order could confound an obnoxious speaker. Their cheers carry dismay into the ranks of opponents; and, on points of order, and other questions, where it would have been a waste of time to call the States, their united votes would overbear dissent. This is no special concern of ours. If a Democratic Convention choose to yield itself up to such influences, certainly it is not the fault of the slaveholders. They are not to be blamed for being tacticians, or ruling over willing slaves.

It will be seen that the Committee on Credentials, after long debate, had laid upon the table a resolution pledging each member to sustain, by all honorable means, those who might receive the nomination of that body, arbitrarily instituted the test in their examination of the New York contestants. It resolved not to look into the credentials of either set of delegates, until they would pledge themselves in any event to vote for the candidates who might be nominated; when in fact its sole duty was, to examine credentials and pronounce upon their sufficiency. The Syracuse (Hunker) delegates, anxious to be admitted on any terms, took the pledge. The Utica delegates, believing that they held their authority from the New York Democracy to sit in the Convention, indignantly rejected it. The committee came to an equal terms with either delegates, or not at all. What made the usurpation of the Committee appear more flagrant was the fact, that the Democracy of Alabama, Georgia, and Florida, had passed resolutions against supporting the nominee of the Convention unless openly committed against the Wilmot Proviso, and instructed their delegates accordingly—but these delegates, thus bound to oppose the nominee of the Convention, in a certain contingency, were admitted, without question, upon its floor, while the New York delegates, totally unpledged and uninstructed, were excluded, because they would not comply with a requisition made upon no other delegates—made, too, by a mere Committee of Credentials, and after the Convention itself had refused to make such a requisition upon its members.

But the final action of the Convention itself was just as derogatory to "the Democracy" of New York. Both sets of delegates could not be right. One only was genuine. Each bore certain credentials signed by the officers of the State Committee, and it was the duty of the Convention to determine which were genuine, which spurious. The Utica delegates (Barnburners) were known to be unrelenting in their opposition to Mr. Cass. If admitted, (as the result shows,) his nomination could not have received the sanction of two-thirds of the Convention. If rejected, the radical Democracy of New York would stand on formidable vantage ground, be able to concentrate its forces, and wield an overwhelming power. But to admit both sets of delegates, was to avoid the responsibility of any decision of the question between them, to deprive the radical Democracy of the sympathy which their formal rejection would have awakened, and at the same time reduce their representative power of New York in the Convention, to a cipher—for, should both sets of delegates take their seats, they would of course cancel each other. But, should the Utica delegates refuse to enter upon such terms, the entire blame might be imputed to them. At all events, General Cass would still be secure of a nomination. For these reasons, and because the Barnburners were Wilmot Proviso men, fixed in their opposition to the General on account of his apostacy from that platform, such was the course adopted.

While New York, with her thirty-six votes, was in this way degraded, South Carolina, with her nine votes, being the bulwark of Slavery, was admitted—rather, *forced* into the Convention, by the action of the Committee, sent no delegates to represent her, but positively refused to do so. General J. M. Commander, sent as a delegate by a Parish Meeting in Georgetown, South Carolina, was the chief actor in this farce. He was transformed into the representative of South Carolina, and authorized to cast nine votes for a State which has uniformly set her face against all National Conventions. The story of his credentials may be understood from the following extract of an editorial article in the *Charleston Mercury* of May 20th:

"The *Union* is also in error in supposing that Georgetown district has chosen a delegate to the National Convention. Of all means the Congressional district, which only has a right to send a delegate. General J. M. Commander derives all his authority from a Parish Meeting in Georgetown, which is only a portion of Georgetown district, which, with the districts of Chesterfield, Marlborough, Darlington, Marion, Horry, and Williamsburg, constitute the Congressional district represented by the Hon. A. D. Sims. The meeting at Georgetown invited the remainder of the district to co-operate with them, but so far the invitation has been unheeded. We make these statements out of no disrespect to General Commander, or those who were present at the meeting which nominated him, but simply in regard to truth, and a determination that neither our State nor ourselves shall be misrepresented upon this subject."

In the face of this, the Convention empowers this representative of a Parish Meeting to cast nine votes—to wield the representative power of a sovereign State, in defiance of the known will of that State—while it completely neutralizes, and in fact virtually rejects the thirty-six delegates of the great State of New York, whose Democracy was pledged to the Wilmot Proviso. Now, if any other reason can be assigned for such conduct, than a fixed resolve to secure to Slavery the control of the Convention, we should like to hear it.

General Commander was evidently disposed to be accommodating. On the first ballot, he gave nine votes for J. C. Calhoun; on the second, nine for Woodbury; on the fourth, nine for General Cass. That in the last he misrepresented the State whose voting power he assumed, is very certain. Mr. Cass has found favor at no time in South Carolina. Hear the *Charleston Mercury*:

"We refuse to yield ourselves up, bound hand and foot, to a party which will not do justice to us, by those who cannot themselves contribute a single vote to the election of the man they nominate; those who may select David Wilmot, Hannibal Hamlin, Marcus Morton, John A. Dix, or some other 'Barnburner,' as their standard bearer, with Abolitionists for their Lieutenant Generals, *or some other equivocating betrayer of our rights!*"

It will be claimed in some Abolition districts of the free States that the nomination of General Cass is really a triumph over Slavery; but nobody of intelligence will believe it. The General, little more than a year ago, was a Wilmot Proviso man. He opposed it, when moved as an amendment to the Three Million Bill, as premature, though admitting it to be sound in principle. In a short time, the decisive action of Conventions in the slave States, admonishes politicians that adhesion to the Proviso will forfeit all slaveholding support. It is enough. The word is given to change front. Not a word, however, Buchanan leads off; Mr. Dallas follows; Gen. Cass, suddenly discovering new lights in the Constitution, faces right about, turning his back upon the Wilmot Proviso, as unconstitutional, unnecessary, unpatriotic. Congress has no power over the territories except to dispose of their lands. The people thereof have the exclusive right to legislate for themselves, and shape their institutions as they please. Enough. While the extreme wing of the slaveholders condemns, the main body is satisfied. On the strength of the new doctrine, the General goes into a Convention controlled, as we have seen, by Slavery, and is made the nominee by a two-thirds vote.

Now, who cares *whence* a candidate is taken? It is not the *place* where he was born, or resides, but the *principle* he represents, which is the important consideration. It is because General Cass represents the Principle of Slavery Extension, in *fact*, though not in *form*, that he has been chosen the nominee of a Convention, a large proportion of the delegates to which were sent home with under positive instructions to vote for no man who was not opposed to all action against the extension of Slavery.

The *Washington Union* rejoices that the Convention has surmounted all its difficulties with so much discretion—has noted with so much concord—and put forth a candidate who will be so likely to harmonize the Democracy of the country. Let us see. General Cass, in his letter to the Chicago Convention, dodged the whole question of Lake, Harbor, and River Improvements. Will the people on the Lake Shores, and the borders of our Western rivers, think him the man for their purposes? New York may be regarded as lost to the Democratic party for the next election. The radical Democracy, who constitute the members of the Convention, and even the conservative delegates were offended. Already has a Convention of the "Barnburners" been called, to take measures for meeting the crisis. South Carolina will not vote for Mr. Cass. He has pursued a vacillating course which she distrusts, and holds principles which she regards as false. *Charleston Mercury*, the great organ of the *peculiar* Democracy of that State, has put its veto upon the General. The State Democratic Conventions of Virginia, Alabama, and Florida, reared a platform on which General Cass does not stand. They resolved that not only has Congress no right to exclude Slavery from territories but the people of the territories have no right to do so. Will Mr. Cass says they have. The Alabama delegates, being under instructions, cannot vote for him, and so throw their votes for Buchanan and Woodbury. Mr. Yancey, too, amid the acclamations which greeted the nomination, arose and expressed his displeasure, holding out no hope that it could receive the sanction of his State. Florida is in the same predicament. She cannot support the nomination without swallowing her own words. The delegates from Virginia, it is true, voted in a body for the nomination, but was it all wind, meant for such, and nothing else—the declaration, that slaveholders have a right to take their slaves into United States territories, despite all opposition, active on the part of the people thereof? Mr. Cass says they have no such right—and yet the Virginia delegates supported him! Will their constituency ratify this contradiction? Will it take back all that it has said?

On the whole, the Future of the General is rather uncertain. Grand as is his attitude, standing, as one of the modern chevaliers elegantly remarked, with one foot upon the Northern Lakes, while "the other made an impression in France," it is yet very doubtful whether the Universal Democracy can be prevailed upon to pass under this Political Colossus.

In fact, "*latent*" is the order of the day, and we are glad of it. The People of the Free States are overthrowing the power of Despotism, the Republicans of the New cannot be better employed than in breaking in pieces the thraldom of Party. Many Whig editors are rejoicing over the dissensions of their opponents, but let them laugh who win. A Convention will soon be held in Philadelphia, and it remains to be seen whether Slavery will not level it there as in Baltimore. *For or against the Principle* of Slavery Extension, must be the decision of that Convention. No Compromise can stave off the issue. Try it—you may muster a majority of the Convention in favor of a Slavery or a Compromise candidate—but Massachusetts and Ohio, in that event, will teach the Whig party we know not how to a lesson, as New York has begun to teach the Democracy.

A JUST REBUKE.

The *Alexandria* (Va.) *Gazette* administers a just rebuke to the members of Congress who figured so largely in the proceedings of the late Democratic Convention. It says:

"It will be seen that certain members of Congress figure largely. For our own parts, we have a decided objection to the presence and participation of Congressmen in Conventions of similar party Conventions. We wish there were no 'Congressional' delegates. And, if there are any to the *Whig* Convention, we hope they will be silent participators, and not active managers in its deliberations. Members of Congress had better remain in Washington, and attend to their duties there. If the wishes of the people was expressed, years ago, in condemnation of Congressional caucuses, and that piece of party machinery was wisely given up, why should it be abandoned. An approach to its revival is made, when we see the Senators and Representatives leaving their seats in the Capitol, and joining in the intrigues and movements of the party Conventions, held for the nomination of the candidates for President and Vice President."

Among the members of Congress who were prominent in the proceedings, we notice the names of Messrs. Bright and Hannegan, Cameron and Dickinson, of the Senate; and Messrs. Bayly, Meade, Bedinger, Jones, Haralson, Morse, Bowdon, and Kaufman, of the House. But, we may well suppose that other members than delegates exerted an influence upon its deliberations. Perhaps a majority of the Democratic members of Congress were on the ground. The influence of their presence and work of a Convention is not always done by the visible actors. A National Nominating Convention at Baltimore, can hardly be anything else than a Congressional Caucus, adjourned from Washington.

The principle of a division of powers in a Government is a sound one; and upon the principle, no less sound and important, is, that the People should confine each department of the Government to its legitimate sphere, and retain within their sole power the nomination and election of their chief Executive officers. Congress is elected to make laws, and not the administrators of laws. Owing to the peculiarities of our Constitution in relation to the election of a President and Vice President, Conventions have been found expedient, for the purpose of concentrating the force of parties. The result is, that a nomination by the Convention of a Majority Party is almost equivalent to an election. To give members of Congress the control of those Conventions is, to make the Presidency a political prize, not eases on that body. Its intrigues, and not the movements of the People, determine the succession.

Where is the remedy? In the People. Let them send no delegate to their National Nominating Conventions. Let the members of Congress—and let them insist upon holding such Conventions in the interior of the country, where the masses can be equally represented and where Congressional influences will not be able to control them.

For the National Era.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

BY WILLIAM H. C. HOSMER.

In frozen climes, and under tropic skies,
Up the broiled victims of injustice rise,
Up rend the rocks that bar their fathers' wave,
Roused by a voice that thunders, "*sleep no more!*"
In lone and far-off islands of the brine,
Dull Night beholds her sleep snatch away decline;
Alarmed, forsakes her couch of hoary moss,
While Christmas plant the banner of the Cross,
The fires of human sacrifice are quenched,
Purged are the tribes in carnage lately drenched;
Foul shrines and broken images of stone
Fall, while the trump of Calvary is blown!
No more the war-song of the conch is heard,
While some forms for murderous conflict gird;
His dread repast the Cannibal abjures,
Do habits bright, stoaing blood, than ours—
Looks on the *Star* that to a Saviour leads,
And with the bread of life his spirit feeds.

Be hushed, ye pale alarmists of the day,
Who look on man, awaking, with dismay,
Then lift your war-song against the oppressed,
Bold hearts who dare to tyranny be foes!
In vain yo toil to fetter pen and speech—
Long since exploded was the creed yo teach,
Dull human hearts have answer'd the appeal—
Lawless, when *free*—when *trusted*, full of *guile*;
When *honored*, *vicious*, and no worse, *enslaved*—
Reckless, when *trusted*, and *vile* when *crushed*;
And only *harmless*, when by *fear* restrained,
From youth to age in base submission trained.
While yo are trembling, lest the people rage,
To fetter down the Spirit of the Age,
Think of the folly of that Royal Dane,
Who breathed his mandate to the billowing main;
Yo swept the rock of Bible Truth aside,
Though waved his puny wand to roll them back!

Look on our fair Republic of the West,
And know the question settled, and at rest,
Regarding man's capacity on earth
To rise progressive in the path of worth!
Who were the Fathers of our Country?—men
Who bearded the grim Lion in his den,
Yo fearless Pilgrims, who fled from all his roar,
Although his bristling mane was steeped in gore.
Corruption in high places they assailed,
And the wide world, with their wrongs unveiled;
High Priests of Independence, here they found
Hesperian groves, where man might walk unbound!
Well may New England of her sales be proud,
Her iron hills that rise to kiss the cloud,
For on her shrine of rugged rock fired blazed
The fiery Spirit, that the Pilgrim praised;
With Allen's rifle aft the shaft of Tell,
Gnard through the coming years that beacon well!

Here, sons of Genius, though in hovels bred,
Bright pathways find that will the world lead, tread;
Fame open flings his temple gate full wide,
And *Merit* enters, unpapaled by Pride,
Which here forbids the Pleb to be "*shamed cold*,"
As if his flesh was formed of rarer mould.
Not on light sand hills, the desert waste
Our fabric of Free Government is based,
But on the rock of Bible Virtue rests,
Its shield a breathing wall of free-born breasts.
Our *Future*, pregnant with sublime events,
Will gladden Seers, and Bards, and Poets, and Poets,
And Realms, at last, will flourish uncontroll'd
By *accepted things* whose "gods are blood and gold."

NEWSPAPER POSTAGE.

The bill to regulate postage, &c., which has been read twice, and referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, contains the following provision:

"1. All newspapers not exceeding one thousand nine hundred square inches in size, (each half inch in length or breadth being reckoned as one square inch,) to be free for thirty miles; for any distance beyond thirty and not exceeding one hundred miles, or within the limits of the State, half a cent; for any distance than one hundred miles, except within the State, one cent. Papers exceeding one thousand nine hundred square inches to be charged by weight, like magazines and pamphlets."

We know that opposition to the kind of discrimination specified in this provision will almost certainly be misconstrued by the Country Press. It will be attributed to merely sordid motives; but, we respectfully ask our country brethren to hear us before they condemn. The provision proposes to tax newspapers out of the State, if carried over one hundred miles from the place of publication, one cent; within the State, or less than one hundred miles and more than thirty, half a cent; while under thirty miles they are to be exempt from taxation. In other words, it discriminates in favor of the Country Press, against Papers, and State and county papers against those the circulation of which is more general. This discrimination we think unjust, unnecessary, unreasonable.

The county paper is as good as the State or general paper, or it is not. If as good, how it is just to discriminate against it, by virtually forcing subscribers to pay twenty-six cents more for a State paper, and fifty-two cents more for a general paper? Besides—if as good, it has local advantages, in respect to domestic news, advertisements, communications of country interest, &c., over all other papers. So that it needs no protection. But, if not as good as papers of a more general character, how is it just to tax the People so that they shall choose the worse instead of the better? Is this just, or reasonable? Why not permit them to buy in what market they please? The same reasoning applies, as between county and State, and what are called metropolitan newspapers.

County newspapers exist from the necessity of the case. The People cannot do without them. There are local interests which require their existence and always minister to their support. The same cannot be said of what are classed as metropolitan papers. They rise and fall without being greatly cared for by the People. If they obtain a wide circulation, it is because they are in the hands of men of intelligence, and are distinguished as *newspapers*; or invest themselves with costly attractions, or become eminent by the laborious application of their conductors, or the various talent of well-paid contributors. Is it just or reasonable to impose a discriminative tax upon the People, for seeking the earliest and fullest intelligence from the most authentic quarters? Is it just to discriminate against the conductors of journals, for their enterprise, their skill, their taste, their labor, their liberality?

But the case is not yet fully stated. The advertisements of the local or country papers are a permanent source of revenue. The subscriptions, lying within a limited circle, are collected with comparative ease, at little expense. Living is always cheap, and the cost of printing to the great majority of country presses is moderate. The metropolitan papers generally have little advertising patronage. The cost of printing is enormous. Living is higher. Collections are not so easy. Agencies are more expensive, to say nothing of the outlays required for contributions. As it respects, then, expense, certainty of revenue, and local attractions, the county papers have advantages over State papers, and both these classes over the metropolitan.

Turn the question as you will—view it as between the public and the conductors of the local papers, or between these and the conductors of the more general papers, and still the proposition to tax the latter, and tax the People, for the benefit of a few newspaper establishments, appears unjust, unnecessary, unreasonable.

We exchange with a great number of local papers. What discrimination they need to protect the majority of them, we cannot see. Their style in which their columns are made up is attractive. Their editorials will bear a favorable comparison with those of their city cotemporaries; in some cases, they have the advantage in independence and strength. And, as to news, the Telegraph furnishes them with the pith in advance of the mail. The cream is all skimmed off for the mammoth city cousins make their appearance.

For all these reasons, we hope that, when the bill shall come up, the provision may be amended, so as to charge postage upon all newspapers: only let the postage be half a cent for all distances within or beyond the State or county where the paper is printed. This would tend to diffuse intelligence, by increasing the circulation of those newspapers which are at the pains of paying liberally for contributions; and it would elevate the character of newspaper literature and discussions, by subjecting the country press to a competition with the metropolitan sheets, without damaging its subscription. This is not all. Many persons would subscribe for daily papers, did not the postage in the course of the year amount to more than the subscription price of the paper. Reduce the rate to half a cent for all distances, and they may gratify themselves. The result would be, an increase of the revenue of the Post Office Department.

Our policy is—two cents pre-paid for all letters under half an ounce, for all distances; half a cent on all newspapers under 1,900 square inches, for all distances; no franking; publishers' exchange copies of pamphlets, magazines, &c., free.

RENPONNE.

The *New York Daily Globe* says:

"It will be seen, by a reference to our telegraphic report, that the Democracy of the United States have failed to combine in a National Convention at Baltimore. Several delegates from different States assembled, and after a protracted discussion, refused to allow the representatives of the Democracy of New York to participate in their deliberations. They proceeded, however, to ascertain the sentiments of the party in the Union assembled, and on the fourth ballot it proved that Lewis Cass, of Michigan, was the choice of a majority of the Democracy.

"We do not regret that this gentleman was preferred—for, in regard to him, the views of the Democracy of the Union, and of the vicinity of the Southerners, and the ground, on which they rally, show that the Southern people understand them better."—*Richmond (Va.) Republican.*

A BLUNDER.

"We quoted, some days since, from Mr. Bayly's speech, the statement, that there are, in Ohio, that emancipated slaves who go there, refuse to remain in the neighborhood of the Abolitionists, but prefer to settle in the vicinity of the Southerners, and the ground, on which they rally, show that the Southern people understand them better."—*Richmond (Va.) Republican.*

Having lived in Ohio for some fifteen years, we feel authorized to say that they the correctness of Mr. Bayly's statement. The Democrats of Ohio are well known in Ohio to be imbued with Abolition sentiment, many of them standing foremost as to the number of Abolitionists: Belmont, Brown, Butler, Champaign, Clark, Clinton, Columbiana, Darke, Fayette, Franklin, Gallia, Green, Guernsey, Hamilton, Highland, Jackson, Jefferson, Logan, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Muskingum, Ross, Stark, Warren, Washington.

But, of the whole colored population of the State—17,342—these counties contain 13,364; Mr. Bayly's "striking fact" is a striking blunder.

But this is not all. Go into the counties of Highland, Fayette, Clark, Brown, Green, &c., and you will find the best Abolitionists among "*Southerners*," natives of Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee. We speak from personal knowledge. The pioneers of the Anti-Slavery cause in Ohio are emigrants from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia. That emancipated colored people would rather settle near these Southerners, than Yankee abolitionists, is not surprising. The former understand better the habits of emancipated slaves.

STRICT CONSTRUCTION.

Who infer the power of Congress to legislate, in certain cases, for territories, from the clause of the Constitution empowering it to dispose of, and pass all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and those who contend for the power of Congress to *acquire* territory, must admit, as an incident, the power to *legislate* for it. Mr. Polk, in his Message, seems to flitter away this argument, denies the power of Congress over the Territories, and says, "I never heard, till lately, that this Government possessed any powers not granted to it in the Constitution, either expressly or by implication." We should like to know *where*, among the express or implied grants in the Constitution, Mr. Bayly finds the power to purchase, or acquire, by joint resolution of Congress, foreign territory? No man has ever pretended to point out any such grant of power in the Constitution; but the Government has usurped it, and Mr. Bayly has sanctioned by his vote the usurpation. Then, however, the object to be accomplished was, the extension of the area of Slavery. Now, the object aimed at is the extension of the area of Freedom.

MR. HALE.

The *Charter Oak*, of Hartford, Connecticut, a paper edited with singular taste and ability, says:

"We cannot penetrate the future, but, so far, Mr. Hale has proved himself a statesman, and proved his title to the confidence which the Free Party has reposed in him. He has been true to his principles and theirs, and bold in the advocacy of unpopular sentiments. We are not prepared to distrust him, but many to confide in him; and so, for the first time, we this week place his name at the head of our columns, as the Free Party candidate for the Presidency, and shall do what we can to rally the friends of Liberty to his support; as a noble representative of a noble cause."

We have no doubt that Mr. Hale will mind his p's and q's. Messrs Calhoun and Foote have been of great service to him. Speaking of the services of Mr. Calhoun, it seems that we, too, are under obligations to him. An old friend in Ohio, a settler from North Carolina, sending us a new subscriber, says: "You've gained that much through the aid of J.

what they please, and what they cannot find a chance to discuss at any other time.

We hope this statement may serve to make the good People a little more charitable towards their Representatives.

MAINE.

The Whigs of Maine, in Convention assembled, have made the following nominations:

For Governor—E. L. Hamlin, of Bangor.

Senatorial Delegates—Edward Kent, of Bangor; George C. Getchell, of Anson.

Electors at large—Charles S. Davies, of Portland; B. W. Hinkley, of Blue Hill.

These are all friends of General Taylor. The *New York Tribune* is wrathful against its brethren in Maine. It says:

"The Whigs of Maine (we know there are noble exceptions) have generally, for the last seven years, deserved their reputation of being proverbially inefficient, indolent, useless, and faithless. They were among the first to let everything go to wreck in 1841, and they hit their friends a deadly blow in the month in 1844. Of course they are just the boys to cry out, 'Mr. Clay can't be elected,' and so with any other straightout, whole-souled Whig. They want a candidate who will elect himself, and only devolve on them the arduous labor of dividing the offices."

FURTHER FROM MEXICO.

Advices from the city of Mexico of the 4th instant, and from Queretaro of the 3d, add but little to our previous information from those quarters. It seems that a quorum of the Mexican Congress was formed, without the necessity of excluding the deputies from any State, and that the Government has issued a decree, depriving of their civil and political rights those deputies who do not present themselves, or such as shall desert their posts, after they have come together.

The *Monitor* of the 4th instant says that there are but more than eighteen deputies present who favor the continuance of the war, and yet we perceive that the correspondents of the New Orleans papers do not regard the ratification of the treaty as an event to be relied upon. The difficulty last stated is said to be, whether the General Government of Mexico has the power to cede any of the States of the Mexican Republic.

The United States Commissioners were still in the city of Mexico, not having yet been notified of the ratification of a new President, and believing their presence at Queretaro unnecessary until this should be done.

FIRE AT BALTIMORE.

On Sunday afternoon, a most destructive fire broke out in John Knox's cotton factory, at the corner of Poppleton and Fremont streets, and soon communicated to many of the surrounding tenements, of which sixty or more were consumed, including Robert J. Baker's logwood factory. The whole square, encompassed by Lexington, Poppleton, Saratoga, and Cove streets, was nearly destroyed. The buildings were generally small, and inhabited by poor families, who could least afford to lose their all, as was the case with many of them. The total loss is probably $150,000.

LATER FROM EUROPE.

The steamer Hibernia arrived at Jersey City on Saturday last. Dates from London to the 12th; Liverpool to the 13th instant.

Great Britain.—Weather beautiful, crops promising, money plenty, wheat slow of sale, corn in demand, cotton reduced in price ¼ of a penny. Ireland more tranquil, potato crops abundant. Mr. S. O'Brien stricken from the roll of the magistracy in Limerick.

France.—An Executive Committee of five members, constituted by the National Assembly, Lamartine standing fourth on the list, on account of having protested openly against the exclusion of Louis Bollin from the Government. Lamartine is a generous, noble man—too good for Paris. M. Bucher, Conservative Republican, elected President of the Assembly for one month. The Executive Committee have appointed the following ministers: *Foreign Affairs*, Bastide; *War*, Charras; *Finance*, Duclerc; *Justice*, Cremieux; *Instruction*, Carnot; *Commerce*, Flocon; *Religion*, Bethmont; *Public Works*, Trelat; *Marine*, Casey, *Interior*, Recurt; *Under Secretary Foreign Affairs*, Favre. A proclamation is issued by the Assembly, declaring the Republic to be permanent. An official order directs the whole line of coast in the district of Bonlogne to be put in a state of defense.

Austria, Italy, &c.—The hostilities in Lombardy have received a new impulse by the accession of the Pope to the Italian Confederacy against Austria. The Austrians are in a critical position, from which they can only be extricated by the advance of Count Nugent, whose successes have, it is said, been checked by the coming up of the allies from the south.

The most important event of the war has occurred at Rome. The repugnance of the Pope to declare war against Austria, the most Catholic country of central Europe—has drawn down upon him the whole weight of popular fury. On the 1st and 2d instant a movement was got up at Rome, to compel him to declare war against the Austrians, which he long resisted. The safety of the Pope, the Cardinals, and the Austrians, was by Radetsky towards his prisoners. It is even asserted that the Austrians had a scheme of mining houses, and blowing up the Neapolitan army on the day it arrived, together with 40,000 inhabitants! These inventions naturally excite the Italians, and portend more difficulties.

Germany, Poland, &c.—Germany continues in an agitated state, and the report of an army of 50,000 men between Bamberg and Nuremberg has created a deep sensation at Paris. On the Prussian-Polish frontiers, the utter disorganization of all government has led to frightful excesses. As far as we can judge, the Germans having broken faith with the Polish Patriots, on conditions granted to them, the latter flew to arms. The fiercest battles have been fought; the two last, at Gnent and at Mitau, have been most fearfully bloody. The carnage of the first battle was only exceeded by that of the second. The Prussians had 10,000 men, whilst the Poles were a mere handful, and yet the victory was for a time. The Prussians were beaten. The whole province of Posen was in arms, and that city is not unlikely to be taken by the Poles.

Between the latter and the Germans the fiercest animosity subsists. The Poles have refused to send any delegates to the Diet, and, in fact, allow all connection with the Germans. Prussia seems to be in a deplorable state, from Treves to Posen; and the distress at Berlin is intense.

Russia is on the alert, bristling on every side with bayonets.

Spain is becoming the scene of insurrections. A military insurrection at Madrid, on the 7th of May, was suppressed, after a bloody conflict of several hours.

Portugal.—The Queen of Portugal has issued a decree, appointing a commission to carry into effect the abolition of slavery in the Portuguese ultra-marine possessions.

Greece, Hungary, &c.—Greece was on the high road to revolution, insurrectionary movements having broken out. Hungary and Bohemia are complete victims of anarchy.

Extract of a letter recently received from a distinguished gentleman in England.

"The times in which we live are indeed surprising, and I am greatly in hopes that the revolution in France will be overruled to the advancement of true Christianity and of course human happiness there. It is much to be regretted that the elections were held on the Sabbath, and that the whole population were thrown into the notion of liberty with being armed; but this, I think, partly arises from the fact that all who had votes under the old system were 'National Guards.' I hope they will grow wiser than this. Our aristocracy, like other despots in power, seem determined to resist all change; but I hope the middle classes will gradually see the imperative necessity of uniting with the working classes to demand the franchise; and the favorable result of the election in France, in a country where a majority of moderate men, seems likely to lessen the fears of the timid in this country.

"Business lately seemed to be in a bad way, and I say and heard there confirms me in the opinion to which I was before leaning, that the sooner they are peacefully separated from this country the better. They cannot well be worse than they are.

"Thou wilt see, by the Anti-Slavery Reporter, pretty much the position of our question. We have no safety for that, or any other question for the good of mankind, as long as our aristocracy are dominant. May a change be effected by peaceable means."

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

HOBART'S ANNOTATIONS of Bishop Butler's Analogy of Religion. New York: Harper & Brothers. For sale by Franck Taylor, Pennsylvania avenue, Washington.

We recollect having had occasion, some years ago, to notice an abridgment of this important work, edited by Charles E. West, Principal of Rutgers College, New York. We are glad that he has seen proper to prepare another edition, in which the Analysis is given without abridgment. It is a very useful work, particularly adapted to schools, but serviceable to any one who needs a guide to the comprehension of that masterpiece of analogical reasoning, Butler's Analogy.

A SYSTEM OF ENGLISH VERSIFICATION. By Erastus Everett, A. M. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

From the limited examination we have been able to give the work, we are impressed very favorably with its ability. The author seems to comprehend fully his subject, and treats it with great clearness and judgment. It is intended, he says, for the use of students in the advanced classes of high schools and colleges, but we are sure that both authors and critics will find it highly serviceable.

BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE, May, 1848. New York: Leonard Scott & Co. Agent for Washington, W. Adam, Bookseller, Pennsylvania avenue, near Fourteen-half street.

Contents.—The Caxtons, Education in Wales, the Silver Cross, Heigh Ho, Republican Paris, the Spanford in Sicily, Crime and Remarkable Trials in Scotland, Sir Stephen Leproux's Wife Grandee, the Lost Walk, Man is a Featherless Biped, the Revolution in Europe.

The bill of fare is good, and the articles are served up in Blackwood's own style.

DR. WEBSTER arrived in this city last Friday evening, and General Scott on Sunday morning.

The Hon. HANNIBAL HAMLIN has been elected United States Senator by the Legislature of Maine.

Telegraphed for the Baltimore Sun.

PITTSBURG, *May 29*—P. M.

The Methodist Episcopal Conference, which has been in session here, has committed the decided by arbitration what is termed the "Property Question," placing it upon the most liberal and enlightened grounds. The Conference, after this for the time being disposing of this question, adjourned.

CORRESPONDENCE OF THE ERA.

For the National Era.

LETTER FROM BALTIMORE.

NOW THEY DO THINGS IN CONVENTION.

"I admit that I want to admire your consistency, or to applaud the conduct which I am endeavoring to correct. These to People, and to whom I am addressing, I know they have nothing like justice to expect from me; unless you feel as I do, that a compliment of the highest order is intended in the expression, I shall be unable to appeal to your justice against your ineliberal—FRANCIS.

I have just returned from the National Democratic Convention at Baltimore. It was the first assembling of the kind that I have ever attended. I sat it out from beginning to end—from the prayer of the Rev. Theophilus Fisk to the *sale* of old Andrew Stevenson, in a lumber room of trial, I assure you. The weather was hot, the air was fragrant with gin-slings and tobacco, and the President-makers were in a state of great audorific fidelity. Nothing but the fragrance of a bottle *de Cologne*, a bath every night, and frequent changes of linen, I was enabled to survive the operation; and I am now congratulating myself in the enjoyment of a very considerable accession to my fund of useful and entertaining knowledge.

The delegates, in taking leave of his *confreres*, devoutly expressed the desire that "every man and woman" with true democratic blood in their veins, might have been present to witness their proceedings. I can easily imagine that they would concur; and, with your permission, I shall now make the effort to render your twelve thousand subscribers participants, to some extent, in those pleasures from which Mr. Stevenson so much regretted that they were debarred. It is true my readers cannot have the delightful excitement of the sittings of the Convention—the balmy sweets of that patriotic atmosphere—the stertorous breathings of fraternal love at Barnum's—the Democratic Hotel—the roar of the triumphant song of enthusiastic delegates, as they made the decent regions of "the Meadows" ring with the spirit-stirring chorus of

"Playune Butler's come to town?"

in the early hours of the morning, when the street-lamps glimmer and watchmen have resigned themselves to the embrace of Morpheus? Still, it may be possible to convey some idea of the scene, and enable the people to obtain a faint insight into the admirable practices, in some great, in those made, and "the Democracy" maintained in undying vigor.

In my verdancy I had supposed that all the States were placed in these Conventions on a footing of perfect equality in respect to representation. I was very specially corrected in this silly impression. In the rooms of the Committee on Reception, I had seen the name of the twenty-three delegates from the great State of Ohio entered on the roll; and shortly afterwards the Virginia list was handed in, in order that the tickets for her representatives might be filled. Ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty tickets were inscribed with the names of the Virginia democracy to be "Old Dominion," and yet the cry was, "Still they come!" The Secretary looked up in amazement. Thirty-two forty-fifths of the tickets were made out, and the list was at last announced as complete. Maryland sent her score of delegates; Louisiana, eleven; Texas, six; and Delaware, seven to twenty delegates. Kentucky had upwards of thirty. The excellent result of this management was apparent throughout the sessions of the Convention. Nothing but the "Democracy" was true enabled to do all the shouting, obtain the floor whenever it was desired, sustain the decisions of the Chair, overrule points of order, and keep a sharp look-out in every direction. Out of doors, the value of this system was no less apparent. The "force" was judiciously distributed, as to be present at the different meetings. Refractory delegates from the free States were subjected to the tender attentions of a "vigilant Committee" with stylings, "Sons of the rural districts of the East and West, were provided with experienced *cicerones*, who spent their money, taught them how to vote in Convention, and, in return, initiated them into all the mysteries of a city like Baltimore. Old Hunkers from all parts of the North were to the same judicious treatment. Hence there was a delicious state of bamboozlement. So admirably, indeed, was the thing managed, that when a proposition was made in Convention, by one stupid fellow, not "in chalk," that the number of delegates hereafter to the number of electoral votes, it was rejected with scorn and contumely! Many Congressional districts were represented by delegates appointed by "immense mass meetings" composed of half a dozen individuals! He was stated publicly on the floor of the Convention during the brief debate on the question as to the right of General Commander to cast the nine votes to which South Carolina was entitled. The gentleman in question himself stated that "his case was by no means an anomaly."

Another delightful and characteristic feature of the Convention was the presence of members of Congress amongst the delegates. It was quite consolatory and gratifying to find these distinguished men—accustomed to be considered, perhaps, modestly stepping from their exalted stations, to mingle with their Democratic brethren in this popular assemblage—coming, in the poetic language of the illustrious Hannegan, like Hannibal, to swear unalterable affection at the altar of his country! I made a memorandum of these Congressional delegates, that I may as well give it a place in these reminiscences.

Senators present, as Delegates—Messrs. Borland, Bright, Cameron, Dickinson, Downs, Johnson of Georgia, Hannegan, Lewis, Mason, Rusk, Turney.

Lobby Members.—Messrs. Bagby, Bradbury, Moor, Yulee.

Members of the House of Representatives, as Delegates.—Messrs. Bayly, Bedinger, Bell, Dickinson, Phelps, Bedinger, Bowdon, Boyd, Daniel, Biggs, Haralson, Pettit, Henley, McClelland, Jones, Chase, La Sere, Harmanson, Morse, Pillsbury, Kaufman.

Lobby Members.—Broodhead, Cobb, and fifty others.

No wonder, the reader will unite with us in exclaiming—no wonder, that in view of such a delegation from both Houses of Congress, the twenty-seven democratic columns Baltimore appropriately presides, should have denounced all attempts to transfer the location of the Convention from Baltimore to the "Queen of the West?" No wonder that Democratic letter-writers became so delicate as they talked of the glorious association which clustered around the "Monumental City?" It was, in fact, virtually an adjournment of Congress from Washington to Baltimore.

The number of office-holders in the Convention was prodigious. Custom House and Post Office scent forth their *halitous* from all parts of the Union. Then the office-seekers! From the bleak coasts of the North, lashed by the Atlantic, to the reeking pestilence of the Crescent City, flocked the hungry vultures, smelling far off the grateful odors of another field of Democratic victory! You could pick them out by the dozen, distinguishing them by their pinched features and feverish anxiety. Their blood-shot eyes, as they hurried from one caucus to another, told of themselves the whole story of corruption and intrigue. Every gesture spoke as plainly as words could have expressed it—

"My soul's in arms, and eager for the fray!"

Here and there, few and far between, you might have discovered some wretch, only half-conscious of the rascality and humbug of the whole affair. It was amusing to witness, on the first day, the indignant whispers of these half-conscious sons of "Democracy," as with open mouth and staring eyes they witnessed the proceedings; and the indignant "Pshaw!" by which a sudden effect of the delightful "caucuses" at Barnum's, where "soft crabs" and softer "doughfaces" were "dressed up" with Southern skill, amid the loud "hip, hip, hurrah!" inspired by Monongahela and Champaign. Oh! the miracles wrought at these symposium! Glorious Democracy! Happy in your delegations of the same representatives! Glorious Conventions! Little wot ye of the magic of a judiciously managed "drink!" Maine was to have led off with "Polk for President," but Old Vorcable elater, of rugged aspect, yet tender and unsuspecting heart, thy chosen delegate was at that moment pledging eternal love to one of the Sirens, in a bottle of whisky, brought all the way from the smoke of Pittsburg, and was *non est inventus*; and so New Hampshire, ever wanting a trick, went for Woodbury, and changed the whole game!

But I must reserve for another communication the details of this memorable Convention. The cunning management of the New York question—the inscrutable decisions of the Southern chairman—the modesty of the Southern members—the bargain and sale operations inside and out of doors—the open violation of every principle of democratic equality—will furnish abundant material for the pen of a Tacitus or Macaulay. Farewell!

In the mean time, let me ask the great Democratic party of the free North, can they longer submit to such a flagrant imposture as this National Convention at Baltimore? Young men of the free States, untainted by the corrupting influence of more party politics, and loving Truth and Liberty for their own sake, are willing to be made the pliant tools of these three hundred huckesters in the shambles, in whom all honor and manliness have long since utterly perished, and whose very garments infect the atmosphere around them? JOHN SMITH THE YOUNGER.

BALTIMORE, *May 28, 1848.*

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION.

FOURTH DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

The Chair announced that there was a mistake in counting the vote the day before. It stood 126 to 124, instead of 126 to 125. The question being upon the resolution of Mr. Yancey, as amended by Mr. Bartley, several points of order were raised, but overruled. The vote was then taken by States, and resulted—yeas 216, nays 36—ninety-two of the nays being from the slave States, Texas, Kentucky, and Tennessee, voted as before. The amendment as amended was agreed to. The original resolution, as amended, was as follows:

Resolved, That both sets of delegates now present and asking admission from the State of New York be, and they are hereby admitted to a full participation in all the privileges and proceedings of this Convention, and be authorized to cast thirty-six votes for the State of New York, being the number of votes to which she is entitled in the electoral college.

Upon this resolution the vote was as follows:

States.	Yeas.	Nays.	Yeas.	Nays.
Maine	9	9	9	0
New Hampshire	6	6	6	0
Massachusetts	12	12	12	0
Vermont	6	6	6	0
Rhode Island	4	2	2	2
Connecticut	6	6	6	0
New York	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	7	7	0	0
Pennsylvania	26	26	0	0
Delaware	3	3	0	0
Maryland	8	3	5	0
Virginia	17	0	17	0
North Carolina	11	0	11	0
South Carolina	9	0	9	0
Georgia	10	0	10	0
Florida	3	0	3	0
Alabama	9	0	9	0
Mississippi	6	0	6	0
Louisiana	6	0	6	0
Texas	4	0	4	0
Arkansas	3	0	3	0
Tennessee	13	9	4	0
Kentucky	12	12	0	0
Ohio	23	10	12	1
Indiana	12	9	2	0
Illinois	9	9	0	0
Michigan	5	0	5	0
Iowa	4	4	0	0
Missouri	7	2	4	0
Wisconsin	4	0	4	0
	133	118		

So the original proposition, as amended, was finally carried.

The Chair announced that the passage of the resolution entitled both sets of delegates from New York to take their seats. Mr. Hannegan read a resolution from the State Democratic Convention of Indiana, repudiating the Wilmot Proviso, and then submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the New York delegation known as the Syracuse delegation, are rightfully entitled to cast the vote of said State in this Convention.

Mr. Dickinson, of New York, obtained leave to read a paper from the Syracuse delegates, protesting against the decision of the Convention, as wrong in itself and injurious in effect. An extract will show its purport:

"In politics, as in morals, there is a right and wrong principle; and this question very clearly involves it. Shall the Democracy of New York, the Democratic organizations, the denunciation and repudiation of its candidates and administration, and finally the proclamation of an existing and threatening schism, have no weight, nor want to the teachings of the national Democracy, and hostile to the interests and stability of the party, and yet the offenders, who have made all this, receive recognition and favor—then all these things, well known to this Convention, may be passed over, and the partisans of whose course they have been the unfortunate victims, be admitted as holding a rightful place in this Convention?

It was moved that Mr. Hannegan's resolution lie upon the table. On this motion Mr. Cambreling stated that New York declined to vote. The Chair also ruled that she could not vote. The vote was then taken, and stood 125 nays. So the resolution was laid upon the table.

Mr. Sanderson moved that the Convention proceed to nominate candidates. The Utica delegation retired for the purpose of consultation. Mr. Ramsey proposed to read a letter from the President of the United States. Mr. Parbut, of New York, spoke in favor of the business the President had with that Convention. The letter was read, announcing the purpose of Mr. Polk not to accept a renomination, were it tendered him. The gentleman to whom it was addressed was authorized to read it, should it be ascertained that any one intended to submit his name to the Convention. Mr. Yancey moved to lay the resolution of Mr. Sanderson on the table, until after the adoption of resolutions; but the previous question having been moved, it was ruled out of order. Mr. Yancey appealed—the Convention sustained the Chair. The previous question was ordered. Mr Yancey moved to lay it upon the table. Lost—yeas 21, nays 232. The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McCandless, of Pennsyvania. I nominate, in the name of the Democracy of my State, the distinguished son of Pennsylvania, JAMES BUCHANAN. [Applause.] Let us be a united and harmony, allow me to direct your attention to the red and white rose blended. [Loud applause] Here it is, sir! [Exhibiting a beautiful bouquet.] I hope, in the name of this Convention, and I beg to present it to our New York friends. [Applause]

[The roses were handed to the New York delegations, but both declined to receive this offering]

Mr. Ellie, of Mississippi. I beg leave to nominate Lewis CASS, of Michigan, as President of the United States. [Applause]

Mr. Hamlin, of Maine. I beg leave to present the name of Levi WOODBURY, of New Hampshire. [Applause.]

Several motions of adjournment to various hours were made, in order to allow the delegations to consult; but they were all negatived.

The Convention proceeded to ballot, and, on the fourth ballot, Lewis CASS was declared to be the nominee of the Convention. The votes on the several ballots were as follows:

	1st ballot.	2d do.	3d do.	4th do.
Cass	125	133	147	179
Buchanan	55	54	40	33
Woodbury	52	56	53	38
Dallas	3	3	0	0
Calhoun	6	6	5	1
Worth	1	0	5	1
Butler	0	0	0	1

FIRST BALLOT.

States.	Cass.	Buch.	Woodb.	Dallas.
Maine	0	0	9	0
New Hampshire	0	0	6	0
Massachusetts	0	0	12	0
Vermont	4	0	2	0
Rhode Island	1	0	3	0
Connecticut	0	0	6	0
New York did not vote.				
New Jersey	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0
Maryland	6	0	2	0
Virginia	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	11	0	0	0
South Carolina	9	0	0	0
Georgia	10	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	3	0
Alabama	9	0	0	0
Mississippi	6	0	0	0
Louisiana	6	0	0	0
Texas	4	0	0	0
Arkansas	3	0	0	0
Tennessee	7	2	2	2
Kentucky	8	1	1	1
Ohio	23	0	0	0
Indiana	12	0	0	0
Illinois	5	0	0	0
Michigan	5	0	0	0
Iowa	4	0	0	0
Missouri	7	0	0	0
Wisconsin	4	0	0	0
	179	33	38	1

Whole number of votes, 254; necessary to a choice, 170. So Lewis CASS, of Michigan, having received two-thirds of the whole number of votes cast, the Chair declared him duly nominated by the Convention as the candidate for President.

Mr. Bryce, of Louisiana, and Mr. Toucey, of Connecticut, both rose for the same object, to make a motion by which those States whose delegate had left the room, should not be deemed to have an opportunity to give in their concurrence, in order that the nomination might be unanimous.

These United States, represented in this Convention, were then called again, when it appeared that the nomination of General Cass was unanimously sustained by the delegates of the Union States, with the exception of New York, Alabama, and Florida, the former not having voted at all, and the two latter permitting their votes to stand as cast on the last ballot.

Mr. Yancey, of Alabama, said, that State will still adhere to principle; and when the principles of the platform, for which the nominee of this Convention is to go before the people had been laid down by the Convention, if those principles were in accordance with the instructions of his Alabama had given to her delegates, Alabama would support that nominee.

Mr. Cambreling said that since the decision of the Convention in regard to the claims of the contesting delegations from New York, that which he represented had consulted, and find themselves in a difficult position, from the instructions of their constituents. Their course would be indicated by a paper which they had prepared and now presented.

The paper was read by Mr. Smith, and went briefly into a history of the circumstances under which they had been sent here, the action of the Utica Convention, the subsequent response of the Albany legitimate caucus, its approval of their sentiments, and the expression of surprise by that Convention, that the same should be considered as neutralize their action here, by forcing upon the Convention another set. No instructions had been given, because none were necessary, from their clear principles were so well known to the Democracy.

Other considerations, also, had influenced their determination. They were entitled to claim to be seats exclusively, or not at all. They differ in principle from the other. And if they are not entitled to seats, they should not be compelled to embarrass the action of those others. They had desired the question of right to be settled; and if they should consent to divide with the other delegations, they would be false to the trust which gave the confidence of the Democracy of New York. They therefore decline, respectfully, to take seats upon the terms proposed.

Mr. Forman offered the following resolutions, on which he called the previous question:

"Whereas that portion of the delegates from New York, known as the Utica Convention Delegates, have withdrawn from the Convention—

"*Be it resolved*, That those members commonly called Utica delegates, who have under the organization of the Syracuse Convention, be received by this Convention as the legitimate representatives of the Democracy of New York, and be entitled to cast the vote of that State.

"*And be it further resolved*, That this Convention repudiate the Wilmot Proviso." [Applause and disapprobation.]

A somewhat stormy scene followed, several gentlemen rising to questions of order.

The resolutions were withdrawn. A committee of one delegate from each State was ordered to prepare resolutions.

Mr. Bayly, desired to order. He did not wish New York to be disfranchised. He believed she was now in a condition to vote; and he submitted that she ought to be allowed to vote.

Mr. Yancey, of the Syracuse New York delegation. She does not want it.

The Chair. The gentleman undertakes to raise a point of order on behalf of New York, and she declines to vote.

The committee was as follows:

Me., F. Smith; N. H., N. Hibbard; Mass., B. F. Hallett; Vt., Thomas Bartlett; R. I., Walter S. Burgess; Conn., Isaac Toucey; N. Y., ——; N. J., Samuel Lilly; Penn., John W. Forney; Del., James N. Sutton; Md., Francis P. Blair; Va., James McDowell; N. C., John Daniel; S. C., J. M. Commander; Ga., Francis H. Cone; Fa., John C. McGehee; Ala., W. L. Yaney; Miss., Charles Clark; La., John Slidell; Texas, David S. Kaufman; Ark., Charles E. Moore; Tenn., Philip P. Glenn; Ken., H. J. Groesback; O., John Glover; In., John W. Pettit; Ill., William C. Kinney; Mich., Richard Lyon; Iowa, Hannibal Emerson; Mo., Thomas Van Swearingen; Wis., Levi B. Hubbard.

The Virginia delegate was chosen after the retirement of the committee.

The Convention resolved to nominate for the Vice Presidency, when Generals Butler and Quitman, Messrs Howard, King, McKay, and Mason, were nominated. Mr. Howard withdrew his name, and Mr. Dickinson, of New York, spoke as follows:

I rose not occupied in his life some strange positions, but the present was one entirely new. It had not been the custom of New York to speak with a forked tongue, but the Convention had driven them to it. He would then be compelled to speak as an individual. He and his associates had not looked on without interest at the glorious work of that Convention. He had the pleasure with which he was associated threw firebrands into the Convention! [NO! NO!] NO! NO. He would crack down, but he had one, like the stricken deer, to brood over her wounded honor.

The Convention proceeded to ballot for a Vice Presidential candidate.

	First ballot.	Second ballot.
Butler - - -	114	62
Quitman - - -	74	62
J. Y. Mason - -	74	26
W. R. King - -	26	26
J. J. McKay - -	13	11
Jefferson Davis - -	1	0

Whole number of votes on second ballot, 235. Necessary to a choice, 118. General Butler was declared the nominee. The Union, being then called, voted for him unanimously.

Mr. Benton, of New York, stated that he had been instructed, on the part of his delegation, to inform the committee that they would support its nominee. Mr. Butler, in addition to his duties as President, they did not feel authorized to vote, and did not do so.

The Convention adjourned.

FIFTH DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. Hallett, from the Committee on Resolutions, reported a series resolutions, which were adopted by a majority of 184, with additions.

Mr Wells, of New Hampshire, offered a resolution recommending that no State hereafter send more delegates to the National Nominating Convention than the number of electoral votes to which it is entitled. The resolution was opposed by Mr. Clark, of Kentucky. General Houston spoke in support of the doctrines of the Southern Democracy, but contended they were able to take care of themselves in any Convention, no matter whether they had many or few delegates. On motion of Mr. Bright, of Indiana, the resolution was laid upon the table—yeas 126, nays 62.

Mr. Hallett, from the Committee on Resolutions, read a long series, affirming that the Federal Government is one of limited powers—has no power to assume the debts of the States—no power to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of another—no power to pass any other than a revenue tariff—no power to charter a national bank—that the moneys of the Government ought to be kept separated from banking institutions—that our country ought to be kept open and free to foreign immigration—that the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands is inexpedient and repugnant to the Constitution—that the veto power ought to be preserved—that the Mexican war was conducted by the President with skill and necessary on our part—that the Administration ought to be sustained in its prosecution—that the soldiers and officers in this war have covered themselves with imperishable glory. Resolutions were also passed, congratulating France on her triumph over Monarchy, and lauding Polk and Dallas.

The following resolutions we copy in full:

2. That the Constitution does not confer upon the General Government the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvements.

7. That Congress has no power, under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the Abolitionists or other citizens to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to fan the flame of sectional jealousy and recriminations, and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the People, and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be encouraged by any friend of our political institutions.

Messrs. Yancey, McGehee, and Commander, representing Alabama, Florida, and South Carolina, made a minority report, concurring in every resolution except the 7th and 8th, which, they say, is restricted by the majority of the committee to *the States*, leaving the Territorial question untouched. They therefore recommended the following resolution as a substitute:

Resolved, That the doctrine of non-interference with the rights of property of any portion of the People of this Confederation, be it in the States or in the Territories, by any other than the parties immediately interested, is the true republican doctrine recognised by this body.

Mr. Yancey spoke in support of this resolution. Mr. Hull inquired whether it denied the right of the Territorial Legislatures to regulate slavery. Mr. Yancey answered, certainly. The question was then taken on the substitute, and it was rejected, those voting in the affirmative being—Maryland 1, South Carolina 9, Georgia 9, Florida 3, Alabama 9, Arkansas 3, Tennessee 1, Kentucky 1—total 36. Nays 216. Mr. Strange, in behalf of the delegation from North Carolina, said he was instructed to say that they believe the resolutions of the Convention to be entire ground of non-interference with the rights of slavery in any part of Congress, whether in the States or Territories. The report of the committee was then adopted, entire, without amendment, by 249 votes.

Mr. Commander (before the vote was declared) obtained leave to make an explanation, as he had he had declined to cast the vote of South Carolina on this question. He had voted for a Northern candidate, on an implied understanding that the South should be treated with the respect of the Convention, upon which they could stand forever. That had not been done. But he had determined Congress on the subject of abolishing slavery, &c. in the District of Columbia; that all petitions on this subject ever presented have been laid on the table, or referred to committees who have never reported upon them. He had left the right of citizens only to present their petitions, but to have them considered; Therefore,

"Resolved, That the several committees of this House, to whom have been referred petitions or memorials on the subject of the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, be directed to report back to this House, for action, and report thereon at the earliest practicable period."

The reception of this resolution being objected to, Mr. T. moved a suspension of the rules to enable him to offer it, but the motion to suspend the rules was negatived.

Mr. Ingersoll moved to suspend the rules to enable him to offer a resolution, making the bills reported by the Judiciary Committee, in relation to taking the census, the special order of the day for the 3d Tuesday in June. Yeas 75, nays 45 So the rules were not suspended.

Mr. Smith, of Indiana, asked the general consent of the House to offer a resolution, making the bill to establish a Territorial Government in Oregon the special order immediately after the disposal of the general appropriation bills. The message of the President, concerning Oregon, was also read. Mr. Cobb, of Georgia, was anxious to have the subject taken up at once, and disposed of without discussion. Messrs. Collamer and Vinton opposed this. It was unnecessary, as immediate provision, if required, might be made for sending troops to succor the Oregon settlers; but the Territorial bill was a different matter. It was well understood that there were important questions, including that of slavery, connected with the bill, on which there would be discussion. They were opposed to any gagging. Messrs. Haralson, Hilliard, Venable, and other Southern members, also denounced any attempt to gag discussion on this subject. The result was, that Mr. Smith's motion was agreed to, and the message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

On a motion of Mr. Ashmun to suspend the rules to enable him to offer a resolution that Congress adjourn on the 10th of July, the vote stood—yeas 113, nays 66. So it failed.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and took up the bill making appropriations for the Post Office Department. Several amendments were made—the bill was reported—the main question was ordered—but the House adjourned.

MAY 30.

SENATE.—The Senate was occupied in the consideration of the Indian Appropriation bill, chiefly in relation to an amendment moved by Mr. Atchison, to strike out the appropriation to Colonel Johnson for his Choctaw school.

A resolution, introduced by Mr. Atchison, to close the session on the first Monday in July, and hold an extra session the first Monday in October, was read twice, and ordered.

HOUSE.—The House went into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and took up the West Point Academy, returned from the Senate with an amendment. Mr. Toombs, the Chairman, decided that speakers must confine themselves to the subject matter under consideration; from this decision an appeal was taken, and argued till nearly 2½ o'clock, when it was sustained by the Committee—74 yeas, 72 nays. It has been the custom of the House, in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, for members to speak upon any subject connected with the state of the Union, no matter what the particular bill formally under consideration. By the decision, and the vote sustaining it, this custom is abolished.

The Military Academy Bill, with the amendment, was then reported to the House, and passed.

Adjourned.

DOMESTIC MARKETS.

BALTIMORE.

Beef Cattle.—Prices ranging from $2.92 to $3.75 per 100 lbs. gross—the sales of 1,500 at $3.50 per 100 pounds, nett, averaging about 33⅓ gross and advance.

Flour.—A full supply in market. Sales at $4 a $4.50 per 100 pounds.

Flour and Meal.—The news by the steamer Hibernia has had no special effect on the market for Flour and Meal. The receipts of Flour are about 2,500, the receipts and supply continue moderate; holders of City Mills are asking $4.12½ a $4.25; not much inquiry for exports. Sales at $4.12½ to $4.37½ $3.87½. Corn meal dull at $2.95 a $2.97½.

Grain and Seeds.—The receipts of all kinds of grain are moderate, and prices exhibit no material change. Prime red wheat is selling at $1.20 a $1.25; nominal at $1.40 a $1.50. Corn is selling at 42 a 43 cents for white, and 45 a 46 for yellow—about 1,000 bushels sold. Oats are in good demand, with sales at 30 a 32 cents per bushel. Rye 75 a 77 cents. Clover seed unchanged, and not much in demand.

Provisions.—The provision market is steady, with moderate sales to the regular trade, but no change in prices. Pork sells at $10.25. Beef as at last quoted. Bacon unchanged. Lard 6½ a 6¾ cents per pound, in barrels and kegs.

ANTI-SLAVERY PUBLICATIONS.

CENTRAL AGENCY *for the sale of Anti-Slavery Publications.* The undersigned, Agent for the *New York—Tract Society*, or Agent of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, would inform the friends of the cause that he has made arrangements with the publishers of standard works on American Slavery, whereby he will be enabled to keep on hand, for sale, a general assortment, and retail, a full supply of the Anti-Slavery literature of this country. The agent has also made, that he will keep for sale, set forth by the advocates of emancipation, can be brought before the public. Orders, accompanied by the necessary resolve will be produced; and it is earnestly hoped that the facilities afforded by this establishment for the new Anti-Slavery Depository will be suitably appreciated and improved.

It is not intended or expected to compete in this adv

THE NATIONAL ERA.

CONGRESSIONAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 13, 1848.

The report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, accompanying a bill for the relief of Benjamin Hodges, praying for compensation for a slave, who escaped to the British army from Maryland, in the year 1814, having been read,

MR. TUCK rose and said:

I know too well the importance to individuals of having their claims against the Government not only allowed, but allowed promptly, to be willing to impose any unnecessary delay and objection to the one now under consideration. I have carefully examined the report which has been read, and also such documents and papers in the archives of the Government as I thought would aid me in coming to a just and satisfactory conclusion upon the nature and merits of this claim; and I am constrained to say that I find the demand unsustained, either by law, precedent, or principle. The amount is inconsiderable, and might deserve to escape the scrutiny which has not a short time; but the principle involved—that of taking the funds of Government to pay for slaves, who in time of war have escaped to the enemy—is of great importance, and especially in the present time, when the precedent for such an allowance would lead to a multitude of new demands upon the common treasury of the nation.

The three facts set forth in the report, and which are to constitute the reasons for voting for the bill introduced by the committee, are stated thus:

"1. The Committee are satisfied that the negroes, Phil, belonging to the husband of the petitioner, was taken off by the British army, on his return from Washington City to the fleet, then lying in the Patuxent.

"2. That the owner of said slave has never regained him.

"3. The Committee are advised that there remains unapplied a residue of the funds obtained under the treaty of Ghent, for the express and only purpose of indemnifying losses of this character."

In regard to the first and second of these reasons, I say that they are entirely immaterial, and that their existence or non-existence cannot constitute any element of a just demand upon the Government. The escape of slaves to a Power with which we are at war, and the consequent loss of property to the alleged owners, is not a case which invokes our sympathy with the master, or authorizes our action in his behalf. To grant the indemnity demanded, would be a new precedent upon the Constitution, by which the General Government was intended to be kept disconnected with the institution of slavery. I am surprised that a Committee of the House, at a time when discussion upon the subject of slavery is so much deprecated, should lay before us a report that imposes the alternative of examining the character and merits of that institution, and of repudiating its unjust pretensions, or of sitting, in craven subjection, and voting the money of our constituents for hateful and infamous purposes. Why is it that gentlemen who are loud in their complaints and fierce in their malediction against those who may charge with institutions slavery into this hall, should give their sanction to a claim which necessarily forces the free States into dishonorable subjection, or coerces them into indignant opposition? I can account for it on no charitable supposition, except that in the press of business it has escaped that critical nation which is indispensable to examine it.

In regard to the third reason stated, I say that, if the Committee were advised of what they ought, (which I will not deny,) they were not advised of what has never had any existence in fact. There does not "remain unapplied" any "residue of the funds obtained under the treaty of Ghent;" nor were such funds ever obtained by this Government, for the "purpose of indemnifying losses of this character." If the Committee acted upon any such representation, they could not have derived their knowledge from any authentic source, and were grossly misinformed. I trust that the importance of the principle involved in this claim will be a sufficient apology for detaining the Committee, by reading such documents as are necessary to be understood, in order to judge correctly of its merits. It is well known, that by the treaty of Ghent, concluded December 24th, 1814, peace was established between the United States and Great Britain. It was first stipulated that treaty is thereby portion necessary to be referred to for our present purpose; it contains the following clause:

"All territory, places, and possessions whatsoever, taken by either party from the other, during the war, or which may be taken after the signing this treaty, excepting only such islands or places as shall be mutually agreed upon to be restored without delay, and without causing any destruction or carrying away any of the artillery or public property originally captured in said forts or places, and which shall remain therein upon the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty, *or any slaves or other private property*."

I call particular attention to the last line of this clause, because that portion produced protracted negotiations between the two Governments, and assumed such importance before what would have been expected, from the modest and almost accidental manner in which the idea indicated seems to have got into the treaty. It appears that our Government ever made upon England under the stipulation of the whole clause, excepting the last line, did not amount to fifty thousand dollars; while that last line gave Great Britain a claim for fifty thousand dollars, and upwards, for runaway slaves, the number of which was more than even hundred and fifty thousand dollars—being more than ninety times the value, and any conception of at the time of concluding the treaty. Having, however, signed the bond, there was no escape; and the English, to whom the bond was given, and fugitive slaves. The demand for satisfaction was urged by our Commissioners, and was resisted by that ok England. The stipulation was not absolutely definite, though it was certain to come extent. Volumes correspondence took place, and negotiations were pending until October 20th, 1818, when a Convention was entered into between the two Governments, which gave hope of an end to adjustment of the difficulty. The nature of the disagreement may be inferred from the terms of this Convention. The first article recites the first article in the treaty of Ghent, by which I have read, and then contains the following preamble and conclusion:

"Whereas, under the aforesaid article, the United States claim for their citizens, and as their private property, the restitution of, or full compensation for, all slaves, *or the fate of the exchange of the ratifications of the treaty*, taken from territory, places, or possessions whatsoever, delivered by the said treaty to be restored to the United States, but then still remaining by the British forces, whether such slaves were, at the date aforesaid, on shore, or on board any British vessel lying in waters within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, or elsewhere, in presence have arisen, whether, by the true intent and meaning of the aforesaid article of the treaty of Ghent, the United States are entitled to the restitution of, or full compensation for, all or any slaves as above described, the high contracting parties hereby agree to refer the said differences to some friendly Sovereign or State, to be named for that purpose. And the high contracting parties further engage to consider the decision of such friendly Sovereign or State to be final and conclusive on all the matters referred."

It will be seen that the value of the United States was confined to such slaves as were in possession of the British on the date of signing the treaty. By the 5th article of the same Convention, the Emperor of Russia was agreed upon as the friendly Sovereign alluded to; and he, on the 22d of April, 1822, after hearing the parties, decided that the United States might claim from Great Britain, in behalf of their citizens, "pay for all slaves which the British forces may have carried away from places and territories, of which the treaty stipulates the restitution, in quitting those same places and territories."

"That the United States are entitled to consider as having been so carried away, all such slaves as may have been transferred from the above-mentioned territories to British vessels within the waters of said territories, and who for this reason may not have been restored."

This award was confined, without dispute, to the date specified in the claim recited in the Convention, which the report of Ghent had been agreed upon. The principle having thus been determined, by which the amount of the claims should be estimated, the two Governments entered into a Convention, July 12th, 1822, by the first article of which the parties agreed upon the appointment of two Commissioners and two arbitrators, the latter to be called in conditionally, in case the first should be to notify the Secretary of State of the United States, and, after publication in the newspapers, to hear and decide upon the validity of the claims, to receive and certify proof of claims under the award, and, from a list to be furnished by the Secretary of State, make a report, stating who were actual and *bona fide* claimants, the number of such claim and its amount, and the sum total of the whole.

By the 3d article in said treaty, it is further provided as follows:

"When the average value of slaves shall have been ascertained, the said Commissioners shall constitute a board for the examination of the claims which are to be submitted to them, and they shall notify the Secretary of State of the United States, that they are ready to receive *a definite list of slaves and other private property*, for which the citizens of the United States claim indemnification; *it being understood and hereby agreed that the Commission shall not take cognizance of, nor receive, and that his Britannic Majesty shall not be required to make compensation for claims for private property, under the first article of the treaty of Ghent, not contained in said list*."

MR. COLLAMER (in his seat.) Will the gentleman read the last clause of that article again? It is important.

MR. TUCK. I will, and I invite particular attention to it, inasmuch as it expressly stipulates against any such claim as the one now before us. It was, I suppose, in the error of the Committee, in their assumption, that "funds were obtained under the treaty of Ghent for the purpose of indemnifying losses of this character."

"*It being understood and hereby agreed, that the Commission shall not take cognizance of, nor receive, and that his Britannic Majesty shall not be required to make, compensation for claims for private property, under the first article of the treaty of Ghent*, NOT CONTAINED IN SAID LIST."

The Secretary of State of the United States was to furnish to the Commissioners a list of those who made claims against Great Britain under the treaty of Ghent, and they were to hear and decide upon the validity of the claims, and make a report, stating who were actual and *bona fide* claimants, the number of such claim and its amount, and the sum total of the whole. The only restriction as to the extent of liability of Great Britain was, that they should not be required to make "compensation for claims not in said list." There is no pretence that the claim now before us was on said list, or was either presented to the Secretary of State or Commissioners; for, indeed, was ever heard of, till twenty-five years had elapsed from the time of the loss. There is no pretence that it was ever in possession of the British at the date of the treaty; and the presumption is that he was not, else the claim would have been presented at the time. What interest, then, has the claimant in a sum of money received for the benefit of other persons?

The sixth article in the Convention of July 12, 1822, directed the Commissioners, in case of the Committee, in recommending to allow to this petitioner a dividend of the money recovered. I will read from the report:

"A.—A.—The decision of the two Commissioners, or of the majority of the board, as constituted by the preceding articles, *shall in all cases be final and conclusive*, whether on the question of the OWNERSHIP of the slaves, or other property for which indemnification is to be made. And the British Commissioner, or Commissioners, shall be awarded to each and every owner, in lieu of his slave or slaves, or other property, to be paid in specie, without deduction, the amount of the claim, and at such place or places, as shall be awarded by said Commissioners, and on condition of such release or assignments, to be given as they shall direct."

No language can make a case plainer than this Our Government were the mere agents in liquidating the claims of our citizens against our citizens, and obtaining a stipulation from a foreign Government, to pay those citizens their several demands, as certified on a list to be furnished. Until ratified, it was not contemplated that Great Britain should pay the money to our Government, but should pay the citizens individually, taking their personal discharges as vouchers for the same.

The Commissioners performed the duty of their appointment, and reported a list of claims, some of a great number of individuals, with the sums due to each, the whole amounting to $1,204,960. This business did not come to a conclusion until 1826, when the matter was finally settled, Great Britain became anxious to avoid the trouble of paying out a large number of comparatively small claims, which, if paid, would probably promote a convenient settlement of the demands in favor of the citizens of the United States. Accordingly, a new Convention was entered upon, November 13, 1826, by which England agreed to pay, and did pay to our Government, the full amount reported, and received a full discharge from our Government. It is well known, that the treaty of Ghent, concluded December 24th, 1814, peace was established between the United States and Great Britain. It was first stipulated that treaty is thereby portion necessary to be referred to for our present purpose; it contains the following clause:

"All territory, places, and possessions whatsoever, taken by either party from the other, during the war, or which may be taken after the signing this treaty, excepting only such islands or places as shall be mutually agreed upon to be restored without delay, and without causing any destruction or carrying away any of the artillery or public property originally captured in said forts or places, and which shall remain therein upon the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty, *or any slaves or other private property*."

I call particular attention to the last line of this clause, because that portion produced protracted negotiations between the two Governments, and assumed such importance before what would have been expected, from the modest and almost accidental manner in which the idea indicated seems to have got into the treaty. It appears that our Government ever made upon England under the stipulation of the whole clause, excepting the last line, did not amount to fifty thousand dollars; while that last line gave Great Britain a claim for fifty thousand dollars, and upwards, for runaway slaves, the number of which was more than even hundred and fifty thousand dollars—being more than ninety times the value, and any conception of at the time of concluding the treaty. Having, however, signed the bond, there was no escape; and the English, to whom the bond was given, and fugitive slaves. The demand for satisfaction was urged by our Commissioners, and was resisted by that ok England. The stipulation was not absolutely definite, though it was certain to come extent. Volumes correspondence took place, and negotiations were pending until October 20th, 1818, when a Convention was entered into between the two Governments, which gave hope of an end to adjustment of the difficulty. The nature of the disagreement may be inferred from the terms of this Convention. The first article recites the first article in the treaty of Ghent, by which I have read, and then contains the following preamble and conclusion:

"Whereas, under the aforesaid article, the United States claim for their citizens, and as their private property, the restitution of, or full compensation for, all slaves, *or the fate of the exchange of the ratifications of the treaty*, taken from territory, places, or possessions whatsoever, delivered by the said treaty to be restored to the United States, but then still remaining by the British forces, whether such slaves were, at the date aforesaid, on shore, or on board any British vessel lying in waters within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, or elsewhere, in presence have arisen, whether, by the true intent and meaning of the aforesaid article of the treaty of Ghent, the United States are entitled to the restitution of, or full compensation for, all or any slaves as above described, the high contracting parties hereby agree to refer the said differences to some friendly Sovereign or State, to be named for that purpose. And the high contracting parties further engage to consider the decision of such friendly Sovereign or State to be final and conclusive on all the matters referred."

It will be seen that the value of the United States was confined to such slaves as were in possession of the British on the date of signing the treaty. By the 5th article of the same Convention, the Emperor of Russia was agreed upon as the friendly Sovereign alluded to; and he, on the 22d of April, 1822, after hearing the parties, decided that the United States might claim from Great Britain, in behalf of their citizens, "pay for all slaves which the British forces may have carried away from places and territories, of which the treaty stipulates the restitution, in quitting those same places and territories."

"That the United States are entitled to consider as having been so carried away, all such slaves as may have been transferred from the above-mentioned territories to British vessels within the waters of said territories, and who for this reason may not have been restored."

This award was confined, without dispute, to the date specified in the claim recited in the Convention, which the report of Ghent had been agreed upon. The principle having thus been determined, by which the amount of the claims should be estimated, the two Governments entered into a Convention, July 12th, 1822, by the first article of which the parties agreed upon the appointment of two Commissioners and two arbitrators, the latter to be called in conditionally, in case the first should be to notify the Secretary of State of the United States, and, after publication in the newspapers, to hear and decide upon the validity of the claims, to receive and certify proof of claims under the award, and, from a list to be furnished by the Secretary of State, make a report, stating who were actual and *bona fide* claimants, the number of such claim and its amount, and the sum total of the whole.

By the 3d article in said treaty, it is further provided as follows:

"When the average value of slaves shall have been ascertained, the said Commissioners shall constitute a board for the examination of the claims which are to be submitted to them, and they shall notify the Secretary of State of the United States, that they are ready to receive *a definite list of slaves and other private property*, for which the citizens of the United States claim indemnification; *it being understood and hereby agreed that the Commission shall not take cognizance of, nor receive, and that his Britannic Majesty shall not be required to make compensation for claims for private property, under the first article of the treaty of Ghent, not contained in said list*."

MR. COLLAMER (in his seat.) Will the gentleman read the last clause of that article again? It is important.

MR. TUCK. I will, and I invite particular attention to it, inasmuch as it expressly stipulates against any such claim as the one now before us. It was, I suppose, in the error of the Committee, in their assumption, that "funds were obtained under the treaty of Ghent for the purpose of indemnifying losses of this character."

"*It being understood and hereby agreed, that the Commission shall not take cognizance of, nor receive, and that his Britannic Majesty shall not be required to make, compensation for claims for private property, under the first article of the treaty of Ghent*, NOT CONTAINED IN SAID LIST."

The Secretary of State of the United States was to furnish to the Commissioners a list of those who made claims against Great Britain under the treaty of Ghent, and they were to hear and decide upon the validity of the claims, and make a report, stating who were actual and *bona fide* claimants, the number of such claim and its amount, and the sum total of the whole. The only restriction as to the extent of liability of Great Britain was, that they should not be required to make "compensation for claims not in said list." There is no pretence that the claim now before us was on said list, or was either presented to the Secretary of State or Commissioners; for, indeed, was ever heard of, till twenty-five years had elapsed from the time of the loss. There is no pretence that it was ever in possession of the British at the date of the treaty; and the presumption is that he was not, else the claim would have been presented at the time. What interest, then, has the claimant in a sum of money received for the benefit of other persons?

The sixth article in the Convention of July 12, 1822, directed the Commissioners, in case of the Committee, in recommending to allow to this petitioner a dividend of the money recovered. I will read from the report:

"A.—A.—The decision of the two Commissioners, or of the majority of the board, as constituted by the preceding articles, *shall in all cases be final and conclusive*, whether on the question of the OWNERSHIP of the slaves, or other property for which indemnification is to be made. And the British Commissioner, or Commissioners, shall be awarded to each and every owner, in lieu of his slave or slaves, or other property, to be paid in specie, without deduction, the amount of the claim, and at such place or places, as shall be awarded by said Commissioners, and on condition of such release or assignments, to be given as they shall direct."

No language can make a case plainer than this Our Government were the mere agents in liquidating the claims of our citizens against our citizens, and obtaining a stipulation from a foreign Government, to pay those citizens their several demands, as certified on a list to be furnished. Until ratified, it was not contemplated that Great Britain should pay the money to our Government, but should pay the citizens individually, taking their personal discharges as vouchers for the same.

The Commissioners performed the duty of their appointment, and reported a list of claims, some of a great number of individuals, with the sums due to each, the whole amounting to $1,204,960. This business did not come to a conclusion until 1826, when the matter was finally settled, Great Britain became anxious to avoid the trouble of paying out a large number of comparatively small claims, which, if paid, would probably promote a convenient settlement of the demands in favor of the citizens of the United States. Accordingly, a new Convention was entered upon, November 13, 1826, by which England agreed to pay, and did pay to our Government, the full amount reported, and received a full discharge from our Government. It is well known, that the history of the fund, as the Committee please to call it, upon which they are of opinion that this petitioner has a claim, is, that it is known that there is no such fund as the Committee imagine; but that the money obtained is the property of Great Britain, and that, if any balance remains in the Treasury, it stands to the credit of individuals, who may at any moment call for and receive the same. Could we appropriate the sum recommended to this petitioner, we should actually take the private property of one person, and give it to another.

But this case ought not to be recognised, because it does not appear that it was such an one as could have been embraced in the stipulations of Great Britain, in the Convention, to use Secretary of State and the Commissioners. Great Britain was liable for only such slaves as were in their possession, on land or sea, at the date of signing the treaty; and it does not appear that the slave in question remained on board their fleet until December, 1814, and it is by no means probable that it was. It is well known, that the fleet from the report is, that the slave went away; but whether by the invitation or by the compulsion of the English commanders, whether he was invited on sea or land, a prisoner or a guest of the commanders of the army, whether he was white or black, is not reported. The fact that he was a slave, and therefore a free man, is not proved, on this fact we are asked to prove our sympathy by taking the common treasure of the country to indemnify the owner.

I have thus far examined this claim as I would had any other claim for the destruction or loss of property, and have shown that it cannot be allowed without no stipulation or obligation which we are authorized to recognise. But, sir, I resist the claim on other grounds. I deny that one man can have property in another. I deny that the laws of this country, or the laws of any other country, can make a property in another. In the days of the Revolution there was a great deal of talk about "free men" and "free soil," and "free men" and "free soil" were the watchwords of the patriots of the Revolution. Yet, sir, I have seen a statesman who did not deprive slavery as an inexpressible evil. They drank too freely from the undulcitated fountains of Liberty. Truth, and Humanity, and Christianity, cannot any such notion, I hold in my hand slaveholding authority that those who formed the Constitution guarded against the idea that there can be property in man. In the Madison Papers, where Mr. Madison reports the discussions in the Convention, I find the following, as a part of the discussion on that clause which alludes to the migration or importation of persons:

"Mr. Gerry thought we had nothing to do with the conscences of the southern States; *but we ought to be careful not to give any sanction.*

"Mr. Sherman was opposed to any tax on slaves imported, as making the matter worse, *because it would be a sanction.*

"Mr. Madison *thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man.*"

The clause was then modified from its original shape, agreeably to the wishes of Mr. Madison, and adopted as it now stands. It is by the sanctions of the Constitution, and by the power thus conferred, that the Committee come to be spoken of as containing compromise in favor of slavery. It was not by legislation, it was not by compromise, that slavery was saved from express condemnation. The whole spirit of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution is one withering blast of condemnation of the idea of property in man. Slavery is human bondage. If it were not so, we have come to that age of the world when we should strike for a better Declaration and a better Constitution. No, sir; the Constitution does not recognise property in man, and Congress have no power to act in that direction and for that purpose.

This idea of property in man being recognised in the Constitution, is repudiated by the Supreme Court of the United States. In Groves, *vs.* Slaughter, 15 Peters' Reports, 449, Judge McLean was the following language: "If slaves are considered in some of the States as merchandise, that cannot divest them of the leading and controlling quality of persons, by which they are designated in the Constitution. The character of property is given them by the local law. This law is respected, and a rights under it protected by the Federal authorities; *but the Constitution acts upon slaves as persons, and not as property.*"

MR. BURT. I deny such to be the law; the gentleman does not state it correctly. I challenge any gentleman to prove such sentiments to be held by the Supreme Court.

MR. GIDDINGS. I accept the challenge, and, at the proper time, I will maintain it, not only by the authority of *Groves vs. Slaughter*, but by other decisions.

MR. TUCK. Let me inform the gentleman from South Carolina that what he finds fault with is the exact language of the reported decision; and if he makes any controversy upon the point, it is with the Supreme Court, to whom I pass him over for satisfaction.

MR. BAYLY. The Supreme Court have regarded slaves as property, in many cases, and they will do so again. The history of this Government settles the question that slaves are property.

MR. TUCK. The history which the gentleman from Virginia so often talks about on this floor is spoken of by the historians of this country tells a different story from any which that gentleman can ever understand. As to his points of law, stated today, or at other times by day or night, or morning, I have never to be published under that title. I allege, without fear of contradiction, that the Supreme Court have no one case in respect to the Constitution of the *United States*, regarded slaves as property. When administering local law, according to the statutes of the several States, they have decided questions as they have arisen; they have never decided that the Constitution of the United States upon slaves as property. On the contrary, the Court have decided the reverse. I refer to the cases *Groves vs. Slaughter* and *Prigg vs. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, 16 Peter's Reports. Now, I will yield to Mr. Bayly [Mr. Bayly] says that the Court never will decide as I have stated. Let me tell that gentleman, that he legislate for slavery in the District of Columbia will soon be brought before the Supreme Court, and his prophecy tested; I shall be much disappointed, as well as chagrined and grieved, if they do not decide against slavery in this District is unauthorized and criminal.

The Constitution was formed for the express objects, which are set forth in the preamble, "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." To establish or continue slavery was not among those objects. Congress is restricted in the Constitution, in the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus; and slavery can be made legal only by a legal suspension of this writ, so far as the persons to be enslaved are concerned. Have Congress power to establish slavery in the forts, navy yards, arsenals, and dock yards of the United States? I trust, I deny that they can do it in the District, as legislation attempted to be in connecting the slave laws of Maryland and Virginia. But I have not time to enlarge on this topic, and I have already spoken longer than most of our colleagues, and obtaining a stipulation from a foreign Government, to pay those citizens their several demands, as certified on a list to be furnished. Until ratified, it was not contemplated that Great Britain should pay the money to our Government, but should pay the citizens individually, taking their personal discharges as vouchers for the same.

The Commissioners performed the duty of their appointment, and reported a list of claims, some of a great number of individuals, with the sums due to each, the whole amounting to $1,204,960. This business did not come to a conclusion until 1826, when the matter was finally settled, Great Britain became anxious to avoid the trouble of paying out a large number of comparatively small claims, which, if paid, would probably promote a convenient settlement of the demands in favor of the citizens of the United States. Accordingly, a new Convention was entered upon, November 13, 1826, by which England agreed to pay, and did pay to our Government, the full amount reported, and received a full discharge from our Government. It is well known, that the history of the fund, as the Committee please to call it, upon which they are of opinion that this petitioner has a claim, is, that it is known that there is no such fund as the Committee imagine; but that the money obtained is the property of Great Britain, and that, if any balance remains in the Treasury, it stands to the credit of individuals, who may at any moment call for and receive the same. Could we appropriate the sum recommended to this petitioner, we should actually take the private property of one person, and give it to another.

But this case ought not to be recognised, because it does not appear that it was such an one as could have been embraced in the stipulations of Great Britain, in the Convention, to use Secretary of State and the Commissioners. Great Britain was liable for only such slaves as were in their possession, on land or sea, at the date of signing the treaty; and it does not appear that the slave in question remained on board their fleet until December, 1814, and it is by no means probable that it was. It is well known, that the fleet from the report is, that the slave went away; but whether by the invitation or by the compulsion of the English commanders of the army, whether he was white or black, is not reported. The fact that he was a slave, and therefore a free man, is not proved, on this fact we are asked to prove our sympathy by taking the common treasure of the country to indemnify the owner.

I have thus far examined this claim as I would had any other claim for the destruction or loss of property, and have shown that it cannot be allowed without no stipulation or obligation which we are authorized to recognise. But, sir, I resist the claim on other grounds. I deny that one man can have property in another. I deny that the laws of this country, or the laws of any other country, can make a property in another. In the days of the Revolution there was a great deal of talk about "free men" and "free soil," and "free men" and "free soil" were the watchwords of the patriots of the Revolution. Yet, sir, I have seen a statesman who did not deprive slavery as an inexpressible evil. They drank too freely from the undulcitated fountains of Liberty. Truth, and Humanity, and Christianity, cannot any such notion, I hold in my hand slaveholding authority that those who formed the Constitution guarded against the idea that there can be property in man. In the Madison Papers, where Mr. Madison reports the discussions in the Convention, I find the following, as a part of the discussion on that clause which alludes to the migration or importation of persons:

"Mr. Gerry thought we had nothing to do with the consciences of the southern States; *but we ought to be careful not to give any sanction.*

"Mr. Sherman was opposed to any tax on slaves imported, as making the matter worse, *because it would be a sanction.*

"Mr. Madison *thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man.*"

The clause was then modified from its original shape, agreeably to the wishes of Mr. Madison, and adopted as it now stands. It is by the sanctions of the Constitution, and by the power thus conferred, that the Committee come to be spoken of as containing compromise in favor of slavery. It was not by legislation, it was not by compromise, that slavery was saved from express condemnation. The whole spirit of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution is one withering blast of condemnation of the idea of property in man. Slavery is human bondage. If it were not so, we have come to that age of the world when we should strike for a better Declaration and a better Constitution. No, sir; the Constitution does not recognise property in man, and Congress have no power to act in that direction and for that purpose.

This idea of property in man being recognised in the Constitution, is repudiated by the Supreme Court of the United States. In Groves *vs.* Slaughter, 15 Peters' Reports, 449, Judge McLean was the following language: "If slaves are

---

For the National Era.

DESTRUCTION OF SCHENECTADY IN 1690.

The history of the American colonies should with reason be one of the most thrilling and tragical nature. We, who live in the peaceful enjoyment of our civil and religious liberties, beneath the golden sun of the nineteenth century, can form but a faint shadow of the amount of suffering which the first settlers of the American wilds were obliged to endure.

The early settlers of Schenectady, who were nearly allied, would assemble for their mutual benefit, form a sort of government, and agree to lend each other all whatever dangers might assail them, and to defend each other from the midnight raids through fields of carnage, and he became, like Adams, a Saprenne Magistrate, a Consul. But there were other Consuls. He was not content. He thirsted for more. He was Consul, but Consular power was too short. He fought new battles, and was Consul for life. But Power, confessedly derived from the People, was too short for his audience to their will, and must be resigned to them again, at least in death. He was not content. He thirsted for more. He was Consul for life. The public, imprisoned the Patriarch who presided over Rome's comprehensive See, and obliged him to pour on his head the sacred oil that made the persons of kings divine, and their right to reign indefeasible. He was an Emperor. But he saw around him a mother, brothers, and sisters, and nephews, in the vast empire of which he was the world that he was born a Plebeian; and he had and no heir to wait impatient for the imperial crown. He scourged the earth again, and, again, he was born into the world, even in his wild extravagance. He bestowed Kingdoms and Principalities on his kindred—put away the devoted wife of his youthful days, and another, a daughter of Hapsburg, imperial honor, joyfully accepted his proud alliance. Offspring gladdened his anxious sight; a diadem was placed on its infant brow, and it received the homage of prostrate kings in cradle. Now he was indeed a Monarch—a legitimate Monarch—a Monarch by divine appointment—the first of an endless succession of Monarchs. But there were other Monarchs who held sway in the earth. He was not content. He would reign with his kindred alone. He gathered a few and, with them, he drew his own hundred from subjugated lands. He called forth the young and brave, one from every household—from the Pyrenees to the Zuyder Zee—from Calais to the Ocean. He marshaled them into long and majestic columns, and went forth to seize that universal Dominion, which seemed ready to fall into his hand. But Ambition had tempted Fortune too far. The nations of the earth resisted, rebelled, pursued, surrounded him. The pageant was ended. The Crown fell from his prostrate brow. Lost. The wife who had wedded him in his pride, forsook him in the hour when fear came upon him. His child was murdered in his sight. His kindred were degraded to their first estate, and he was no longer Emperor, nor Consul, nor General, nor even a citizen, but an exile and a prisoner, on a nearly lifeless in the midst of the wild Atlantic. Discontent blended him there. The wayward man fretted out a few long years of his yet unbroken mortal existence, and, in the midnight and in the evening's twilight, toward that distant world that had only just eluded his grasp. His ashes were cast, Death came, and he was buried, though it came even then unwelcome. He was stretched on his bed within the fort which constituted his prison. A few fast and faithful friends stood around him. He was dying, and, perhaps, the hour of relief from long and wearied watching was at hand. As his strength wasted away, delirium strewed the hours with its fairy and inglorious insanity. The pageant of Ambition returned. He was again a Lieutenant, a General, a Consul, an Emperor. He was in Italy, upon the thrones of Charlemagne. His kindred pressed around him, again reinvested with the pompous pageantry of Royalty. The Daughter of the long line of Kings of Spain stood upon his side, and the sunny face of his Child shone out from beneath the diadem that encircled its flowing locks. Marshals and Kings bowed at his word of command. The legions of the Old Guard were in the field, and their scarred faces rejuvenated, and their eyes flashed with the fire of youth. Prussia, Austria, Denmark, and England, gathered their mighty hosts to give him battle. Once more he mounted his impatient charger, and, waving his sword on high, he drew his sword aloft, and cried, "Tote d'Armee." The feverish vision broke, the mockery was ended. The sinews and muscles, and all the frame, fell back upon his bed a lifeless corpse. This was the END OF EARTH THE CORSICAN WAS NOT CONTENT.

WIDOW BEDOTT'S TABLE TALK.

The following humorous sketch is from the London Punch, who respectfully recommends its perusal to a certain class of writers and speakers:

"He was a wonderful hand to moralize, my husband was. Ever and anon, he would jump right off from the table, and, in the middle of his meal, he would begin to enjoy poor health. He made an observation once, when he was in one of his moods, that I shall never forget the whole day I live. He says to me, one winter evenin', as he was sittin' by the fire—I was knittee', (I was always a wonderful knitter,) and he was a smokin' (he was a wonderful smoker, though the doctors used to tell him he'd be better off to let tobacco alone. When he was well, he used to take his pipe and smoke it regular, Sunday, after he's chores done up, and if he wun't well, he used to smoke the biggest part of the time)—well, he took his pipe out of his mouth, and he looked at me—I know'd somethin' was comin', for he had a peculiar way o' looking round when he was going to say somethin' uncommon—and, says he, says he, 'Silly,' (my name was Cynthia Ann, but he always call me Silly,) and he spoke in a kind o' musing manner, as if he was talkin' to himself, and he kind o' hitched his chair a little nearer the fire, and he put his feet on the andiron, and he leaned back in his chair, and he looked right at the fire, and he had a solemn countenance naturally—after he'd got to be a deacon 'twas more so, but since he'd lost his health it amounted almost to sorrow—I certainly you wouldn't wonder at it if you know'd how much he underwent. He was troubled with a wonderful pain in the chest, and sumain' weakness in his spine, and he had a kind o' hollow cough in his side, and having the ager considerable part of the time and bein' broke o' his rest o' nights, 'cause he was afraid to lie down, and sleep like a dog, 'cause he was afraid he'd be choked to death if he lay down. Why, it's an onaccountable fact, that when the man died, he hadn't seen a well day in fifteen years, though he was first taken down with it only a dozen or six years after, I shouldn't desire to see a rugger man than he was. But the time I am speakin' of, he had been sick and poorly nigh upon ten years, and, oh dear sakes, how he had altered since the first time I see him! That was at a quiltin' at Squire Smith's, a spell afore Sally was married. I see him for the first time, I recollect. Well, that was the first time I ever see my husband, and if any body'd told me that I should marry him, I should have thought, I should, I do! I most forgot, I was gwine to tell you what he said that evenin', and when a body begins to tell a thing, I believe in finishing on't some time or other. Well, he sat there a long piece of time, a round for ever, and never coming to the pint, and taking twenty words to say what might be told in five.

"Now, there's Miss Jenkins, she that was Polly Bingham, after she was married—she is just the prettiest little woman, I do declare, I ever see in all my born days; but I was gwine to tell what my husband said. He says to me, says he, 'Silly,' says I, 'what?' 'Ain't you 'what, Hezekiah?' says I, (I didn't like the name, I never did,) I heard it I nearly killed myself a laffin. Hezekiah Bedott, says I, well, I'd give it up if I had such a name! But he's a good man, and he's a kind man, and he's a pious man, and he's a man that makes the most of a bad bargain, and he's a man that makes the most of his wife, and he's a man that makes the most of his family, and he's a man that makes the most of himself, and he's a man that makes the most of everything, and he's a man that makes the most of everybody, and he's a man that makes the most of his sickness, and he's a man that makes the most of his poverty, and he's a man that makes the most of his riches, and he's a man that makes the most of his sorrows, and he's a man that makes the most of his joys, and he's a man that makes the most of his sins, and he's a man that makes the most of his repentance, and he's a man that makes the most of his prayers, and he's a man that makes the most of his hymns, and he's a man that makes the most of his sermons, and he's a man that makes the most of his Bible, and he's a man that makes the most of his Sabbaths, and he's a man that makes the most of his Heaven, and he's a man that makes the most of his Hell, and he's a man that makes the most of his Eternity, or Darkness; Tetter, Shingwam, Scald Head, Ac. Ac. Ac.