VOL. XVII. NO. 44. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 22, 1856. WHOLE NO. 824.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY

At its Office, 138 Nassau St., New York,

AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 North Fifth St., Philadelphia.

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion, and 75 cents for every subsequent insertion. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.

Selections.

MR. HALE AND MR. PIERCE.

Extract from Senator Hale's Speech on Kansas, in the United States Senate, February 26, 1856.

WHAT followed the result of the invasion of Kansas—this going over of Missourians, as admitted and as shown? A law was passed; and I will read you that law, although it has been already read twice:

"SECTION 1. Be it enacted, &c., That if any person print, write, introduce into, or publish, or circulate, or cause to be printed, written, introduced into, published, or circulated, or shall knowingly aid or assist in bringing into the Territory, or in printing, publishing, or circulating, within the Territory, any book, paper, pamphlet, magazine, pictorial, or other print, or any article, any statements, arguments, opinion, sentiment, doctrine, advice, or intended, calculated to produce a disunion sentiment, or a dangerous, or rebellious disaffection among the slaves of this Territory, or to induce such slaves to escape from the service of their masters, or to resist their authority, shall be guilty of a felony, and be punished by imprisonment, at hard labour, for not less than five years."

But as much longer as the judge sees fit. The honourable Senator from Illinois [Mr. Jones], in commenting upon this law, finds a little fault with it. He thinks it is not quite severe enough, but he says it ought to have been a penalty of death, and that every one offending against its provisions ought to be hung on a very high gallows—just as high as that old gallows on which Haman was hung. But, let us suppose the law to remain as it is; and let us suppose that a court was organized in the Territory of Kansas for the trial of offenders against the law; what would be done with a man who was found with a document in his pocket, reading in this way?

"The Southern people have NO RIGHT—natural, moral or political—to enforce slavery upon the new Territories. They have no more right to go there and hold slaves, than they have to do so in New Hampshire. THE SLAVEHOLDERS HAVE NO MORE RIGHT TO SLAVERY UPON THESE TERRITORIES THAN THEY HAVE TO ABOLISH SLAVERY IN SOUTH CAROLINA."

Do you not think that would amount to an "innendo," to say the least of it? Who is the author of that sentiment? The editor of the *New Hampshire Patriot*. He is not one of his *post mortem* examiners, but was published as late as the 28th of December, 1848. That is the declaration of the *New Hampshire Patriot*; and I suppose all of us know the relation which that paper sustained to the present Executive of the United States. I suppose a Senator does not, he may find that one of his first officials acts, after he was elected President, was to present to this editor a gold-headed cane, in token of the very high estimation in which he held him, and the manner in which he had discharged his duties. Do you not think a man ought to take five years for that? Would it not come up to an "innendo, or advice, or opinion?" That was in 1848. Now let me go back one year. Suppose a man should be tried under this law, and this document were found in his possession?

"Resolved, That we declare IT OUR SOLEMN CONVICTION, as the Democratic party have before done, that slavery *is a sacred institution*, and should hereafter exist in any territory which may be acquired by, or annexed to, the United States; and that we will oppose the nomination of our delegation in Congress in favour of the Wilmot Proviso."

What is that? One of the resolutions passed at the Democratic State Convention of New Hampshire, in October, 1847. It must have been that a man who voted for Lane for one of those Senators whom they were thanking for voting for the Wilmot Proviso. Who were the committee that produced this resolution? I will read some of their names. Amongst the gentlemen who composed that resolution were Asa Fowler, "Ichabod" Bartlett, "Old Ironsides" Pierce and by the way, the present Executive of the United States. If any captain general and standard bearer, who is stumping the State of New Hampshire for the office of Governor to-day. He has some hopes of being elected, but, I think, more fears of being defeated. He will see in about two weeks.

Another member of the committee that reported this resolution was Joseph H. Smith, a highly respectable gentleman of my own village. The President has shown his appreciation of Doctor Smith's patriotism, judgment and politics, by appointing him to the highly important office of inspector of drugs in the city of Boston, with a salary of $1,000 a year.

Another gentleman whose name we find among those who reported this resolution was Samuel Swasey. That President did not think so much appreciation of his services, that he thought he must go a little higher than an inspector of drugs, and he was, therefore, appointed inspector and measurer at Portsmouth, with a compensation of over $1,000 a year. The next name upon the Committee who reported this resolution the name of another gentleman, Charles H. Peaslee, who has been rewarded by the President with the very lucrative office of collector of the customs and superintendent of light-houses" for the port of Boston, with a salary of $6,400.

Well, sir, what do you suppose the *New Hampshire Patriot* said about the resolution which I have read, that was submitted by those gentlemen? In an article in that paper of November 4, 1847, it said:

"We never read a more able, eloquent and appropriate series of resolutions adopted upon any occasion; and there is one fact in this connection we must mention. *These* resolutions were adopted UNANIMOUSLY by the very able committee of twenty, after much deliberation, and were unanimously adopted by the Convention. Do not these facts show that the DEMOCRACY AND NATURE convictions of the Democracy of this State."

How long shall these fellows take, sir? Will five years be enough? Certainly that goes beyond an "innendo;" it must come up to a "sentiment" [laughter]. That, you perceive, was in 1847. What next? In 1848—these men were inveterate sinners [laughter]—the Legislature of New Hampshire, with an overwhelming Democratic majority, passed the following resolution unanimously:

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened*, That we are in favour of the passage of a law making it penal *to introduce slavery* in the Mexican and California, *and in all other territories* now acquired, or hereafter to be acquired, by the United States, in which slavery does not exist at the time of such acquisition."

To how long a term of imprisonment, under the law which I have read, ought they to be sentenced for that? This was in 1848. Perhaps it will be said that they began late to reform. Let us see how the Democratic resolutions were passed unanimously by the New Hampshire Legislature:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened, That, opposed to every form and pretension, the spirit of slavery has always been and ever viewed with deep regret the existence of slavery in this Union; that while they have always contended that it was a subject in their constitutional rights, they have not only lamented its existence as a great social evil, but regarded it as *fraught with danger to the peace and safety of the Union*."

"Resolved, That while we respect the rights of the slave holding states as the free portions of the Union respect theirs, we will not willingly consent to any compromise, to be done to any member of the glorious Confederacy to which we belong, WE ARE TIMELY AND EARNESTLY OPPOSED TO THE EXTENSION OF SLAVERY OVER ANY PORTIONOF AMERICAN SOIL NOW FREE.

"Resolved, That, in our opinion, Congress has the CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO ABOLISH THE SLAVE TRADE AND SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; and that our Senators IN INSTRUCTED, and our Representatives in REQUESTED, TO TAKE ALL CONSTITUTIONAL MEASURES to accomplish these objects.

SAM'L H. AVER, Speaker of the House of Representatives.
WILLIAM P. WORCESTER, President of the Senate.
SAMUEL DINSMORE, Governor.

Who do you suppose introduced that proposition? Mr. Clement. And do you suppose that merit like his has been passed over by the President? No, sir; but he has been appointed by the President collector and superintendent of light-houses for the district of Portsmouth, and agent of the marine hospital there. Mr. Clement determined to put an end to this continual passing resolutions. He said to himself, what is the use of that? Here you are passing resolutions year after year on this subject. Now, said he, let us have done with it, and let us declare to all the world and to all time that we are unalterable. Other things may change; we never. We live in a granite State; our evidence bills tower up higher than the clouds; they may crumble and fall, but the New Hampshire Democracy are unalterable; they will never turn [laughter]. And their unalterable position is, that they are opposed to the extension of slavery over any portion of American soil now free." That was in 1848.

What did the *New Hampshire Patriot*, the mouthpiece of the President, say then in regard to the subject? On the 12th of July, in the year 1848, it said:

"The Democracy of the North never did endorse the doctrine, *and they never will*. The Democracy of the North are unanimous in the opinion, so far as we know, that *Congress has power and should exercise the power, and exclude slavery* from California and New Mexico."

So far as they knew, then, there was not a man in New Hampshire who did not entertain those opinions. Did General Pierce entertain them? Why, sir, he was chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee during all this time; and he was the New Hampshire Democracy.

FRENCH VIEW OF AMERICAN SLAVERY.

[Translated from The Journal des Debats for The Evening Post.]

In the last message of the President of the United States there are certain passages devoted to Europe, which have elicited a great deal of comment from the French journals. In the opinion of some, the threats directed towards England are the omens of a coming rupture between the two countries; according to others, there is nothing, after all, in this cross-fire of insult and recrimination that is constantly kept up between the leading newspapers of London and New York but the vanity of a free press, and it is for the very reason that there is such an ado made at the outset that there is so little real cause for apprehension in the sequel. This last opinion is borne out by experience. This is not the first time we have heard the President of the United States, and we have heard that they are of the same blood and members of the same family. John Bull is generally the first to step forward with a proffer of reconciliation; and he seems to recognise and admire himself every time in the faults and violent outcries of his brother Jonathan.

But there is another part of the message which has been thrown completely into the shade, and which, notwithstanding, is far more important than that in which the President gives vent to his anti-British spleen. We mean that portion of the message which treats of home affairs. In spite of its equivocal title, this is the chapter that most concerns the interests of Europe, both present and future. It is true that it is here, under the the cognomen of established precedent, the President only speaks of *domestic institutions* and of the right of each State to regulate its institutions of this nature as it may think best. But this modest disclaimer of the property of words conceals a fact of the greatest import—we mean the establishment of slavery in the new, and for the most part uninhabited, Territories. The Kansas question, as it is called, will perhaps decide the future destiny of the United States, and, judging from present appearances, will ere long involve that country in serious difficulty with Europe. It is time, then, to call public attention to the point at issue.

It is generally know that when, in the year 1819, the Territory of Missouri applied for admission into the Union, the public mind in America was strongly agitated all over the country; the people wanted no new State with a Constitution tolerating the institution of slavery. At that time no one dreamed of denying the right of Congress to exercise sovereign power over the Territories, and consequently to oppose the spread of those *domestic institutions* which are a disgrace to humanity and to the civilized world. The dispute was settled in the year 1821 by a compromise; an imaginary line was drawn 36 1-2 degrees north of the equator, and this was to be the line of demarcation between slavery and freedom; thus Arkansas, Florida and Texas were allowed into the Union as slave States, while Michigan, Iowa and Wisconsin came in as free. A compromise on such a question to the strengthening of slavery was a sad mistake, as time has but too well proved.

The Mexican war and the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, by adding immense territories to the United States and territories situated above the 36th degree of latitude, menaced the slave States with the loss of their equality of suffrage in the Senate, upon which they place their whole reliance, and which alone maintains and perpetuates the institution of slavery. It was evident that, out of those deserts, larger than France, Italy and Spain together, not one new State would be created for the Union, which would give an enormous preponderance to the cause of liberty in the councils of the nation. Already had California, in forming her State Constitution, given slavery the go-by; if the plan of compromise adopted in 1821 retained its highest development on the shores of the Pacific, were to allure free emigrants into all the countries between the Mississippi and the ocean, the doom of slavery would be irrevocably sealed. America would get rid of the cancer that was eating out her vitals, and would soon become the promised land of freedom.

The slave States were aware of the impending danger, and this accounts for their military expedition in Kansas against Cuba. Cuba, could she have been conquered, would have given the Union three or four slave States, and counterbalanced the efforts of free emigration, which was spreading away to the North, and to the Pacific, as well as Minnesota, Utah and Oregon. This, too, explains the political agitation which for the last few years has marked the course of American legislation—an agitation which was brought to a close in the year 1850 by the abandonment of the Wilmot Proviso, followed by the adoption of a clause introducing a new principle into the Federal Constitution. The sovereignty of Congress over the Territories was transferred to the Territories themselves, and to their inhabitants, thus giving to the people the right of regulating their *domestic institutions* as they should think best, or, in other words, the right of admitting or rejecting slavery. The condemning these poor people to perpetual servitude which is meant by the phrase "dangerous" it was considered a question of trifling moment, which was properly left to the decision of those whom it most interested.

At the same time, that nothing might be wanting to render the triumph of the South complete, the Fugitive Slave law was incorporated into the compromise of 1850—that is to say, a law permitting the Federal Government to seize, within the limits of free States, slaves who had escaped from their masters. Thus, while at the North State sovereignty was being infringed upon and weakened to promote the interests of slavery, the same sovereignty was enlarged in Southern Territories for the introduction into them of the peculiar institution.

The South, then, had triumphed in the sad compromise of 1850, to which Mr. Clay attached his name, but it is the destructive characteristic of injustice that every one of its victories but hastens its own destruction by aggravating the disease it is sought to cure. It had rallied all the care and skill of a great statesman to hold up this towering structure of iniquitous laws—a few pages, written by an unknown Christian woman, sufficed to level it to the ground. Uncle Tom is certainly not a literary *chef d'œuvre*; it is more than that: it is a noble action.

Since the appearance of this book, the hatred of slavery has been constantly gaining ground in the free States. Horace Greeley, a leading journalist, and a popular tribune, has attacked this odious system of legislation. All the Eastern States refuse to assist in the *extradition of the refractory*, as the honied language of the Message has it; and in the delivering up innocent fugitives, they have given up their legal complicity and licensed infamy. That is what the President calls, in his Message, "not fulfilling their constitutional obligations on account of a blind prejudice"; for, at the present day, there are entirely changed their ancient notions of Christian. The good citizens and saints are those who defend the peculiar institution, while the criminals are those who demand the freedom of their fellow-beings in the name of the Gospel and the Rights of Man.

We will come the Kansas question, which is now engaging the attention of Congress, and threatening the stability of the Union. Kansas is a Territory lying between the thirty-seventh and the fortieth degrees of north latitude, and between the States of Missouri and the Territory of New Mexico. Planters from Missouri and Arkansas have, from time to time, established themselves in it with their slaves, or merely visited it long enough to deposit their votes, and thus influence the Territorial elections. Emigrants from the North also settled in the Territory, carrying with them their ideas of freedom. Threats were exchanged, and in last December the little city of Lawrence, where the friends of liberty had taken up their quarters, was besieged by a force. There seems, unfortunately, too much reason to believe that the owners of slaves are now in the majority. If they carry the day, and Congress admits the new State into the Union, Nebraska and New Mexico will soon follow Kansas's example, and there will be, from the Mississippi to the Pacific, one uninterrupted line of slave States, which will confine liberty to the limits of the North, and assure the prepotence of the South.

We can all of us imagine how fierce will be the struggle on the floor of the present Congress, from the fact that, for nearly two months, Congress was unable to organize by the election of a Speaker. The reason of this is evident: this is the battle-ground on which the two parties are to measure their strength. Mr. Banks, who has the largest number of votes, sea in the clause of 1850 the effect of a hasty onslaught on public opinion, and opposes greater limits to the Fugitive Slave law with the principles of the Missouri Compromise; his adversary, Mr. Richardson, sees, on the contrary, in this admission, the real application of constitutional guarantees, and between these two opinions the House of Representatives stands a third in Mr. Fuller, who is beating on and off, and will not commit himself in a crisis where indecision is so eminently out of place.

Rarely has a greater struggle taken place in the counsels of a nation; it is nothing more nor less than the future destiny of liberty that is about to be decided. But one would hardly imagine so, in reading certain passages, wherein the President has nothing but insult for those who want neither a Fugitive Slave law nor the admission of Kansas.

"If," says the message, "the passionate rage of fanaticism and partisan spirit had not for the first time put our attention, it would be difficult to believe that any considerable portion of the people of this enlightened country could have so completely forgotten themselves as to attempt to the unprepared interest of Africans in the United States as totally to abandon and disregard the interests of the twenty-five millions of Americans—to trample under foot the Constitution, the moral and constitutional obligations, and to engage in plans of vindictive hostility against a people who are associated with them in the enjoyment of the common heritage of our national institutions."

It is true that the Union is stronger a thousand times than all the wild and disorganized elements which manage which are generated one after another in the unstable minds of visionary fanatics and interested agitators. Imply on the patriotism of the people, on the dignity and self-respect of the States, on the wisdom of Congress, and, above all, the continued gracious favour of Almighty God, to maintain, against all enemies, whether at home or abroad, the sanctity of the Constitution and the integrity of the Union."

We know not what effect was produced in America by such language, but it is to be feared that to the people of the Old World this appeal to justice and to Providence will look more like blasphemy than anything else. Is it true that the President talks in this strain, that it will sounds far later set the whole mass to fermenting. There is too much honour, too much religion, too much virtue in them, to think of endring forever this Mezentian torment. Every day the cry of humanity grows slowly filling, and, in Europe. When will it overflow? That is known of God alone.

But has Europe nothing to do but look calmly on and watch the drama that the ambition and cupidity of man has laid on the stage—not the result of any plot? Is she entirely unconcerned in an affair which, to our mind, is more pregnant of danger to the future than was even the Eastern question?

Let us consider a moment. We are in the full light of the nineteenth century, and in a republic, across the sea, in a country that styles itself Christian, is now being discussed the question, not as to whether a disease, well-nigh irremediable, is to be endured or extirpated, but whether this disease shall not be transplanted into a soil where it is now unknown, and where not a shadow of a pretext exists for introducing it. To satisfy the South, to calm its fears or to quench its inordinate thirst for gold, millions of human beings must be plunged into the most abjectness and degradation; civilization must be thrust back and the Bible be trampled under foot, that the minds of few Arkansas planters may be set at ease, that Virginia may be kept by raising negroes, and that Mr. Pierce may be reelected.

The President waxes eloquent over the independence of the United States, which, says he, exhaust their strength neither in foreign nor in civil wars, and loudly declaims against all European interference in the affairs of the New World. Perhaps his zeal misleads him a little in the latter particular, and the Kansas bill may be distined to bring about the very change in European policy which he so much deprecates. The United States world is no longer either European or American. There is something else besides mere territorial lines and demarcations, which steam is blotting out every day. The world is christianised and civilised, and it is the duty of every one on its face is uninterested in what is passing in the United States.

Europe saw with indifference the first provinces of Mexico wrested from a country which, for the past three centuries, has seemed to wrap itself in the blessings lavished upon it by Heaven. Thanks to the liberal policy of the United States, those long-deserted shores were thrown open not alone to America, but to all mankind. California is an admitted star on the flag of the Union, but it is none the less a Colony accessible to all in quest of fortune or a livelihood. Who, then, can envy this prosperity, in which every one is directly or indirectly interested?

But is the case the same if, in the newly-acquired Territories of the Union, a new Roman Republic is to be reared, with the institution of slavery underlying it as a foundation? Is there no reason to fear that slavery, after its introduction into Kansas, will find its way into New Mexico, and thence, by an easy gradation, slope away to the south, till it finally reaches the Isthmus of Panama? Shall we remain in the presence of such a possibility? Two distinct and antagonistic forms of civilizations—the one assuming Christian equality for its standard, the other demanding its laws from ancient Rome, and possessed of all the haughty pride, ambition and insolence of the old masters of the world? As it is no longer civilization, but slavery, that the conquerors draw in their train, will not Europe feel surely called upon to check the United States in its career of triumphal aggression? President Pierce's Cabinet has declared that it will consider the enfranchisement of slaves in Cuba as a *casus belli*. The South cannot tolerate the vicinage of freedom. Shall Europe be less sensible to the dangers that menace the liberties of the future, and deem that the conquest of Mexico and the establishment of slavery are no business of hers?

And even though the United States should have nothing to fear on this side of the Atlantic, though no obstacle were to impede the onward march to conquest in which she is now incessantly urged by the greediness of the South, she can but know that she has inflicted on herself a more terrible calamity than could possibly happen from a war with Europe. With a free and admirable form of government, she was at once the model and the envy of the Old World. She was the common mother of all high-minded, generous spirits—she was the hope of the human race. At the present day, by becoming the advocates and the propagandists of slavery in the midst of a civilization based upon the idea of the perfect equality of all, by departing from the principles of Washington, Jay and Franklin, she has lost her moral force, her sacred mission, and have inflicted a terrible blow on the cause of civil and religious liberty. Their moral standard has been lowered. To the great joy of the enemies of freedom, public opinion in Europe is setting down the United States as a country of hypocrites. With ten millions of inhabitants, the United States in 1815 were really greater and more respected than they are at present. The example they held up to the world, and the authority of the real principles of humanity, to whom they were indebted for their institutions, constituted by no means an insignificant feature of their greatness. America was for us the country of Washington. A few short years, and, lo! what a change! When Austria is emancipating her serfs, when Prussia is thinking of doing the same, how shall we class the free people which not only defends slavery, but carries and plants it where it had never existed?

If the President's friends applaud the clearness and precision of the message; we know not what may be the success of this document to-morrow, but there is one thing of which we are certain, and that is that the President has covered his name with indelible infamy, and that, if the Kansas bill triumphs, the name of Mr. Pierce will be inscribed, not underneath those of Washington, Jefferson, and their noble compatriots, but among those who have failed to realize the expectations of their country, who have sullied its honour, and who, through weakness or design, have humbled the glory of America, and proved traitors to the cause of justice and liberty.

EDOUARD LABOULAYE.

A SLAVE SALE IN RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

MAY I give your readers a brief sketch of one or two scenes I have witnessed to-day? There is a row of well-dressed girls, from 15 to 20 years of age, awaiting their turn to second the auction-block or table, while a group of men and boys are being sold. They are surrounded by a group of sensual-looking men, young and old, mixing them all sorts of immodest and impure questions—feeling their ankles, arms and bosoms—while those trembling, sensitive ones have no power of resistance. Now their turn comes to second the table and be placed under the auctioneer's hammer. Now is called out. She ascends the stage, and for the time being is the observed of all observers. She is dressed with true artistic skill, to set off her form; flowing sleeves, which are soon to be thrown back to display the gracefully-rounded arm; a tasteful wrought skeleton of the whitest cambric; her raven hair trimmed with ribbons; a slight dash of African blood can be seen in her cheeks, which only increases her beauty; lecherous-looking men gather close, anxious her beauty; lecherous-looking men gather close, anxious to hear her bid, the price; and now the auctioneer begins—"What is bid, gentlemen, for this beautiful girl? Only sixteen; sold for no fault; brought up in a genteel family; right and title good; warranted sound; one hundred dollars, I say. What is bid, gentlemen? Six hundred dollars, I hear—six? six? six? six? six!—" "Fifty!" "Thank you; six hundred and fifty dollars is bid. Now, gentlemen, I hear—seven; seven! seven! going for seven hundred dollars; seven—" "Fifty!" "Seven, twenty-dollars; seven—" "Twenty-five!" "Seven, fifty—do I hear any more? Why, gentlemen—mark her beautiful form! See her well-shaped foot and gracefully-turned ankle!"—as the same time raising her clothes above her knees, while a short of approbation greets him from the gazers around the table beneath. Now the bidding goes on, under the excitement of this exposure of her person, hrisker than ever. It reaches $900, and then another move is tried. She is taken down from the table to fall back, and a path is made to the furthest side of the building; and between those files of men she is made to walk briskly backward and forward. "Hold up your head, miss; walk part, now, as if you were going to church to meet your beau! See there, gentlemen, the beauty of the foot you; the real Baltimore clip! step as light as an antelope's. What is bid, gentlemen? While she is thus exhibited, the pseudo-Christian trade man, any one that chooses may stop her and handle any part of her body, ask her any question he chooses; then, for the last time, she ascends the stand, and is soon knocked down to the highest bidder, at not far from $1,000. And this course is pursued by each, till all are disposed of. As I have to observe here, that the men and boys are taken into another room, a little before the sale, and are stripped naked, that their muscular developments may be better seen; and also, if they have any wounds or whip-marks on them.—*Cor. of The Tribune.*

For The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

BANKS ELECTED.

"CLOSE THE RANKS."

"Close the ranks, comrades. Victory clings to Unity."
Kossuth at Pest, 1848.

We have passed the second Decade
Of the struggle and the fight,
And the contest rages fiercely round us
In the gloomy moral night
That envelopes all the Nation:
Like the Night-Mare of old,
Round the stern, historic heroes,
In their classic battles, rolled.

But along the far horizon
Dawns a brighter, more inviting light
Flashing upward, streaming outward,
O'er the darkness of the night.
"Close the ranks, ye freedom-loving warriors;
Close the ranks, by battle torn;
See yr not the blazing streamers
Giving promise of the morn?"

"Close the ranks," renew the battle,
For the combat still must be
Fought in Faith, the heart believing
We shall yet see victory free.
"Close the ranks," we *hear* the foemen
Falling round us, one by one:
And WE WILL CONTINUE TO BE victors
At the coming of the sun.

Lo! it is the same old conflict
Of the Centuries ago:
Gather we, the Hosts of Freedom,
Round the still unvanquished foe.

Listen! in the conflict's pauses,
How the solemn minutes pass
Break upon us with the sorrow
For our valiant fallen ones.

Let us leave them! soft reposing,
Place and fold them to our breast!
Crown them with immortal honour!
Hold them in unbroken rest.

Close the ranks *where they* have fallen!
Standing on each new made grave
Close the Ranks, surviving comrades,
At the coining of the slave.

CAUSE AND EFFECT.

As will be seen by reference to another column of our paper to-day, the slave case in Cincinnati has been decided, by Commissioner Pendery, against the fugitives. This case has excited considerable attention, in almost all parts of the country, in consequence of having been the subject of the most full and lively revelations of incidents that has ever been recorded in the history of slavery. A mother has murdered her child, declaring that she would rather see it dead than to have it return to the bondage of the South; and she was on her way with it to Canada to escape. What a lesson for those dealers in human beings is contained in this one sentence! A mother murders her offspring to preserve it from slavery. We have no language with which to express our opposition to the institution which will thus affect the ties of affection between parents and children. But this is only one of the effects of this withering, blighting, damning curse upon our Country and Nation. Men are driven to infamy in their cities; fathers to self-destruction; children to lewdness and debauchery. Families are separated by masters, tearing women and children from their sires and husbands; the marriage ceremony is made a mockery by libaish and the plaited thong; the provisions of our national compact contravened; the principles of liberty and of justice violated without compunction; the foundation of all civil and religious liberty is sought; and the foundations of liberty scattered broadcast over our whole country, drawing the very life-blood from the Government which fosters it.

They who are bound by the weight of its galling chains, and trampled into the very dust by its demoniac ruling power, whose operation is known only by its effects, receive no sympathy from persons professing Christianity, or, at least, no more than they might expect from the Pagan Mahometan. Men who are driven from the Bible and the professions of those who pretend to regard them as sacred can have no effect upon its course. No abuse can be found, search where you may, that may not either cleave, Error; the crimes of which Slavery has been the parent exposed to the refining fire of Justice, and the rights of man proclaimed. Let this one case be a warning for the future; and let all who have at stake the cause of humanity and justice, calmly at this instance of the harbarism of slavery, and, looking, learn to denounce a fraud, impiety and hypocrisy which would disgrace a nation of savages.—*Newport (Ky.) News.*

MORE OF THE FUGITIVE CASE.

DECISION OF JUDGE BURGOYNE ON THE MOTION TO DISMISS THE HABEAS CORPUS.

FROM THE Cleveland Weekly Leader, Feb. 27.

LAST EVENING, Judge Burgoyne, of Cincinnati, in the case of the fugitives against Marshal Robinson, gave his decision on the motion of the defendant to dismiss the petition and writ of *habeas corpus*. After citing the defence set up, that the certificate of the Commissioner was conclusive, according to the latter clause of the eighth section of the Fugitive Law, "shall prevent all molestation of such person or persons by any process issued by any Court, Judge, Magistrate or other person whomsoever," and that this decision was a bar to the writ of *habeas corpus*, and, therefore, the Court had no jurisdiction in the case, Judge Burgoyne proceeds:

"The first question to be considered is, whether the clause referred to in the closing paragraph of the sixth section of the Fugitive Slave law, already cited, was intended by the Congress of the United States to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus*; and, if so, whether Congress had the constitutional power so far to do. Article first, section nine of the Constitution of the United States provides 'that the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* shall not be suspended unless when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it;' and repeatedly the same words were engrafted into the Constitution of Ohio in 1802, and repealed in the present Constitution of the State. This provision of the Constitution nugatoriously renders void so much of any act of Congress as undertakes to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* in times of public tranquility; and if the intention of the Fugitive Slave law was to place persons claimed as fugitives from labour, after the certificate of a Commissioner, beyond the reach of this great writ, so much of it as undertakes to carry out that intention is clearly unconstitutional. In this aspect of the case it matters very little what construction properly belongs to the language of the act of Congress. If it does not mean to place the persons certified by the Commissioner to be persons owing service in one State and escaped into another, beyond the reach of the writ of *habeas corpus*, then the defendant's motion must be overruled, because there is nothing in the law to support it. On the other hand, if the fair construction of the language of the act is such as to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* in the class of cases for which it provides, then so much of the act is in the teeth of the express provisions of the Constitution, and is void.

"Judge Grier, in the remarkable case *ex parte Jenkins*, was of the opinion that the Fugitive Slave law was not designed to interfere with the issuing of the writ of *habeas corpus*; but, with all due deference to so high an authority, such an opinion seems not to be supported by the plain words of the law. To shield a person having the custody of another from 'all molestation by any process issued by any Court, Judge, Magistrate or other person,' certainly implies a protection against the writ of all others most likely to be applied for in such cases; and it is the clear conviction of the Court that Congress designed to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus*, and, in so doing, clearly transcended the limits prescribed by the Constitution. Entertaining these views, we are compelled to deny the motion. Assuming it to be true, as claimed by the defendant's counsel, that the plaintiffs are in the custody of the Marshal, under the certificate of the Commissioner, in the sense of the eighth section of the act of Congress, there is still nothing in the case which prevents the operation of this writ. The *habeas corpus* has not and cannot be suspended in this or any other case. Fortunately, the people of Ohio have never delegated to the National Government the power to enact laws preventing a judicial inquiry into the cause of any restraint of individual liberty within their borders; and, whatever practical results may follow investigations such as this, the writ of *habeas corpus* is too sacred to be denied in any case whatever.

"We shall require the United States Marshal to return the writ, in accordance with its commands, on next Friday, at ten o'clock, to which time the case stands adjourned."

RIDICULOUS—VERY.

By reference to the report, in another column, of the proceedings of the Kentucky Legislature, it will be seen that the citizens of Boone and Kenton Counties have made application for an appropriation from the public treasury to defray the expenses of Archibald K. Gaines and James Bell, two citizens of Ohio, for endeavouring to reclaim their fugitive slaves, in Cincinnati, and also praying for the raising, by tax, of a State fund to be expended by the citizens of Kentucky in such cases.

Now, if this will not awaken the people of Kentucky to a sense of their duty to themselves, their fellow-men and to the State, we cannot imagine anything which would have that effect. Taxe the people and the State, forsooth, for expenses incurred by individuals in reclaiming their fugitives! Taxe a free, a negro, oppressed and cyber-hundered, flee from his master, for the purpose of gaining a liberty which is dearer than anything else to the human mind, be must be pursued, taken and brought back, not as the property of his owner, and at his own expense, but at the expense of a tax upon the people, and a drain of the public treasury. This is the last and greatest specimen of human effrontery of which we have ever heard. The citizens of Boone and Kenton Counties—magnanimous and generous as they would have us imagine them—will probably next petition the General Government for an appropriation from the treasury of the United States to pay the expenses incurred by them in having their boots blacked, and their shirts and other proper materials wherewith to tar and feather school teachers.

Of all the ridiculous things which have come to our knowledge, from the capture of a flock of geese by the immortal Don Quixote and his faithful Squire, Sancho, down to the action of Judge Leavitt, a few days ago, in Cincinnati, in declaring that although a fugitive slave murder her child in Ohio, she may not be delivered to the proper authorities, but must be remanded back to her master and to those who have never heard of her during half so absurd. And yet, the people of Boone and Kenton Counties expect to have the people submit to an institution which will drive men and women to murder and self-destruction, and, if their negroes, their private property, stray or run away from them, they expect to tax the State for the purpose of capturing and bringing them back. Why not, at the same time, petition the Legislature to capture their hogs, horses and cattle, and bring them back, and then say, "you may pay the expense incurred out of the State fund"

The people of these Counties certainly need Free Schools, if they need anything. They are in need of instruction in the first principles of liberty; and, if they expose this measure, even if passed, will be submitted to by the citizens of the State, and they are sadly mistaken if they suppose their "peculiar institution" will much longer need the support of Uncle Sam. A few more such decisions as this will secure the freedom of Kentucky from an evil, which all would acknowledge if they would but look at the matter in its right light, as much greater than any other which has ever cursed a State or a Nation.—*Newport (Ky.) News.*

A BRACE OF PILLARS OF THE OLD SCHOOL ZION.

THE Cincinnati *Gazette* thus describes Gaines, the slave-hunter, who was concerned in the illegal dragging of the heroic slave woman, Mary Garner, and her remaining children, back to slavery:

"Mr. Gaines is a member of the Old School Presbyterian Church, and is a leading member of it, and a zealous and active supporter of the Church establishment of that denomination in his neighbourhood."

Judge Leavitt, by whose decision the fugitives were finally given over to their pursuers, is an Elder of high standing in this same Old School Presbyterian Church. He has been more than once a delegate to the General Assembly, in which body he figured largely. He has been a Missionary of the Presbyterian Board; and, he, like his brother Gaines, "is one of the chief supporters of the clergyman of his denomination in his neighbourhood." His residence is Steubenville, Ohio.

The mind of those who are in their sect is thus above suspicion. Let us now look at their conduct in this case, in the light of Christian principle:

In the first place, this Gaines is guilty of holding as a chattel a human being, created in the image of God, and redeemed from sin, "not with corruptible things as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ." This is the essential wickedness; for if it be right to hold property, it is right to hold property in man. He writes in his ledger, along with his horses and oxen, as a chattel personal, the name of a woman who has shown a soul capable of the loftiest heroism, and the names of her husband and babes. She is *his* woman; his body and soul for virtue and her immortality are his property. She is his by brute force; by theft and piracy; and nothing less. Her bondage in his hands, however, becomes too insupportable to be borne, and she flees to her husband, who is chained with her hasts by her *Christian (?)* master. Rather than have her children fall again into his hands, she kills one and seeks to kill them all, and then to plunge the knife to her own heart. She is overpowered, seized and carried back to the dollar-loving slaveholder, as a matter of course, gives heaup. But the criminal laws of Ohio, in this instance, at least, the ministers of mercy, arrest her on charge of murder. Judge Leavitt is applied to, and he finds that the laws of Ohio, of the Constitution of the United States and of the law of God, commands her to be given up, and she is forced away. This decision of Judge Leavitt, elder and member of the Old School Presbyterian Church Missionary Board, is a single leap to the climax of human guilt. There is no deeper or higher crime against God and humanity that they can commit. They take their places alongside of Judas Iscariot and Pontius Pilate.

The mind of those who are in their sect is thus above suspicion. Let us now look at their conduct in this case, in the light of Christian principle:

In the first place, this Gaines is guilty of holding as a chattel a human being, created in the image of God, and redeemed from sin, "not with corruptible things as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ." This is the essential wickedness; for if it be right to hold property, it is right to hold property in man. He writes in his ledger, along with his horses and oxen, as a chattel personal, the name of a woman who has shown a soul capable of the loftiest heroism, and the names of her husband and babes. She is *his* woman; his body and soul for virtue and her immortality are his property. She is his by brute force; by theft and piracy; and nothing less. Her bondage in his hands, however, becomes too insupportable to be borne, and she flees to her husband, who is chained with her hasts by her *Christian (?)* master. Rather than have her children fall again into his hands, she kills one and seeks to kill them all, and then to plunge the knife to her own heart. She is overpowered, seized and carried back to the dollar-loving slaveholder, as a matter of course, gives heaup. But the criminal laws of Ohio, in this instance, at least, the ministers of mercy, arrest her on charge of murder. Judge Leavitt is applied to, and he finds that the laws of Ohio, of the Constitution of the United States and of the law of God, commands her to be given up, and she is forced away. This decision of Judge Leavitt, elder and member of the Old School Presbyterian Church Missionary Board, is a single leap to the climax of human guilt. There is no deeper or higher crime against God and humanity that they can commit. They take their places alongside of Judas Iscariot and Pontius Pilate.

The mind of those who are in their sect is thus above suspicion. Let us look at their conduct in this case, in the light of Christian principle:

In the first place, this Gaines is guilty of holding as a chattel a human being, created in the image of God, and redeemed from sin, "not with corruptible things as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ." This is the essential wickedness; for if it be right to hold property, it is right to hold property in man. He writes in his ledger, along with his horses and oxen, as a chattel personal, the name of a woman who has shown a soul capable of the loftiest heroism, and the names of her husband and babes. She is *his* woman; his body and soul for virtue and her immortality are his property. She is his by brute force; by theft and piracy; and nothing less. Her bondage in his hands, however, becomes too insupportable to be borne, and she flees to her husband, who is chained with her hasts by her *Christian (?)* master. Rather than have her children fall again into his hands, she kills one and seeks to kill them all, and then to plunge the knife to her own heart. She is overpowered, seized and carried back to the dollar-loving slaveholder, as a matter of course, gives heaup. But the criminal laws of Ohio, in this instance, at least, the ministers of mercy, arrest her on charge of murder. Judge Leavitt is applied to, and he finds that the laws of Ohio, of the Constitution of the United States and of the law of God, commands her to be given up, and she is forced away. This decision of Judge Burgoyne on the motion to dismiss the habeas corpus, and, in so doing, clearly transcended the limits prescribed by the Constitution. Entertaining these views, we are compelled to deny the motion. Assuming it to be true, as claimed by the defendant's counsel, that the plaintiffs are in the custody of the Marshal, under the certificate of the Commissioner, in the sense of the eighth section of the act of Congress, there is still noth

of the walls of the Old School Zion, they will tumble to pieces! Hence, when I see the naughty shaving of the pious and "orthodox" Mr. Gaines ran away, no less than eight of the corner-stones of this spiritual edifice were withdrawn. It must have reeled terribly under this sapping and mining process. Hence, dodge Leavitt and his brother Cities have proved themselves devoted sons of the Church, in "chucking" these corner-stones again into their place under the walls of their Zion, and in draining off their heart's blood to the amount in value of Thirty Pieces of Silver! Mr. Gaines ran away, no less than eight ought to be "put into the ministry" at once; and some Southern Old School College should confer D.D. upon them forthwith.

But this subject is too grave and solemn for irony. The above is neither exaggeration nor caricature. It is a simple and truthful representation of the actual position in which the whole of the Old School Presbyterian Church is placed by the action of its General Assembly. For as the General Assembly is a representative body, it speaks for the whole Church, and its proceedings bind every man, woman and child who remain in its communion.

We write in no spirit of bitterness. There are thousands of honest, pious, freedom-loving Christians in that Church, who hate this transcendant wickedness as intensely as we do. We count a number of these among our readers and our personal friends. We know them as Christian brethren. But we do not believe that they have yet adequately conceived of the terrible enormity of the teachings and position of the General Assembly of their Church on this subject. The resolutions of 1845, quoted above, are so intensely wicked that they think, perhaps, they must mean something else. They are slow to believe —and this is very natural—that men whom they have regarded as pious ministers of the Gospel *could* take such a horrible position. But there stands the plain language of their resolutions, which means what we have said it means, or it means nothing at all. More than ten years have passed since these resolutions were adopted, and they stand now as "the recorded and settled doctrine of the Church on this subject. Dodge Leavitt and Mr. Gaines have acted in strict accordance with their letter and spirit in this Cincinnati tragedy; and the standing of these [illegible] which will not be compromised in the [illegible] an act which ranks in enormity along [illegible] and crucifixion of Christ. Surely, [illegible] God to *Christians* in such a Church [illegible] or, my people, that ye be not partakers [illegible] that ye receive not of her plagues."—

Yellow Springs (O.) Free Presbyterian.

MANUMISSION OF A SLAVE IN ENGLAND.

From The (London) Anti-Slavery Reporter.

We beg to call the attention of the friends of the anti-slavery cause in the United States to the statement submitted below, and to request them to use their best efforts to procure the insertion of the notice in as many of the American anti-slavery and other journals as possible. Our object in making this request is to place on record the fact of the subject of this notice having been manumitted by his late master, so that should the young man return to America, and unhappily be seized by some one and in consequence be subjected to inconvenience, or be in danger of his personal liberty, there may be some readily accessible proof of his having been legally emancipated.

We cannot, perhaps, do better than first give his own account of himself, as handed to us immediately after he had obtained possession of his free papers. It is as follows:

"L. A. Chamberozow, Esq.—*Respected Sir*: You wish me to put down in writing a few incidents of my experience of slavery during the time I was in bondage. I have nothing of any importance to communicate in that respect. It was my good fortune to have a humane master, and treated me kindly, and being a house-servant, or rather slave, I saw nothing of plantation life; but what I did witness of the accursed system gave me a dread and abhorrence of the state I was placed in. Sir, you are too familiar with the horrors of this barbarities practised on slaves for me to say any thing on them here.

"I was born a slave. My father, Obit Bailey, was a freeman, but my mother Alice was a slave, owned by one Richardson, consequently I became the property of my mother's master. I was raised in Carolina County, State of Maryland, and remained in slavery until I became a man grown. I am now about twenty-eight years of age. My slave's name was Philip Bailey; my freeman's name is James Francis Thomas. I remained in my flight, when I was from home, my master was taken suddenly and seriously ill, and, after lingering a short time in severe pain, death put an end to his sufferings. He was a kind-hearted master to me, and I dreaded the return to a new master; I determined to attempt to escape at whatever cost it might be, for I was convinced that nothing could be worse, come what might, after the kindness I had received from my deceased master. I knew that the thing could place me in a position of a more horrible character than to be in the power of a cruel task-master. I had always witnessed this, in the case of many of my poor fellow-slaves changing masters. I therefore started off one Saturday night in April, 1846, at about two o'clock, and I took the liberty to borrow my late master's horse, to facilitate my flight. I may here remark that my good friend, who conveyed me out of reach, got safe back to his stabling again. I have never heard a word about the horse, and should it ever be my lot to fall across the path of that horse, I guess I would most cheerfully give him a feed of corn for having been the first means of enabling me to land on the shores of Old England. About three o'clock in the morning I arrived at a village called, I believe, Smyrna, about 45 miles from Denton, the place where I was born; and after turning the horse loose, I sauntered about till six o'clock, when I walked quietly on board a small trading vessel bound for Philadelphia which I reached the next day without molestation from any one. I remained there two or three days, when I received information from the Underground Railway officials that my young master was in pursuit of me, and making diligent search after me. Acting upon their advice, I dressed myself in woman's clothing, and took passage on board a steamer for New York, where I arrived in safety. I remained in that city a considerable time, and was fortunate enough to fall into good employment, and should have done well there but for that disgrace to America, the passing of that abominable Fugitive Slave law, which compelled me once again to renounce my flight from the slaveholders. At this time I made for the home of the slave and the land of the free, which I was successful in reaching—glorious Old England. Since then I have travelled the world over, and by the blessing of God saved up money enough to purchase my own freedom. When I get back to Philadelphia, by the advice, I dressed myself in woman's clothing, and took passage on board a steamer for New York, where I arrived in safety. I remained in that city a considerable time, and was fortunate enough to fall into good employment, and should have done well there but for that disgrace to America, the passing of that abominable Fugitive Slave law, which compelled me once again to renounce my flight from the slaveholders. At this time I made for the home of the slave and the land of the free, which I was successful in reaching—glorious Old England. Since then I have travelled the world over, and by the blessing of God saved up money enough to purchase my own freedom. When I get back to Philadelphia, by the advice of the slaveholders at defiance, for I hold in my right hand my papers of freedom, which I have purchased by the sweat of my brow. Thanks be to Almighty God!"

"James Francis Thomas."

We have thought it best to give the above narrative as we received it from the writer. He procured employment as ship's steward, and having saved £40, placed the amount at our command, requesting us to negociate for his freedom. Through the instrumentality of Mr. Lewis Tappan, of New York, a application was addressed to Mr. Engene K. Richardson, the late owner of Philip Bailey, who at length consented to make out his former slave's manumission papers, in consideration of receiving the sum of Forty Pounds. Subjoined is an appendix of this curious instrument, which to many of our readers will probably be quite a novelty. We would call their attention to its curious phraseology, and to the vague and specious manner in which the slaveholder refers to the "divers good causes and considerations" which induced him to release Philip from slavery. Not a word is said as to the kind of consideration he received, so that one is left to the conclusion that he manumitted his slave as an act of conscience.

COPY OF ACT OF MANUMISSION.

"To all whom it may concern: Be it known that I, Engence De K. Richardson, of Cecil County, in the State of Maryland, for divers good causes and considerations me thereunto moving, have manumitted and set free, liberated, manumitted and set free, and by these presents do hereby release from slavery, manumit, and set free, my negro man, Philip Bailey, otherwise called James F. Thomas, being of the age of twenty-six years, and able to work and gain a sufficient livelihood and maintenance; and him, the said negro man named Philip Bailey, otherwise called James F. Thomas, I do declare to be henceforth free, manumitted, and discharged from all manner of service or servitude to me, my executors or administrators, forever. In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seal, the tenth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five (1855).

"Engene De K. Richardson. (Seal.)

Sealed and delivered in the presence of us

Edmund Brown, Sen.,
John S. Rossell,
Caleb Parker.

ENDORSEMENT.

"State of Maryland, Cecil County, &c.: Be it remembered, and it is hereby certified, that on the 10th day of October, eighteen hundred and fifty-five, before the Subscriber, a Justice of the Peace of the State of Maryland in and for Cecil County aforesaid, personally appears Engene De K. Richardson, the grantor herein, and he acknowledge the same to be the person named in the foregoing or within deed or instrument of writing, and doth acknowledge the said instrument to be his act and deed. In witness whereof I have hereunto subscribe my name on the day and year aforesaid.

"Edmund Brown, Sen., J. P."

"State of Maryland, Cecil County, &c.: I hereby certify that the within deed of manumission was received on the 19th day of October, 1855, and on same day recorded in H. H. M. No. 5, folio 341, &c., one of the Land Record Books of Cecil County aforesaid.

"In testimony whereof I hereto subscribe my name, and the seal of my office affix, this day and year aforesaid.

"H. H. Mitchell, C. R."

When the above document came into our hands, James F. Thomas was absent on a voyage. We received a line from him immediately on his return, and had the pleasure of placing his manumission papers in his hands in presence of the Lord Mayor, on the 24 of January ult. The fact was recorded as follows, in the *Times* of the next day.

"Mansion-House.—A gentleman, who is officially connected with the *British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society*, waited upon the Lord Mayor, and introduced to the notice of his Lordship, Philip Bailey, a native of Maryland, who purchased his manumission from his master, our Engene De K. Richardson, and submitted that the public Engene De K. Richardson, and submitted that the public should be of the fact in the press (particularly in the *Times*) might be of essential service to the poor man in the event of the loss of the document, or of other disaster, upon his departure from England. The applicant said that Bailey had laboured hard until he had put together $200, the price of his manumission; and having paid that sum for his manumission, he had, acting upon the advice of his Lordship, appeared before the Lord Mayor, that the document might be handed to him in the most public manner; the acknowledgment of which having been done would be a record of the fact, and might prove of essential service to the applicant, as he would be respected as conclusive testimony in the United States.

"The Lord Mayor said he had every reason to believe that the press would most gladly notice an application of the kind, and certainly he would not hesitate to employ the publication as an instrumental to the service of such a person as had made it.

"The document was then returned to Bailey, who retired, expressing his thanks to the Lord Mayor for the very kind manner in which he had been received."

THE PRACTICAL LESSON.

From The (Ohio) Anti-Slavery Bugle.

My Dear Friend: The Cincinnati tragedy is over, and the miserable victims of a wrong system and an atrocious law have been led back to slavery. We, whose feelings have been harrowed by the varying phases of that short but eventful drama, are now called upon to learn the practical lesson, how to hasten the blessed period when such crimes against God and Humanity shall no longer desecrate our land, and make her a bye-word of reproach to the civilized world.

There is danger of our feelings being led away in a false direction and of our wasting on helpless and probably reluctant ministers of impassible law that indignation which should be concentrated on the system itself. For, although we may not exist in any part of this Republic, and the arm of Law and Force is necessary to keep down the natural tendency of the inborn spirit of Liberty to rise against this robbery of our dearest and most inalienable right. There may, therefore, be a law stringent in its provisions and relentless in its spirit, in order to prevent the escape of slaves or to force them back to the house of bondage. The present law is, perhaps, needlessly atrocious in some of its clauses; but, as a whole, it is the only law which could hold out to the masters something like security in their human property. This law must have judges and other officers to administer it, unbending as itself. As *judges* (I do not say as *men*), they are bound to execute the law, and their decisions upon the law consistently with its spirit and letter. Their private feelings must not interfere with their official duty. Hence those men who, to their own sorrow, I expect, were called on to decide on the fate of the slave mother and her children, could have no other course than they did.

Instead of blame, they deserve high credit as *judges* for the calm, lucid and logical manner in which they expounded and applied the law. I say they deserve credit in their judicial capacity. It is quite a different question, whether a man ought to accept or hold an office which compels him to act in opposition to the higher law of Christianity and human brotherhood.

Neither could the Governor of this State have interfered to oppose the execution of the Judicial decree. Like the sad and silent spectators of that worse than funeral procession, he could only look on and mourn in the secret of his heart. But, as head of the State, he was bound even to protect and aside the ministers of the law, and they were obstructed in their office.

What portion of good shall we then extract from this measureless sum of evil? This—that the time is past for compromises and the patching up of a hollow peace between Freedom and Slavery. They are incompatible. Modify the Fugitive Slave law and it becomes inoperative. No! There must be a total separation from the system of slavery. "No Union with slaveholders" must be our motto; whereby I do not mean to cease from all political, religious and human charities; the slaveholders are our brothers however erring or blinded; and, could we consider their case calmly, we should, perhaps, find them entitled, almost as much as the slaves themselves, to our compassion and our efforts to remove that moral evils which the accursed system forces upon them.

But, in our individual and collective capacity, we, men and women of Ohio, should, beneficeth, have nothing to do, nothing to do, nothing to do, with slavery. We should, by redouble our efforts to create a healthy public opinion in the North, and to awaken the paralyzed conscience of the South so that they may at last put away the Evil Thing from among them. But, instead of injuring all idea of pursuing the spirit of revenge against the slaves, or the use of any but moral force to extinguish slavery, we should proclaim to the world our determination to refuse all aid to slaveholding, all connivance with slavery; yes and, as far as we have the right, we should refuse to use in a runaway slave any other than a man and a brother, *free* by the imprescriptible law of Nature. We must ignore the possibility of a law which could empower a slaveholder to seize a free man and hold him for sale.

If this *virtual* secession from the constitutional compromise between the slave and free States lead to an *actual* dissolution of the Union, let it come. We must regret seeing the fair fabric of our Political Union rent in twain; but we must resolve itself into new combinations. We would do what we conscientiously could to prevent such a consummation; we will treat our guilty brethren of the South with all forbearance, we will bear with patience their taunts and violence; but we cannot, even to save the Union, allow ourselves and our children to be any longer implicated in their guilt, and to be placed in the cruel alternative of either violating our compact with the Constitution or sinning against the supreme Law of God.

T. E. Sulloy.

Franklin, Portage Co., Ohio, March 11, 1856.

OHIO DISGRACED.

From the decision of Lord Mansfield in the case of Sommerset, in 1772, the fact that a slave once stepping into free Territory became instantly free, was never doubted or denied until some Courts of slaveholding States recently made the important discovery that if the slave did not claim his right *at the time*, such right would be forever lost to him afterwards.

The freedom of the slave in such a case did not depend on his entering free Territory *by any means*, whatever, he became *free*. It was this well-known and universally received law which induced the Convention that framed the Constitution of the United States, to insert the clause which provides that persons held to service in one State and *escaping* into another shall be discharged," etc. They left the common law as it stood in regard to all slaves—except those escaping into other States. And the Court not only of the free States but of the Slave States, have always recognised it and given it force and validity until recently.

But Commissioner Pendery holds that a master may bring his slave into Ohio, and hold him as a slave so long as he thinks proper to do so, and that he has a right to take his slaves through our State.

Now, we are a *law-abiding* people. But in making this assertion we should utter a flagrant falsehood, if we submitted to such decisions against law, against rights guaranteed by common sense, against justice and the honour of the people.

In regard to the decision of Judge Leavitt. We say of that dignitary, as of all others, "there is a point beyond which forbearance ceases to be a virtue." To say that a man may commit murder on the soil of Ohio, and that the master may, in defiance of our State sovereignty, take the murderer out of the hands of our officers, and carry him to the hell of slavery, is no less insulting to the State than were the assertions made by Judge Leavitt to the common sense of our people.

We repent on this point the people of Ashtabula County would have *sustained the law*, against such a decision. They would have retained the murderess and permitted the Judge to go into slavery.

But Commissioner Pendery and Judge Leavitt are the merest parasites of the Slave Power, the miserable lickspittles of the President and his party. Indeed, we do their servility is extolled by members of the democratic party, who appear anxious to thrust these questions on us at the earliest moment. We call on Republicans to meet them; meet them boldly and promptly. Let the issue be made of unutterable contempt and hatred for every one and every officer who would thus disgrace our State and degrade our people.

Thank God for these indications which leave us little room to hope that one short year will see a Republican President occupying the Executive Chair.

Then we hope to see such Doughfaces as Leavitt and Pendery driven from places of trust, and sent howling to their dens.—*Ashtabula (O.) Sentinel.*

The Savannah (Ga.) *Republican* states that several companies of emigrants from that State are about to start for Kansas. The party of them, are slaveholders, and that no slaves accompany them. The *Republican* doubts if even the votes of these men are to be safely relied on, and prophesies they would have retained the vote last year from wards voted with the Free State men. The same thing is true of the emigrants from Missouri—they are sent out by persons the invading ruffians from their own State. No amount of emigration likely to go from the South will make Kansas a slave State, if her people succeed in throwing off the Bogus government forced upon them by outside barbarians, backed up by the Slave Democratic Administration.

Hon. John G. Palfrey has withdrawn himself from the political arena, and it is understood intends to devote the remainder of his life to literature. He is writing a history of New England, and will in a few weeks sail for Rome, in order to prosecute his researches in the archives of the mother country.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 22, 1856.

THE NEW YORK OBSERVER.

The course pursued by this paper is at once painful and instructive to the Christian. It is a journal professedly devoted to the support and diffusion of Orthodox Protestant Christianity, and in many respects is faithful to its profession. Yet the temper it manifests on a particular topic, and its wrath, and bitter and evil-speaking towards those who differ from him on that topic, are the reverse of what is required by the spirit and the precepts of the Gospel of Christ. All this is very painful, but it is also very instructive. It warns us to be especially on our guard against the sin that does most easily beset us. It teaches us that any one sin, rolled as a sweet morsel under the tongue, poisons the whole system in all that relates to, or in any way connected with, that sin. No matter how pure and orthodox is the creed professed, no matter how sensitive may be the conscience in regard to sins for which we have no mind, the one cherished sin paralyzes the moral sense on all subjects connected with that sin, and takes from the conscience the power of distinguishing between good and evil in regard to the means we use to favour our indulgence, or to effect our object. Isabella of Castile was naturally an amiable well-disposed woman, but religious persecution was her besetting sin, and she could torture and murder thousands, and yet flatter herself she was a good Christian and doing God service. The *Observer* thinks it is his mission to watch over and uphold American Slavery. Hence his conscience in regard to the means he uses, and the slanders he pours on the opponents of slavery, is as obtuse as that of Isabella in regard to the murder of heretics.

Mrs. Stowe, in her famous "Uncle Tom," assailed the *Observer's* beloved institution. Blinded by passion, and regardless of the restraints imposed by morality and Christian courtesy, the *Observer* treated her with a scurrility and malignity little less than that which characterize what is denominated the "Satanic press." Her book, one of the most effectively pious works that has issued from the American press, was denounced as an anti-Christian book! Yet this same book was hailed with delight by the Christians of Great Britain, and by all in the United States, not contaminated by a pro-slavery bias, or interest. Soon, Mrs. Stowe and her slanderer both appeared in England. The former there made a triumphal progress, receiving from all classes, and especially from the religious community, honours never before conferred on an uncrowned female. The latter had been most improperly furnished with a commission to represent the American Bible Society at the anniversary of the parent institution. His pro-slavery championship and his abuse of Mrs. Stowe excited the indignation of the English press. He was despised and shunned, and prevented, by the force of public opinion, from appearing on the platform of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Hence England became identified by the *Observer* with opposition to slavery, and consequently the object of intense hatred. "The bulwark of Protestantism" does not find in Bishop Hughes a more determined opponent than in the very Protestant *New York Observer*. There is scarcely a number of the *Observer* that does not verify these remarks, but a very strong illustration of their truth is furnished in the number of the 6th March.

It is well known that, to the glory of English judicial justice, Sir John Paul and his partner have recently been tried and convicted of fraud, and sentenced to fourteen years transportation. Sir John belonged to the hereditary aristocracy and was nearly allied to two members of the House of Lords. Circumstances having defeated their villanous plot to establish a penal colony, they were, in the meantime, committed to prison. It was soon discovered that, owing to their late social position or some other cause, their jailor allowed them favours not accorded to common felons. For his partiality he was dismissed and another appointed in his place. The new jailor warned by the fate of his predecessor, perhaps went to the opposite extreme. He converted the Baronet into a tailor, and Mr. Strahan into a chairmaker. The *Observer* quotes some remarks on this subject from a newspaper, English paper, but one which he says is a *religious* journal. The writer, after stating some extenuating circumstances in regard to the prisoners, objects to the employments assigned to them. He observes that prison employments, independent of the penalty involved in them, are intended to implant useful and self-supporting habits in the idle and untaught; but that the particular employment of these two men was intended solely for the purpose of insult and degradation.

"Let the punishment," he says, "be as heavy as you please; *make it more onerous and terrible* than that inflicted on ordinary caitiffs. Let there be suitable employment, something that may be to fallen men of rank what tailoring and chairmaking are to fallen labourers; but let not the nation be seen insulting dignities in misery, and adding an unnecessary drop of bitterness to a cup of sorrows already wrung to the very dregs."

This sentence throws the liberty-loving, pro-slavery *Observer* into a paroxism of virtuous indignation. In spite of the proof furnished by the sentence and treatment of these aristocratic criminals, of the severe impartiality of English justice, and remembering the civilities bestowed on Mrs. Stowe by the Duchess of Sutherland, he breaks out into a tirade against the respect entertained in England for the aristocracy. He tells us, "The Lord is flattered, treated with the greatest deference though he is a rake, and the humble, though intelligent and good must keep their places." The *Observer* is horrified that in *England* a rake in high life is treated with deference; but the different in the United States! He is oblivious to the fact, that we have had a President and Vice-President, both flattered and treated with the greatest deference, and yet, each of them the father of mulatto children; and one of them an avowed and most malignant infidel.

But in England, "the humble, though intelligent and good must keep their places." Of course, in his opinion, things are very different here. Perhaps he has never heard of an humble minister of Jesus Christ, being taught in New York to keep his place, by being publicly expelled from an omnibus into which he had presumed to introduce himself. For information on this point we refer the *Observer* to Dr. Pennington.

The *Observer* tells us that in England "it is insisted by the religious press that 'fallen men of rank' ought to be treated in prison with greater leniency than those who sin under greater temptation." Thus a single anonymous paper is converted into the *religious press*. What would be the indignation of the *Observer*, should the London *Times* copy an article from the *Independent*, reflecting on the *Observer*, and represent it as the language of the religious press of the United States?

Another and terrible instance of English corruption is cited in the same sheet. A young woman in the employment of a milliner was sent to a shop to buy an article. She proffered a coin which the shopman erroneously believed to be a counterfeit. He had her arrested on the suspicion of intentionally offering base money. A police officer took her to the station, where, in a private room, she was searched by a female, and no more money being found on her person, she was discharged. The shopman apologized in the newspaper, and offered her £10 as an atonement for his mistake. She refused the money and brought suit for false imprisonment. The Court charged strongly in her favour, and the Jury, under all the circumstances of the case, awarded her £20—about $100—for a few hours detention, and the injury done her feelings. The damages and cost probably amounted to $200, paid by the shopkeeper.

The *Observer* sneers at the "enormous sum of £20," and exclaims, "Is it not wonderful that in a country where the Gospel of Jesus Christ has been so long preached and professed, the spirit is so inadequately appreciated, wrongs against the poor and obscure are treated even in Courts of justice with less severity than if they were inflicted upon the rich. These are not the principles on which the divine government is administered; and we would hope that in England, at least, the religious influences of the country would be brought to bear upon that anti-Christian aristocracy which confers immunity upon crime and makes high born villany comparatively virtuous."

Rarely, indeed, do we meet with so much falsehood and falsehood concentrated in a single paragraph, nor one which manifests such an utter prostration of the moral sense. The very *facts* on which he comments disprove his reckless falsehood. The English aristocracy, it seems, is anti-Christian and confers "immunity on crime," but it is the vocation of the *Observer* to vindicate the Christian character of the American aristocracy, consisting of about three hundred and fifty thousand men. This aristocracy virtually governs the whole country, and keeps in subjection between three and four millions of serfs. These serfs are denied every civil and religious right. The law no more recognises marriage among this vast multitude than among the beasts of the field. English aristocracy confers immunity on crime, as Sir John Paul can bear witness! A woman in England, falsely accused and arrested for an attempt to cheat, appeals to a Jury of her country, and recovers only $100, and this is owing to an anti-Christian aristocracy. Any member of the American Christian aristocracy may strip and flog a female serf suspected of stealing, and, should she carry her complaint before a Court of Justice, she would be rudely ejected from the Court, and again scourged for her impudence. For the greatest outrage that can be perpetrated on man or woman, no serf can obtain redress by process of law, one cent for damage. Any female serf may be subjected to enforced prostitution, and the law enacted by the aristocracy "confers immunity" on the crime. Long has the *Observer* laboured to prove that American Slavery is consistent with "the principles on which the Divine government is administered." Of course the Divine government is administered in England in very opposite principles. Thank God, the *New York Observer* is not "the religious press" of the United States.

MITIGATION OF SLAVERY.

There are always to be found persons who, disliking extremes, and feeling a horror of radicalism, plant themselves on a point half-way between right and wrong, and then cry out that they have found the golden mean, and confidently invite their neighbours on both hands to come to them and be saved. This farce has been played so often on the ground intermediate between slavery and anti-slavery, and has so invariably proved unacceptable to both, that a repetition of it would now be merely ludicrous to Abolitionists, did not their duty require a careful survey of such things, that the sophistries and falsehoods which make them plausible to a new examiner may be clearly pointed out and refuted. On this account it becomes necessary for us to notice a pro-slavery pamphlet of 115 pages, published in Boston near the commencement of the present year, and written by a clergyman (now a teacher, as we are informed) in Wareham, Mass.

This pamphlet is entitled, "Slavery and the Remedy; or, Principles and Suggestions for a Remedial Code. By Samuel Nott."

In an introductory sketch of the purpose of the pamphlet, the author assumes that slave-holding is an essentially different thing from slave-making, and is neither a crime nor a sin; that though it is an evil, or attended by evils, these would be aggravated, rather than mitigated, by immediate emancipation, which is therefore demanded neither by expediency nor duty; that though Colonization is a wise and beneficent enterprise, it does not fully meet the wants of the African race here, who are fixed, and must be provided for, chiefly on our soil; that the responsibility for action on this subject rests not with the United States, but with each slaveholding State, separately; that *their* attention should no longer be directed to *mere abstract* questions, but to the *facts* of the case, which are given *providentially* on their hands; that a philanthropic and patriarchal Christian State is bound to abolish just so much of slavery as is injurious, and no more, and to retain just so much of it as is beneficial, and no less; and that the Christian patriarch and Christian philanthropist may act together in the accomplishment of this object, by uniting to sustain a "Remedial Code."

The leading point to be kept in view in a Remedial Code is to *preserve the essential quality of slavery*, without the evils which are not of its essence; or, in detail, to provide for the slaves something better than freedom—for the masters something better than slavery—for the free blacks something better than the present condition of their class—and for the conscience and philanthropy of the country a state of self-complacent repose and satisfaction. The Rev. Mr. Nott is "deeply sensible of the difficulties in devising and executing such a code," but he thinks they may be overcome, if the South, "taking the indispensable lead," shall welcome with the whole heart the aid of the North; and he makes his appeal to a Christian country and a Christian people—meaning the people of these United States.

After detailing the distinct provisions of his Remedial Code, the author is careful to repeat the warning that they are devised not in the view of preparing the slaves for freedom, or of substituting any appreciateship, whether shorter or longer, but on the supposition of a continued and abiding relation. The masters must be masters still, in furnishing employment and requiring labour; the slaves must be slaves still, in rendering labour. Mr. Nott declares the essential elements of slavery to be the slave's "being held to labour," and the master's "being held to maintain labour," and that by this they are advantageously enslaved to each other, such a state being better for each than freedom. He thinks that the relations of labour and provision should be carefully defined, by a benevolent wisdom, the masters being entitled to the use of their capital, and to *some due return for their supervision and direction*, and the slaves entitled to *such avails as labour can permanently secure*; by which ingenious phrase we suppose is meant whatever remains after the master has taken the lion's share.

Now the important question arises, How shall these mutual relations of labour from the slave and provision from the master be secured? As a preliminary to the proper regulation of this matter, Mr. Nott tells us that *the substitution of free for slave labour must be discountenanced, and even disallowed*. "Slave labour must be prohibited. The masters must not have power to substitute emigrant labour, *to the loss and damage of the sheriff*, whatever direct advantage it may enable them to realize."

Some of our readers may have heard of the passionate and profane wagoner who was followed by a set of vagabonds up a long hill, in anticipation of the volley of oaths which might naturally be expected on his discovery that the whole of his load had escaped, little by little, through a hole in the back of his cart, and how, after making the discovery, and standing for a moment in stupified amazement, he disappointed them by quietly saying, "It's of no use, gentlemen—I give it up—I can't do justice to the occasion."

A similar sense of inadequacy comes over us at the thought of commenting on that last sentence of the Rev. Mr. Nott. Epithets would fail to express its character—analysis would weaken it by expansion—only the forty-parson power which conceived it could fully express its character in another statement.

The enforcement of the master's duty to the slave is settled in ten lines, as follows:

"First, as to the slave. So far as custom long settled usage and circumstances secure their due care of their slaves, it is well. But *so far as needful*, that care must be secured by new legislation, and must be enforced by the executive power of the State; and the law must more decidedly give the slaves are less able to secure their own rights. Some officer from among the slaves may be the channel of complaint, and some court of justice may hear and redress, but without cost to the slave; *none where his proceeding shall have been merely vexatious and causeless*. The masters, if needful, may be compelled to furnish suitable rations and protection."

If *any* security is needed for the performance of the master's duty to the slave, the above will be quite sufficient, in Mr. Nott's judgment. But to secure the fidelity of people so selfish and unconscientious as the slaves, he finds two pages of stringent provisions necessary, in substance as follows:

Like the man in the old spelling-book, who first threw grass at the boy who was robbing his apple-tree, before trying pebbles, our author recommends that, before the application of enforcement, every pains should be taken to prevent its necessity by securing *voluntary* labour. This, he says, will be partially done by retaining slavery, i. e., by keeping up the habits and expectations of those who, from generation to generation, have been "held to labour." He advises that no formal emancipation should be made, because it would interfere with the above "habits and expectations," and because, "whatever nominal *or* real freedom might result from it, there can be no release to the mass of men from the labour by which they must live." Moreover, he believes it to be an undisputed fact that the slaves of the British West Indies were made *too free*, and emancipated to their own disadvantage. To the force of the continued habits and expectations of slaves he would add, as securities for voluntary labour, these natural provisions: Task-work, giving to the African *contractors* a good margin for their private advantage, and *money to the master* ALL *that is now expected from slave labour*; and, Rewards for faithful and skilful service, or for *contracts* diligently and honestly fulfilled. Observe, this slave is to work at a master's dictation, will he, will he; but if he consents to work before the means of compulsion are applied, he is allowed to call the performance of his task the fulfilment of a *contract*, and this contract is to give him a large margin for private advantage, though it gives his master *all* the advantage he now gets, without paying or rewarding the slave at all. Truly, Mr. Nott possesses all the ingenuity of the slaveholder, who makes high born villany comparatively virtuous. The perch is denied every civil and religious right. The law no more recognises marriage among this vast multitude than among the beasts of the field. English aristocracy confers immunity on crime, as Sir John Paul can bear witness! A woman in England, falsely accused and arrested for an attempt to cheat, appeals to a Jury of her country, and recovers only $100, and this is owing to an anti-Christian aristocracy. Any member of the American Christian aristocracy may strip and flog a female serf suspected of stealing, and, should she carry her complaint before a Court of Justice, she would be rudely ejected from the Court, and again scourged for her impudence. For the greatest outrage that can be perpetrated on man or woman, no serf can obtain redress by process of law, one cent for damage. Any female serf may be subjected to enforced prostitution, and the law enacted by the aristocracy "confers immunity" on the crime. Long has the *Observer* laboured to prove that American Slavery is consistent with "the principles on which the Divine government is administered." Of course the Divine government is administered in England in very opposite principles. Thank God, the *New York Observer* is not "the religious press" of the United States.

MITIGATION OF SLAVERY.

There are always to be found persons who, disliking extremes, and feeling a horror of radicalism, plant themselves on a point half-way between right and wrong, and then cry out that they have found the golden mean, and confidently invite their neighbours on both hands to come to them and be saved. This farce has been played so often on the ground intermediate between slavery and anti-slavery, and has so invariably proved unacceptable to both, that a repetition of it would now be merely ludicrous to Abolitionists, did not their duty require a careful survey of such things, that the sophistries and falsehoods which make them plausible to a new examiner may be clearly pointed out and refuted. On this account it becomes necessary for us to notice a pro-slavery pamphlet of 115 pages, published in Boston near the commencement of the present year, and written by a clergyman (now a teacher, as we are informed) in Wareham, Mass.

This pamphlet is entitled, "Slavery and the Remedy; or, Principles and Suggestions for a Remedial Code. By Samuel Nott."

In an introductory sketch of the purpose of the pamphlet, the author assumes that slave-holding is an essentially different thing from slave-making, and is neither a crime nor a sin; that though it is an evil, or attended by evils, these would be aggravated, rather than mitigated, by immediate emancipation, which is therefore demanded neither by expediency nor duty; that though Colonization is a wise and beneficent enterprise, it does not fully meet the wants of the African race here, who are fixed, and must be provided for, chiefly on our soil; that the responsibility for action on this subject rests not with the United States, but with each slaveholding State, separately; that *their* attention should no longer be directed to *mere abstract* questions, but to the *facts* of the case, which are given *providentially* on their hands; that a philanthropic and patriarchal Christian State is bound to abolish just so much of slavery as is injurious, and no more, and to retain just so much of it as is beneficial, and no less; and that the Christian patriarch and Christian philanthropist may act together in the accomplishment of this object, by uniting to sustain a "Remedial Code."

The leading point to be kept in view in a Remedial Code is to *preserve the essential quality of slavery*, without the evils which are not of its essence; or, in detail, to provide for the slaves something better than freedom—for the masters something better than slavery—for the free blacks something better than the present condition of their class—and for the conscience and philanthropy of the country a state of self-complacent repose and satisfaction. The Rev. Mr. Nott is "deeply sensible of the difficulties in devising and executing such a code," but he thinks they may be overcome, if the South, "taking the indispensable lead," shall welcome with the whole heart the aid of the North; and he makes his appeal to a Christian country and a Christian people—meaning the people of these United States.

After detailing the distinct provisions of his Remedial Code, the author is careful to repeat the warning that they are devised not in the view of preparing the slaves for freedom, or of substituting any appreciateship, whether shorter or longer, but on the supposition of a continued and abiding relation. The masters must be masters still, in furnishing employment and requiring labour; the slaves must be slaves still, in rendering labour. Mr. Nott declares the essential elements of slavery to be the slave's "being held to labour," and the master's "being held to maintain labour," and that by this they are advantageously enslaved to each other, such a state being better for each than freedom. He thinks that the relations of labour and provision should be carefully defined, by a benevolent wisdom, the masters being entitled to the use of their capital, and to *some due return for their supervision and direction*, and the slaves entitled to *such avails as labour can permanently secure*; by which ingenious phrase we suppose is meant whatever remains after the master has taken the lion's share.

Now the important question arises, How shall these mutual relations of labour from the slave and provision from the master be secured? As a preliminary to the proper regulation of this matter, Mr. Nott tells us that *the substitution of free for slave labour must be discountenanced, and even disallowed*. "Slave labour must be prohibited. The masters must not have power to substitute emigrant labour, *to the loss and damage of the sheriff*, whatever direct advantage it may enable them to realize."

Some of our readers may have heard of the passionate and profane wagoner who was followed by a set of vagabonds up a long hill, in anticipation of the volley of oaths which might naturally be expected on his discovery that the whole of his load had escaped, little by little, through a hole in the back of his cart, and how, after making the discovery, and standing for a moment in stupified amazement, he disappointed them by quietly saying, "It's of no use, gentlemen—I give it up—I can't do justice to the occasion."

A similar sense of inadequacy comes over us at the thought of commenting on that last sentence of the Rev. Mr. Nott. Epithets would fail to express its character—analysis would weaken it by expansion—only the forty-parson power which conceived it could fully express its character in another statement.

The enforcement of the master's duty to the slave is settled in ten lines, as follows:

"First, as to the slave. So far as custom long settled usage and circumstances secure their due care of their slaves, it is well. But *so far as needful*, that care must be secured by new legislation, and must be enforced by the executive power of the State; and the law must more decidedly give the slaves are less able to secure their own rights. Some officer from among the slaves may be the channel of complaint, and some court of justice may hear and redress, but without cost to the slave; *none where his proceeding shall have been merely vexatious and causeless*. The masters, if needful, may be compelled to furnish suitable rations and protection."

If *any* security is needed for the performance of the master's duty to the slave, the above will be quite sufficient, in Mr. Nott's judgment. But to secure the fidelity of people so selfish and unconscientious as the slaves, he finds two pages of stringent provisions necessary, in substance as follows:

Like the man in the old spelling-book, who first threw grass at the boy who was robbing his apple-tree, before trying pebbles, our author recommends that, before the application of enforcement, every pains should be taken to prevent its necessity by securing *voluntary* labour. This, he says, will be partially done by retaining slavery, i. e., by keeping up the habits and expectations of those who, from generation to generation, have been "held to labour." He advises that no formal emancipation should be made, because it would interfere with the above "habits and expectations," and because, "whatever nominal *or* real freedom might result from it, there can be no release to the mass of men from the labour by which they must live." Moreover, he believes it to be an undisputed fact that the slaves of the British West Indies were made *too free*, and emancipated to their own disadvantage. To the force of the continued habits and expectations of slaves he would add, as securities for voluntary labour, these natural provisions: Task-work, giving to the African *contractors* a good margin for their private advantage, and *money to the master* ALL *that is now expected from slave labour*; and, Rewards for faithful and skilful service, or for *contracts* diligently and honestly fulfilled. Observe, this slave is to work at a master's dictation, will he, will he; but if he consents to work before the means of compulsion are applied, he is allowed to call the performance of his task the fulfilment of a *contract*, and this contract is to give him a large margin for private advantage, though it gives his master *all* the advantage he now gets, without paying or rewarding the slave at all. Truly, Mr. Nott possesses all the ingenuity of the slaveholder, who makes high born villany comparatively virtuous. The perch the earth dug out of the hole, replied that he would make the hole large enough for both.

Truly, Mr. Nott remarks, with an air of pious resignation, "with all the advantage of the habits and expectations of labour preserved, and of a method of tasks and rewards, there must still be supposed a *necessity* of enforcement, and of course there must be allowed a *power* of enforcement," as follows:

1. Privation of

notices were read in most of the churches, except the Presbyterian. The Presbyterian Minister refused to publish the notice. The Methodist Minister, Elder Jacokes, read the notice to his congregation, but afterwards stated that he had done so, when he learned it was a *Garrisonian*!

The lecture was attended by a full audience, as all such lectures are, including some of the most respectable citizens of the place, and, among the rest, the Methodist Minister; who, beside being in political fellowship with the "sum of all villanies," Henry Clay, has been notorious as a voting Democrat, Silas Burtsfore, been notorious as a voting Democrat, Silas Burtsfore, been notorious as a voting Democrat, Jesse Lewis Cass and Franklin Pierce stripe—thus adding the "sum of all villanies" and "sum of all foods" to his number of many one persouification of Satan. Not to be attached by any accompaniments of the lecture, after speaking of the criminal character of Slavery and slaveholding, I reviewed the position of the called Democratic Party, and referred, with somewhat severity, to the said Methodist Minister, as a home illustration of the fact that, thoroughly pro-slavery and Democratic as the principles of the party, its supporters which are not only as church members in "good standing" but also as occupants of the pulpit! Not to be attached by any reference to the minister, who has the reputation of being the best educated, and most talented clergyman of place, stirred up a good degree of agitation, and at close of the lecture he was called upon for a reply. Said that he could not *condescend* to reply, denied any charge as false, and resumed his seat. It was quite evident that his friends were dissatisfied that he should not undertake to defend his position, as the platform was free, and that most of the audience regarded it as a fair dodge on his part.

The next evening the audience was larger than the first, many being more than could be seated, and quite a large number remained standing for nearly two hours. In this lecture I reviewed the position and aims of the Republican party, also presented the doctrine and philosophy of Disunion, and in conclusion, briefly referred to the Religious aspects of the cause, and to the *excessive "dignity"* in the political *De-mocrat*, who labored to vindicate his cause called upon to do so, the evening previous. I then stated that the following evening I would give a lecture upon the relation of the different Religious Institutions to Slavery. The audience, the second evening, as I have before said, was large, intelligent, and manifested a very gratifying degree of interest.

During the following day, the city, or village, authorities (*pious Democrats*) ordered the Marshal to close the Court-House against me. The fact was not communicated to me until a short time before the hour for the lecture to commence. The audience began to assemble in the street, and remained, cold as it was, until some of the citizens, interested in the meetings, and indignant at the course pursued by the authorities, procured the National Hall, the largest in the place, which was soon lighted, though at that late hour it could not well be warmed. In a few moments after the Hall was opened, quite a large audience had assembled therein. Owing to the lateness of the hour, and the coldness of the room, I did not give the lecture I intended to then evening, but spoke for something more than an hour, upon the facts furnished by the circumstances attending our meeting—the right of free speech—the oil on a free platform, &c. We had a good hearing and a very attentive hearing, and I announced, in conclusion, that I would speak the next evening in the same place, on the relation of the churches to slavery. At the close of the meeting, a company of boys threw quantities of corn and beans, and, as we were going from the Hall to our lodgings, followed us, throwing the same, and occasionally an egg; it was cold, though none of them hit us. These boys, I was informed by a friend who knew most of them, were the sons of leading *church members*, and were thus defending the Religion of their Fathers! Threats of mobocratic violence were made, if we should attempt to hold a meeting the next evening. During the day, the agent of the Hall, THOMAS DRAKE, Esq., received an anonymous letter, warning him that if he opened the Hall for the lecture that evening, that *not only the Hall but his head would be in danger!* He referred to the fact of the opening of the meeting, and informed the audience that he intended not only to take care of his own head out of the heads of all who came there, and especially of such as came there with mobocratic intentions. Although we had a slight admission-fee to defray expenses, we had a large and an intelligent audience. Except an occasional stick or stone against the windows, from the outside, we did not only no disturbance, but a most excellent and gloriously triumphant meeting. There were occasional hisses as I was illustrating the slave-hunting, slave-breeding characteristics of *American* Christianity, but they were soon lost amid the cheers and applause. It was understood to have been in contemplation to offer violence that evening, as I should go from the Hall to my lodgings, and I presume that for a preservation from the same, I am indebted to a few true hearted and noble women, who, being deeply interested in the cause, and conscious of the state of feeling among the outsiders, resolved that if there was to be any martyrdom on the occasion, they would share in it. Had such a trouble followed us for a short distance, but committed no particular depredations, realizing, I apprehend, that public sentiment was more against them than in their favour. To our friends who so kindly and heartily cooperated with us, we are much indebted—among whom were Mrs. F. W. Gillett, Miss Kelley, Mrs. Farmer, Messrs. Beardsley, Farmer, Gillett, Brotherton, Hipp and others.

After enjoying a few days of rest in the family of CYRUS FULLER, the worthy and efficient President of the Michigan Anti-Slavery Society, and with other kind and valued friends in this vicinity, I am to return to Lenawee County and hold additional meetings during a portion of this month.

Yours, for Universal Liberty, AARON M. POWELL.

Ilvonia, Wayne Co., Michigan, March 6, 1856.

The Abolitionists show that Washington, Madison, Jefferson, Pierce, and many other statesmen, North and South, were opposed to African slavery in the abstract, but they do not prove that any of these distinguished men were opposed to forming a union of the States, or desired to abrogate the Constitution upon which our confederacy is based, because slavery had been established in some of the States during past centuries, and is left to the wisdom of those who endure it to deal with us as they may deem fit.

The (Albany) *Evening Journal* quotes the above paragraph from *The* (Boston) *Post*, not, it says, to laugh at the odd association of the name of the gentleman who happened to have no encumber the chair once occupied by Washington, Jefferson and Madison, but to deny, for the thousandth time, the assertion that the Republican party desires to interfere with slavery in the States. "Not a line," exclaims *The Journal* indignantly, "can be found in the speeches or writings of any recognised Republican, justifying the charge. It is one of those stale falsehoods which only dunces and knaves reiterate to give point to these stupid utterances."

If *The Journal* means simply that the Republican party does not intend to interfere with slavery in the States by legislation, then it asserts for that party no more than might have just as truthfully asserted of the whole body of Abolitionists, with the exception only of a small number who act with Mr. Gerrit Smith. From the inception of the anti-slavery movement, a quarter of a century ago, to the present moment, the doctrine has always been maintained that there is no right and no intention to meddle, by legislation, with the existence of slavery in the several States, not only because the Federal Constitution is recognised as the Law of the Land, but also because true wisdom dictated that it would be folly to attempt the moral regeneration of a nation by Act of Congress. The Republicans, therefore, have no new platform on this question.

Morality without politics is a very powerful and sufficient lever in a great moral reform, as the progress of the anti-slavery cause has conclusively shown; but politics without morality, we think, will prove to be a reed of another sort. If the Albany *Journal* means that its party repudiates all wish to interfere with slavery in any way, whether legislative or otherwise, then it certainly differs very essentially from the Abolitionists proper. It is a pity that its speakers and writers would not be a little more explicit on this point. It is one thing to deny the introduction of slavery into the Territories only for certain political and economical reasons; such as that that will give undue preponderance to the Slave Power in the Government, and interfere with the general commercial prosperity; however good such reasons may be, they are certainly very limited in their application both as to time and place. But if, on the other hand, the objection to slavery in the Territories is that the system is a curse everywhere, that it should not be permitted, therefore, to gain fresh foot-hold, then, of course, it follows that the members of the party, if they are either logical or honest, must wish to extirpate everywhere and as speedily as possible, so stupendous a crime which outrages every law of God and every instinct of humanity. By every moral, as distinguished from merely political, means, they must be, of course, anxious to interfere with slavery, and put the speediest possible end to it in all the States. And if they do not do this by legislation, it cannot be because they would not if they could, but because they have not the political power. As politicians merely they should be glad to get and to use, and to use as far as they have already got, the power to exterminate so foul a thing from the face of the earth. Looking at the matter in this light, it seems to us that the Boston paper has got the best of the argument, and that the *Journal* does not fairly represent the spirit of the Republicans, or that, if it does, the anti-slavery abolitionist need not trouble himself much as to what may become of that party.

CAPTURE OF A SLAVER IN NEW YORK BAY.

It is very well known that there is a large capital invested in this city in the Foreign Slave Trade, and that a considerable number of slavers are annually fitted out here for the coast of Africa. The names of some of the persons so engaged are notorious, though sufficient legal evidence to convict them of crime could be obtained only with great difficulty, if at all. The present United States District Attorney, Mr. McKeon, has repeatedly attempted it, and has shown as much disposition to bring the law to bear upon these villains as could be expected in a country, and under a Government, where a similar trade, far more terrible to its victims, is not only not illegal, but is highly respectable, and rather an evidence that he who is concerned in it belongs to the most distinguished and most highly privileged class of which the country boasts—is, in fact, the highest title to American aristocracy. And those engaged here in this Foreign Slave Trade by no means lose caste among their fellow-merchants; some of them are men in good social standing, and are held in high commercial esteem on 'Change. Of course they are wealthy, for the profits of the trade are commensurate with its risks, and are immense.

Great care is taken in fitting out their vessels to avoid all evidence that might lead to conviction, though the character of the vessels themselves, and their cargoes may leave no moral doubt whatever as to their destination. Formerly, such vessels went well armed, partly to defend them from cruisers, and partly to overawe the slaves. But they depend now upon speed to elude all pursuers, and, in place of arms to keep the living cargo in subjection, a few casks of sharp carpet tacks are found to answer the purpose quite as effectually. Among the poor naked wretches, packed closely together, a quantity of these are thrown, and the torment and torture to every moving body is found quite sufficient to subdue any insubordination among them. A Custom-House clearance also used to be one of the difficulties these traders had to encounter, for Manifests and shipping papers were obstacles things to manage without exciting suspicion. This they endeavour latterly to avoid, by leaving port without asking permission of the Collector, trusting to a dark night and a good pair of heels. One of them tried this game on Monday night last, but was luckily tripped up.

Information was given, it seems, on Sunday, to the District Attorney, that a suspicious-looking vessel was lying at the foot of Fourteenth street, fitting out, apparently, for the Slave Trade, and orders were given to two officers to watch and seize her, if that should prove to be the case. On Monday she was hauled into the stream and allowed to drift up with the tide as far as Astoria, where she was anchored. Here she was joined by another schooner, and stores taken on board. On Monday evening it was evident that preparations were making to put to sea. The officers on the watch then received authority from Mr. McKeon to seize her, and sent to the Navy Yard for a file of marines to aid them. The rest of the story may be told in the *Herald*'s report:

Thus instructed, the Marshals hired the steaming Only Son, and, with twelve marines, under command of Captain Watson, went down the bay to head off the Falmouth. All this was done after midnight.

Meanwhile, the mysterious schooner dropped slowly down the bay, and came to Sixty-first street, where over fifty hogsheads of water were taken on board, when she continued her voyage, aided by the steaming Ajax.

Morning had broken before the Falmouth reached the place where the schooner lay, for she would have been out of all danger of capture, but fate had decreed otherwise. The Only Son ran alongside the vessel, and, before the astonished crew had time to ask what it was about, twelve marines precipitated themselves on the deck. Three of the men rushed for the cabin, apparently with a view to destroy some papers that might implicate others, but the officers were too quick for them, and sprang to the doorway, telling no one to enter under peril of their lives.

The steaming Ajax would not come near, and the officers and marines seized an axe and cut the hawser that bound her to the Falmouth, when she steamed up and made way for the city with all possible speed, followed by the Only Son, with her prize in the centre of the stoppage. The schooner was then towed up to the Navy Yard, where she was placed under charge of Lieutenant Dessaint.

Yesterday, at 4 o'clock, Commodore Paulding and his Deputy, H. H. Joachimsen, visited the captured vessel for the purpose of inspecting her and the crew, twelve in number, all of whom were placed on board.

The crew of the schooner consisted of a "long, low, black" craft of about 250 tons burthen, with raking masts, and altogether a very piratical looking concern in appearance, whatever may be her character.

On her stern is painted the words "Falmouth, Baltimore," and the American eagle adorns her prow. The vessel was open in the hold from the mast to stern, and would seem to have been found to erect, it is supposed, a slave deck, that would hold, as one of the officers remarked, "about 500 niggers." The search for the vessel revealed nothing in the shape of a slave deck. On deck was found a large medicine chest, with castor oil, lint and drugs, evidently intended for a larger company than those on board, for of which there were only thirty-five men. Between decks were over fifty hhds. of water, large stores of rice, beans, farina and preserved meats, such as are used by slavers. Large copper pots and pans for boiling large quantities of food, a set of irons, with ladles and spoons to match, and many other questionable appurtenances. About the deck was a number of extra spars. In the cabin were found three of the west coast of Africa, Portuguese, and a large quantity of bunting to make American flags.

But if these circumstances spoke for themselves the crew on board were not communicative, but were as silent and as non-committal as the members of the Know-Nothing fraternity are said to be. None of them knew how they had got aboard—who had shipped them, where they were going to—who the captain or owners' names were. All on board the vessel were Portuguese, and either did not or pretended not to understand a word of English. The captain was a myth. There was no one on board acknowledged the title, or could tell who that functionary was. Three of the men said they were passengers, but could not tell who they paid their money to, or where the ship was going, though one of them, who was suspected of being captain, betrayed an accurate knowledge of St. Paul de Loanda and Angola, both noted resorts for slavers.

"Well, gentlemen," said Mr. McKeon, addressing Marshals De Angelos and Nevins, "you have a fine prize here." According to the law, the vessel belongs to the slaver, or a vessel engaged in the trade, and belongs to the owner, are entitled to half the vessel and cargo. This schooner appears to have no owner."

"Let us try if that is so," responded the officers.

Accordingly, the officers went on board the vessel were called up, but all in turn denied owning the suspected property, and the most rigid cross-examination failed to elicit any light on the subject. The following named persons were placed under arrest, and ordered to be taken to Kings County Jail, there to await the further action of the District-Attorney:

Captain—José Lopez, Casper Marrech, Joseph Antoine. Seamen—Manuel Fortunato, Antoine Gomez, Juan Grazzla, Albert Rose, Antoine José, Manuel Gomez, Emmanuel Antoine, Antoine Gomez, H. B. De la Figueiro.

A number of circumstances, which it would be improper to mention here, throw considerable suspicion on the Portuguese Consul, Senior H. B. De la Figueiro. It seems he was in communication with several persons on board, and knew of their whereabouts. The affair, however, is to be further investigated. The owner lives in the Navy Yard, under the charge of the Deputy Marshal.

AMERICAN SCOUNDREL ABROAD.—Paris letters to the daily press, received by the last steamer, give glowing accounts of a splendid ball which was given by the Americans in that capital on the 22d ult. At the head of the committee is the name of the American Minister, Mr. Mason, a specimen of whose peculiarly republican honor we gave in the last STANDARD. Under the auspices of such a leader, who carries the manners of the plantation into the salons of the Tuilleries, the American society in Paris must be exceedingly elegant and attractive, and accordingly no one can be surprised at an evidence of its good taste and good-breeding given by the committee of good taste and good-breeding given by the committee of this ball. Of course it raked all Paris for all the Lord Dromondolles and Lady Flapdoddles that could be found, and sent cards of invitations, in bad French, to anybody who had a prefix to his name, or was supposed to be entitled to wear a bit of ribbon at his button-hole, for, for all sorts of snobbery, our amiable countrymen abroad, as a class, have long been distinguished. It is stated, however, that Charles Dickens could have been glad to be present, but a ticket was denied him by the committee. Whether Mr. Dickens had any such wish, we think very doubtful, and that the committee declined to invite him is very much to his credit. Mr. Mason and his associates, it is said, could not forget that he was the author of "The American Notes." That he should have laughed at our peculiar dexterity in spitting, in chair-balancing, and other peculiar national accomplishments, might have been overlooked, perhaps; but as he had spoken disrespectfully of the great Institution, he was not to be forgiven. So the Virginia slavebreeder declines Mr. Dickens's acquaintance.

It is to be hoped he will not take it much to heart, but will comfort himself with the reflection that some hundreds of thousands of people, in this country, are, this very week, reading several pirated editions of the fourth No. of "Little Dorrit."

CONGRESS.

THE Kansas question is still under discussion, in one shape or another, in both Houses of Congress, but it seems with little spirit. In the House, the question is the right of Whitfield to his seat, and days have been consumed in speeches, and several more, perhaps, will be before a vote is taken on sending for persons and papers, for which the Republicans are contending. It is very doubtful if they carry their point.

In the Senate, on Saturday, the tedium of the dry season was somewhat enlivened by a short "heated term," in which a spicy debate occurred between the two Illinois Senators, assisted by two or three others. We copy the report of it as made by Telegraph. The question was on printing the reports on Kansas affairs, a long majority report from the Committee having been submitted by Mr. Douglas, and a minority report by Mr. Collamer.

Mr. JOHNSON reported in favour of printing 31,000 copies of the majority and minority reports of the Territorial Committee on Kansas affairs—being 500 copies for each member.

Mr. TRUMBULL opposed the motion. He thought the minority report presented the slavery question in a masterly manner—its positions being unanswerable—but it was not written as a reply to the details of the majority report, which he was sorry to see. It was a mere statement of the Senate, a document containing so many unwarrantable assumptions, erroneous deductions and unfounded statements.

Mr. WADE asked Mr. Trumbull to yield the floor for adjournment.

Mr. DOUGLAS—I hope not; the courtesies of the Senate have been taken advantage of on account of my known absence to make an assault on me.

Mr. TRUMBULL—No, sir; I knew not whether you were absent or present when I made my remarks on the report. I did not introduce the subject, nor did I know it would come up to-day.

Mr. DOUGLAS—My colleague dares to say. In face of the fact, that he did not know I was absent. He acted with unfairness in attacking the report when I was detained from the Senate by ill health. I would ask him if within the reasonable time his speech will be printed?

Mr. TRUMBULL—I think it will be published by Monday.

Mr. DOUGLAS—If I can ask a postponement of the subject until Monday, I will reply to Mr. Trumbull's speech on Tuesday.

Mr. SEWARD—Take your own time.

Mr. DOUGLAS—I thank the Senator; I understand that game; "take your own time." The Senator from Massachusetts took his own time to write and circulate a libel on me when the Nebraska bill was reported. I understood that speech was prepared here as a political act. That will be news to the Democracy of Illinois, and is a libel on the Democracy of that State.

Mr. CRITTENDEN interposed, saying the debate had transcended the rules of decorum. The Senator had charged a libel on Mr. Trumbull (sensation).

Mr. DOUGLAS—I should have been better satisfied if the Senator from Kentucky had said that Black Republicans denounced us in coarse terms, rebuked them for want of courtesy.

Mr. CRITTENDEN—To what do you allude?

Mr. DOUGLAS—When they made coarse and vulgar partisan assaults on the Democratic side of the Senate.

Mr. CRITTENDEN—I protest against such language that of others to call Senators to order for personalities. This is not the place for vituperation. Such matters should be settled elsewhere.

Mr. DOUGLAS—I do not regard the Senator as good authority in Illinois politics. I was speaking of events of which I am better capable of judging than he.

Mr. CRITTENDEN—I think the Chair decided that Mr. Douglas's remark was not personal.

Mr. DOUGLAS—So far as I am advised, and as I believe, my colleague was the author of a miserable sheet in Illinois called Know-Nothings—which are one and the same thing.

Mr. CRITTENDEN—I wish the Senator to understand that I cooperate with the American party, and, standing here as a gentleman and a Senator, and claiming all the respect due to my honesty as a freeman, I repel with scorn every imputation of the kind, as intended to embrace me and my political associates.

Mr. DOUGLAS explained—I spoke of what Know-Nothingism is in Illinois, and said it might be otherwise in other States. Know-Nothing party in Illinois has adopted an Abolition creed; and that is the miserable faction which sent my colleague here. The Senator from Kentucky misunderstood me; I did not know he would have received my remark as personal to him.

Mr. CRITTENDEN—The gentleman did not make the qualification he now makes.

Mr. DOUGLAS—Every gentleman must have understood me as making a distinction. I said nothing about Southern Know-Nothings.

Mr. TRUMBULL—I shall not permit such remarks as these, from my colleague, to pass unanswered. I shall suffer no man, here or elsewhere, to state of my colleague that he is a coward and totally unfounded. If he means to say I am, or ever have been, a Know-Nothing, or connected with any secret political organization, the charge is basely false, and I pronounce it to be false in the basest way—untrue. He proceeded to speak of the politics of Illinois, saying she was and had always been a Democratic State. In the Eighth Congressional District, which gave Pierce nearly 5,000 majority, he (Trumbull) was elected a member of the House by more than 2,600 majority. He ran as the Anti-Nebraska candidate. How did his colleague vote? He voted every Know-Nothing and Abolition vote? He (Mr. Trumbull) did not know.

Mr. DOUGLAS—My colleague said the reason why he did not vote was because he expected to resign our seats last year, to test, by reflection, whether he or I represented Illinois, was that Governor Mattison would appoint me and another Democrat to fill the vacancies, to be been voted by me, in order to take effect at the next meeting of the Legislature.

Mr. BROWN—That's right.

Mr. DOUGLAS—I'll give him till Monday morning to think of it.

Mr. WELLER—That's better.

Mr. DOUGLAS—I said my colleague received every Abolition and Know-Nothing vote in the Legislature. He dare not deny that statement. Why equivocate?

In further remarks Mr. Douglas said that his colleague had become a Chief of the Black Republicans.

Mr. TRUMBULL—I ask my colleague to explain.

Mr. DOUGLAS—Was not the gentleman voted for by Abolitionists and Know-Nobbings from all parts of the State?

Mr. TRUMBULL—I tell him no to his teeth. I never was a candidate of the Abolitionist or Know-Nothing party. I was been voted for by members of the American party, and it was so with the gentleman; but that I was their candidate is not true.

The colloquy was continued further, when Mr. SUMNER replied to the remark of Mr. Douglas, that he (Sumner) had obtained a week's delay of the Nebraska bill in order to circulate a libel on the South. Mr. Sumner said he had just as much intrue—that he had united with other members of the Senate in sending an address to the people of the United States, expressing the true spirit of the Nebraska bill, and predicting many of the evils which have since ensued.

Mr. Douglas said that both Messrs. Chase and Sumner, on the occasion referred to, came to his seat and asked him to postpone the Nebraska bill one week, in order to give them time to examine it. He did so; but the day after, he discovered they had written an address which they had prepared and circulated it broadcast. It was the false statement, that they had not had time to examine the bill, of which he (Douglas) complained. That address had not been voted on by any organization, and was a mere self-aggrandizement, and not a proper sense of public duty. The Senator from Massachusetts did not consider that libellous—oh, no! This might accord with his ideas of a gentleman and a Senator.

Mr. SUMNER—I shall enter into no contest here or elsewhere as to the character of my colleague. The Senator from Illinois is the proper judge of this matter. It is not true that I went to the Senator's seat to make the request to which he alludes.

Mr. DOUGLAS replied that Mr. Sumner, while pretending to be wasted time to read the Nebraska bill, had previously franked a grossly libellous pamphlet on the subject.

Mr. SUMNER said the address was predicated on the first bill and not on the last.

Mr. DOUGLAS remarked that the reasons assigned by Mr. Sumner for the postponement of the Nebraska bill were not true in fact.

Mr. SUMNER—A motion was then adopted, and the Senate adjourned to Monday.

HARRISBURG PRESS.—The London correspondent of the New York *Journal of Commerce* is exercised in his mind as to the cause of misfortune which may await Mr. Dallas, our new minister to the Court of St. James, on some future occasion when he shall dine with the Queen, or partake of a diplomatic dinner with a minister, or feed with the Lord Mayor. His Imperial Majesty of Hayti, it seems, forgetful that the United States Government might not approve of it, has the temerity to send an Ambassador to England, and, too, who is a black man, and, to boot, a born black. This man, whom his Excellency, Mr. Mason, would compute to be worth a thousand dollars in Richmond, is known among other people—who are not Americans and Republicans—as Baron Cuvier, is a member, of course, of the *corps diplomatique*, and is received at the Court of the Queen with as much decorum and distinction as if he were an white Victoria herself. "Last week," exclaims the horror-struck correspondent of pious contemporary, "he was at the Queen's levee." He was also "very prominent at the opening of Parliament," and, what makes it the more aggravating is, he has always appears in a most brilliant uniform, while Mr. Buchanan's clothes are of the colour of the Haytian's skins. And now, says the correspondent, in a grand rage, "Let us fancy one of our ministers dining with the Queen, or at a diplomatic dinner given by a minister, or the Lord Mayor, and this negro at his right! What would be the feelings of our countryman—and worse what his recourse for the pain inflicted upon them?" "Phaney his feeliuks," indeed! Words fail to portray them.

AN ABOLITIONIST PAPER IN KENTUCKY.

NEWPORT, KY., March 10, 1856.

MESSRS. EDITORS: I've been travelling in the manchaised States for several months past, kindling and relighting the flame of hope in the breasts of the hopeless blacks, and endeavoring, as far as possible, to aid the sacred cause of Abolition among the whites, by politico-economical arguments in favour of Free Labour and Free Soil. Not by the argument of a Higher Law—oh! no! Slavery has deadened the moral sense of this people too effectually, to render appeals to their humane or religious instincts effective. To reach their humanity, you must go through their purse. Their hearts are guarded by Dollars.

There is a paper published here which I wish to commend to the attention of your readers. I refer to the *Newport* (Ky.) *News*. It is a daily paper, anti-slavery "up to the hub, hub and all"—as uncompromising in its opposition to the "domestic" iniquity of the South; as fearless in its denunciations and expositions of the moral and pecuniary effects of the "peculiar" and "patriarchal" crime as *The Liberator* or the *Anti-Slavery Standard*. Mr. Bailey has sacrificed a great deal to keep up this journal. He is personally as well as morally a brave man; if he were timid, in either respect, his press would long ago have been immersed in the Ohio river. His whole family deprive themselves of the comforts of life, which are within their immediate reach, to sustain the cause of freedom of speech and advance anti-slavery sentiment in Kentucky. His son, two grown daughters and a young child-daughter, as well as Mr. Bailey himself, devote their whole time to the practical duties of the office, folding and printing. By crossing the river into free Ohio they could live in comparative affluence, but they prefer to serve freedom, even with poverty, by living in Kentucky.

Newport has few slaveholders, but many pro-slavery men. In fact, it is the most ultra pro-slavery town in Kentucky. Here, as elsewhere, the meaner the white man the intenser is his hatred of the negro. Slaveholders are generally far more favourably inclined to Emancipation than the "poor whites of the South."

Bailey is doing a great deal of good here. They dare not throw his press into the river, because they are afraid of him; Abolition, therefore, can get an audience at this point.

Can't you do something to put the *News* on a firm pecuniary basis?

Let those who wish to read a Southern paper with a backbone, subscribe for the *News*. It costs only $2 per year. Yours ever, JOHN BALL, JR.

☞ *Liberator* and *Bugle* please notice.

FUGITIVE SLAVE CASE IN CALIFORNIA.—The Los Angeles *Star* reports the trial of a recent slave case in that place before one Judge Hayes. It was not to be expected that in that remote and benighted region much good law would be found, or that Judges should always have the grace with the judicial wisdom of their brethren on this side of the Continent. One would think from reading the report of this case Judge Kane had never been heard of at Los Angelos; or if he has, it is evident that Judge Hayes is either one of those obstinately conservative men, who does not easily accept new doctrines, or one who permits himself to be governed by simple principles of Justice without regard to judicial precedents. If his decision in the case before us be correct, then Judge Kane in the case of the slave in Williamson case was a monstrous innovation. Certainly, he or Grier, or any other Slave-Commissioner in the Atlantic States, that we know anything about, would have come to a very different conclusion than that reached by Judge Hayes. Any State law that would have stood in their way would have been at once pronounced unconstitutional. But all that can be said for California is that she is still a young State. The case is thus reported:

In this case, the petition of the writ of habeas corpus is brought for fourteen persons of colour, namely—Hannah, aged 34; and Biddy, 38, and their children, to wit: Ann, 17; Lawrence, 12; Nathaniel, 10; Jane, 8; Charles, 6; Marion, 4; Hannah, 2; an infant boy two weeks, all children of Hannah; Mary, 2 years, child of said Ann; Ellen, 17; Ann, 12; Harriet, 5, children of Biddy. The petition states that they are slaves, having been brought into the State of California in the year 1851 (in the fall, it seems) by Robert Smith, who has resided here with them ever since, and now holds them in servitude, and is about to remove to the State of Texas, carrying them with him into slavery. The defendant's return to the writ alleges that in Mississippi he owned as slaves the complaints, Hannah and Nathaniel, and Biddy and her three children above named; he left that State for Utah Territory; Jane was born in Missouri, Charles in Utah Territory, and the other four in California; they left Mississippi with their own consent rather than remain there, and he has supported them ever since, and intends to support them on his own children, and not holding them as slaves; it is his intention to remove to Texas and take them with him; Hannah and her children are well disposed to remain with him, and he intends so to do, with their knowledge and consent. "It is understood," he adds, "between said Smith and said persons that they will return to slavery in Texas with him, as a voluntary act on the part of his family."

All were brought up by warrant, except Hannah, who was shown to be sick, Lawrence, engaged in driving for her, and Biddy, who was absent in Sacramento County, not within this judicial district. The case was submitted as if all were present, under the statute, and judgment rendered on the return, in substance, that they should be free; and, in further greater safety, those under twenty-one years of age were placed in the custody of the Sheriff of this County, as their special guardian, except Charles, who was, by a warrant, placed in like manner in charge of the Sheriff of San Bernardino County; other orders being made to secure this temporary disposition from any unauthorized interference. The two mothers were also placed under charge of the Sheriff of this County for their protection. The reasons for this decision were given fully, with which it is just to him to add, the defendant seemed to be content.

SOUTHERN EMIGRATION TO KANSAS.—The outcry which the South has been making in regard to the Northern Kansas Aid Societies would seem to have been much on the principle that a flying pleiocoke cries "Stop thief!" The Northern Societies are designed solely to help such persons as may wish to become *bona fide* settlers in the Territory, and no other condition is required, and no pledge even exacted that they desire to make it a Free State. At the South, on the contrary, where the complaint has been long and loud against the Northern Societies, they are now forming Societies of their own with the express and avowed purpose of making Kansas a slave State. This is Southern Rights, which, like Punic faith, is become the synonym for falsehood and deceit.

Every mail brings intelligence of some new movement among the South to raise means and men to send to Kansas, there to become, not settlers, but merely voters, and, if need be, fighters. A correspondent of *The Tribune*, writing from Tennessee, gives an account of this sort of emigration. There is no, he says, a train of cars that passes between Nashville and Augusta, Georgia, that does not have quite a number of men on board bound for Kansas; and they are forming companies all through South Carolina, Georgia and Alabama. These men are all armed to the teeth, and are passed free on all the railroads. One company recently went through Nashville from Charleston, S. C., free of charge, each man carrying, in addition to his rifle, revolver and bowie-knife, the following certificate:

"CERTIFICATE.

"CHARLESTON, S. C., ——, 1856.

"TO ALL THE TRUE FRIENDS OF THE RIGHTS OF THE SOUTH:

"We, the undersigned, have this day, ——, the bearer of this, is a true Southern man in sentiment, and emigrates to Kansas with the sole and direct purpose of participating in establishing the Government and laws upon which the authorities in maintaining the Government and laws are in force in said Territory, and which *shall continue to be passed for the protection of Slave Institutions*, and we earnestly command him to the kind offices and friendly services of all who are in favour of maintaining the rights of the South.

WILLIAM WHALEY,	JOHN CUNNINGHAM,
G. D. TYLER,	W. H. TRENCATT,
WM. D. POSTON,	J. W. STONE,
J. W. ROSS,	W. E. MARTIN,
THOS. G. HARKER,	W. LEGG,
W. R. TABER,	J. H. RICHARDSON,
A. F. BROWNING,	

Executive Committee of the Committee of the aid of the Slave Settlement of Kansas. Attested by me, THEODORE G. BARKER, Sec'y."

The writer adds that these men have no fixed purpose by going to Kansas except to aid in making it a slave State, and are impressed with many of them, and, too, expressed their intention of returning to their homes as soon as the question was settled.

THEODORE PARKER'S FAST-DAY SERMON.—We learn that the Rev. Theodore Parker will improve the occasion of the Annual Fast in Massachusetts, which occurs on the 3d of April, to give a "sermon of doctrine" at Music Hall, on the question of Slavery. We quote:

"The Interest which the Northern Men have in Keeping Slavery out of Kansas and Nebraska." It is not to be hope may be permitted to read this. We may venture to say before hand that it ought to be published.

THE GOVERNOR OF KENTUCKY'S ANSWER.—The *Cincinnati Gazette* of the 17th inst. says, that a note from Governor Morehead, of Kentucky, has been seen by the editor of that paper, addressed to the agent sent by Gov. Chase to demand the rendition of Margaret, accused of murdering her child. The Kentucky Governor expresses his extreme regret and indignation, the *Gazette* says, at the course taken by Gaines, the master, who had removed the fugitive to another State, but promises that she shall be returned, that measures have already been taken for that purpose. We are by no means persuaded, nevertheless, of the sincerity of Governor Morehead's regret. To decline absolutely the requisition of the Governor of another State for a criminal, would be a serious thing to do, and it would be no less serious to return to Ohio a fugitive slave. To have the criminal beyond the reach of Slavery has deadened the moral sense of this people too effectually, to render appeals to their humane or religious instincts effective. To reach their humanity, you must go through their purse. Their hearts are guarded by Dollars.

There is a paper published here which I wish to commend to the attention of your readers. I refer to the *Newport* (Ky.) *News*. It is a daily paper, anti-slavery "up to the hub, hub and all"—as uncompromising in its opposition to the "domestic" iniquity of the South; as fearless in its denunciations and expositions of the moral and pecuniary effects of the "peculiar" and "patriarchal" crime as *The Liberator* or the *Anti-Slavery Standard*. Mr. Bailey has sacrificed a great deal to keep up this journal. He is personally as well as morally a brave man; if he were timid, in either respect, his press would long ago have been immersed in the Ohio river. His whole family deprive themselves of the comforts of life, which are within their immediate reach, to sustain the cause of freedom of speech and advance anti-slavery sentiment in Kentucky. His son, two grown daughters and a young child-daughter, as well as Mr. Bailey himself, devote their whole time to the practical duties of the office, folding and printing. By crossing the river into free Ohio they could live in comparative affluence, but they prefer to serve freedom, even with poverty, by living in Kentucky.

Newport has few slaveholders, but many pro-slavery men. In fact, it is the most ultra pro-slavery town in Kentucky. Here, as elsewhere, the meaner the white man the intenser is his hatred of the negro. Slaveholders are generally far more favourably inclined to Emancipation than the "poor whites of the South."

Bailey is doing a great deal of good here. They dare not throw his press into the river, because they are afraid of him; Abolition, therefore, can get an audience at this point.

Can't you do something to put the *News* on a firm pecuniary basis?

Let those who wish to read a Southern paper with a backbone, subscribe for the *News*. It costs only $2 per year. Yours ever, JOHN BALL, JR.

☞ *Liberator* and *Bugle* please notice.

FUGITIVE SLAVE CASE IN CALIFORNIA.—The Los Angeles *Star* reports the trial of a recent slave case in that place before one Judge Hayes. It was not to be expected that in that remote and benighted region much good law would be found, or that Judges should always have the grace with the judicial wisdom of their brethren on this side of the Continent. One would think from reading the report of this case Judge Kane had never been heard of at Los Angelos; or if he has, it is evident that Judge Hayes is either one of those obstinately conservative men, who does not easily accept new doctrines, or one who permits himself to be governed by simple principles of Justice without regard to judicial precedents. If his decision in the case before us be correct, then Judge Kane in the case of the slave in Williamson case was a monstrous innovation. Certainly, he or Grier, or any other Slave-Commissioner in the Atlantic States, that we know anything about, would have come to a very different conclusion than that reached by Judge Hayes. Any State law that would have stood in their way would have been at once pronounced unconstitutional. But all that can be said for California is that she is still a young State. The case is thus reported:

In this case, the petition of the writ of habeas corpus is brought for fourteen persons of colour, namely—Hannah, aged 34; and Biddy, 38, and their children, to wit: Ann, 17; Lawrence, 12; Nathaniel, 10; Jane, 8; Charles, 6; Marion, 4; Hannah, 2; an infant boy two weeks, all children of Hannah; Mary, 2 years, child of said Ann; Ellen, 17; Ann, 12; Harriet, 5, children of Biddy. The petition states that they are slaves, having been brought into the State of California in the year 1851 (in the fall, it seems) by Robert Smith, who has resided here with them ever since, and now holds them in servitude, and is about to remove to the State of Texas, carrying them with him into slavery. The defendant's return to the writ alleges that in Mississippi he owned as slaves the complaints, Hannah and Nathaniel, and Biddy and her three children above named; he left that State for Utah Territory; Jane was born in Missouri, Charles in Utah Territory, and the other four in California; they left Mississippi with their own consent rather than remain there, and he has supported them ever since, and intends to support them on his own children, and not holding them as slaves; it is his intention to remove to Texas and take them with him; Hannah and her children are well disposed to remain with him, and he intends so to do, with their knowledge and consent. "It is understood," he adds, "between said Smith and said persons that they will return to slavery in Texas with him, as a voluntary act on the part of his family."

All were brought up by warrant, except Hannah, who was shown to be sick, Lawrence, engaged in driving for her, and Biddy, who was absent in Sacramento County, not within this judicial district. The case was submitted as if all were present, under the statute, and judgment rendered on the return, in substance, that they should be free; and, for further greater safety, those under twenty-one years of age were placed in the custody of the Sheriff of this County, as their special guardian, except Charles, who was, by a warrant, placed in like manner in charge of the Sheriff of San Bernardino County; other orders being made to secure this temporary disposition from any unauthorized interference. The two mothers were also placed under charge of the Sheriff of this County for their protection. The reasons for this decision were given fully, with which it is just to him to add, the defendant seemed to be content.

SOUTHERN EMIGRATION TO KANSAS.—The outcry which the South has been making in regard to the Northern Kansas Aid Societies would seem to have been much on the principle that a flying pleiocoke cries "Stop thief!" The Northern Societies are designed solely to help such persons as may wish to become *bona fide* settlers in the Territory, and no other condition is required, and no pledge even exacted that they desire to make it a Free State. At the South, on the contrary, where the complaint has been long and loud against the Northern Societies, they are now forming Societies of their own with the express and avowed purpose of making Kansas a slave State. This is Southern Rights, which, like Punic faith, is become the synonym for falsehood and deceit.

Every mail brings intelligence of some new movement among the South to raise means and men to send to

Miscellaneous Department.

HEINRICH HEINE'S SONNETS TO HIS MOTHER.

TO MY MOTHER, B. HEINE, FORMERLY VON GELDERN.

I.

It is my wont to bear my head full high—
Nor can my mind boast much of plant grace;
If even the king should look me in the face,
I should not wear a downward look—not I!
And yet, dear mother, I will not deny,
However my proud soul thus gazes its place,
If I but feel thy blessed soft embrace,
I stand before thee timorous and shy.
In it thy spirit that subdues me so,
That lofty spirit, which can pierce through all,
And dazzle the shining way in Heaven's full glow?
Bitter is memory, as I recal
So many deeds which thy dear heart hath riven—
That tender heart which so much love has given!

II.

Once in mad mood I left thee, to begin
A quest through all the world from land to land—
For I would see what love I could obtain.
Dreaming that love some other love must win.
No path there was but I sought love therein;
At every door I took my weighted stand,
And begged small alms of love with outstretched hand,
But only for my pains met Spite's cold grin.
And ever still for love I wandered—ever,
For love, and yet love found I never,
And at came home thence, sick and sad.
But when to welcome me thus didst arise,
O what was that which awe in thy clear eyes?
The dart and long-sought love; and I was glad.

—Translated for The Manchester (England) Times.

ROGERS'S *TABLE TALK.*

From The London Leader.

HAD the writer on *Table Talk* in the last Quarterly waited a few weeks, he might have added to his list of the pleasantest of the anecdotical works that subject embraces. Samuel Rogers was not a brilliant talker, but his long life, and the amazing wealth of his acquaintance—including princes and poets, actors and artists, warriors and statesmen, wits and leaders of fashion—furnished his conversation with more anecdotes than perhaps any other man of his time could pretend to. The present volume is just what might have been expected; rich in anecdote, and personal glimpses, but by no means unadulterated fun or wit or wisdom in the passages which Rogers himself furnishes. The editor has discharged his office with unusual skill. He might, indeed, have spared us several feeble entries, but we have reason to be grateful that he has not been more liberal in this respect. He has printed nothing which can affect the living, much that must interest every one; and he has so arranged the scattered fragments under their several heads that details which in themselves would be too trivial for publication become important as cumulative traits from which to form a picture. In one word, the book is charming, and will furnish "Table Talk" for all England.

Our task will be to enrich our columns with choice morsels. We begin with an exquisite compliment paid by Burke to Reynolds when the painter gave his farewell lecture:

"Sir Joshua concluded the lecture by saying, with great emotion, 'And I should desire that the last words which I should pronounce in this Academy and from this place might be the name of—Michael Angelo.' As he descended from the rostrum, Burke went up to him, took his hand, and said,

"'The angel ended, and in Adam's ear
So charming left his voice, that he awhile
Thought him still speaking, still stood fix'd to hear.'"

The following is not new, but is good enough to bear repetition:

"Doctor Fordyce sometimes drank a good deal at dinner. He was summoned one evening to see a lady patient, when he was more than half-eas over, and conscious that he was so. Feeling her pulse, and finding himself unable to count its beats, he muttered, 'Drunk, by God!' Next morning, recollecting the circumstance, he was greatly vexed: and just as he was thinking what explanation of his behaviour he should give to the lady, a letter from her was put into his hand. 'She too well knew,' said the letter, 'that he had discovered the unfortunate condition in which she was when he last visited her; and she entreated him to keep the matter secret in consideration of the enclosed (a hundred-pound bank-note)."

This on Voltaire is creditable to Adam Smith:

"When a young man, I went to Edinburgh, carrying letters of introduction from Dr. Kippis (Dr. Price, also) to Adam Smith, Robertson, and others. When I first saw Smith, he was at breakfast, eating strawberries; and he descanted on the superior flavour of those grown in Scotland. I found him very kind and communicative. He was (what Robertson was not) a man who had seen a great deal of the world. Once, in the course of conversation, I happened to remark of some writer that 'he was rather superficial.—'Young man,' said Smith, slapping the table with his hand, 'there has been but *one* Voltaire!'"

Of Erskine we have some delightful *mots*:

"When Lord Erskine heard that somebody had died worth two hundred thousand pounds, he observed, 'Well, that's a very pretty sum to begin the next world with.'

"'A friend of mine,' said Erskine, 'was suffering from a continual wakefulness; and various methods were tried to send him to sleep, but in vain. At last his physician resorted to an experiment which succeeded perfectly: they dressed him in a watchman's coat, put a lantern into his hand, placed him in a sentry-box, and—he was asleep in ten minutes.'

"To all letters soliciting his 'subscription' to anything, Erskine had a regular form of reply, viz., 'Sir, I feel much honoured by your application to me, and I beg to subscribe'—here the reader had to turn over the leaf—'my sixpenny very obedient servant,' &c."

This reminds us of the splendid hoax played by Lokkowitz, the Austrian minister, who detested the Jesuits, and in his will made them a bequest which must have made their mouths water with expectation. By the proposed preamble, he bequeathed to the society 82,000—here the leaf had to be turned over, and on the other side were the words—"sulls towards a new building." The following, especially the first and last, are admirable:

"Erskine used to say that when the hour came that all secrets should be revealed, we should know the reason why—shoes are always made too tight.

"When he had a house at Hampstead, he entertained the very best company. I have dined there with the Prince of Wales—the only time I ever had any conversation with his royal highness. On that occasion the Prince was very agreeable and familiar. Among other anecdotes which he told us of Lord Thurlow, I remember these two. The first was: 'Thurlow used to say to the Prince, 'Sir, your father will continue to be a popular king as long as he continues to go to church every Sunday, and to be faithful to that ugly woman, your mother; but you, sir, will never be popular.' The other was: 'Thurlow's lazy servants were carrying Thurlow up-stairs to his bed-room, just before his death, they happened to let his legs strike against the banisters, upon which he uttered *the last words he ever spoke*—a frightful imprecation on' all their souls.

"Erskine said that the Prince of Wales, 'the Prince, the cosmogony man' (alluding to *The Vicar of Wakefield*), for he had only two classical quotations—one from Homer and one from Virgil, which he never failed to sport when there was any opportunity of introducing them.

"Latterly Erskine was very poor; and no wonder, for he always contrived to sell out of the funds when they were very low, and to buy in when they were very high. 'By heaven,' he would say, 'I am a perfect kite, all paper; the boys might fly me.' Yet, forsooth, he was a Whig, and kept the best society: I have met him at the Duke of York's, &c. &c."

The following epigram may not have been printed before, but it circulates among the Erskine stories:

"The French have taste in cookery, it they do,
Which we are quite without;
For Nature, that to them gave *goût*,
To us gave *gout*."

Many are the stories respecting the power of man's eye on wild animals; but we believe the effect is attributed to a wrong cause; here are two:

"Thomas Grenville told me this curious fact. When he was a young man, he one day dined with Lord Spencer at Wimbledon. Among the company was George Fitz (afterwards Lord Rivers), who declared that he could tame the most furious animal by looking at it steadily. Lord Spencer said, 'Well, there is a mastiff in the courtyard here, which is the terror of the neighbourhood: will you try your powers on him?' Fitz proceed to do so; and the company descended into the court-yard. A servant held the mastiff by a chain. Fitz knelt down at a short distance from the animal, and stared him sternly in the face. They all slunk off, except Lord Spencer. The mastiff was let loose, and rushed furiously towards Fitz, then suddenly checked his pace, seemed confounded, and, leaping over Fitz's head, ran away, and was not seen for many hours after.

"During one of my visits to Italy, while I was walking, a little before my carriage, on the road, not far from Verona, I perceived two huge dogs, nearly as tall as myself, bounding towards me from out a gate way, though there was no house in sight. I immediately crouched like a frog, and trembling from head to foot. I yet had resolution enough to stand quite still and eye them with a fixed look. They gradually relaxed their speed from a gallop to a trot, came up to me, stopped for a moment, and then went back again."

Such facts ought to be registered; but, as before hinted, we doubt the explanation; it is not the fixed look which confounds the animal, but the unusual *attitude*. Dogs are not accustomed to be confronted by a man kneeling before them, or standing motionless. That puts them out. An Indian officer once informed us that he was with a sepoy in the jungle, when they espied a tiger crouching and about to springs; the sepoy instantly crouched like wise, and placing his two handy trumpwise before his lips, shouted: in another instant the tiger was heard crash, crash, crash, leaping through the jungle. The explanation seems to be that the tiger was alarmed by this unaccustomed mode of defence. "Certain it that in the East, where dogs in troops rush out upon the traveller like so many wolves, the only safety is in seating oneself on the ground, and laying aside the stick or gun. The dogs come on, and lay down beside you, but will not attack you so dogs form a circle round you, but will not attack you so long as you remain thus motionless. Curiously enough Homer has, in the Odyssey, noticed this very custom. When Ulysses returns home, and goes to his shepherds, the dogs all rush out upon him, barking furiously; but "Ulysses cruelly scared them, and laid aside his staff."

"Ὀλύσσευς τοὺς μὲν ἔμελλε βαλὼν ἐπὶ νῶτα φόβησε
Ἔξετο κυζήσαντ᾽ ἐν δὲ κονίῃσι χαμάζε."

Now Ulysses could not have fixed them *all* with his eye. A propos of Homer, we may add, that the following observation is worth quoting from this volume:

"Some traveller relates, that an Indian being asleep in his canoe, which was fastened to the shore, a little above the Falls of Niagara, an English soldier wantonly cut the fastenings, and the canoe drifted into the current; that the Indian, after vainly trying the use of his paddles, and perceiving that he was just approaching the Falls, covered his head with his hands, and lay down in the canoe, and calmly resigned himself to his fate. So Homer, following nature, tells us in the *Odyssey*, that Ulysses, when his companions had opened the bag which contained the winds, covered his head with his mantle, and lay down in the vessel."

Here is a glorious *mot* of Sydney Smith's:

"Miss Lydia White (long since dead) was a lady who delighted in giving parties to as many celebrated people as she could get together. The following instance of her readiness in reply was communicated to me by my friend, the Rev. W. Harness. 'At one of Lydia White's small and most agreeable dinners, in Park street, the company (most of them, except the hostess, being Whigs) were discussing, in a very unctuous strain, the desperate prospects of their party. "Yes," said Sydney Smith, "we are in a most deplorable condition: we must do something to help ourselves; I think we had better carefully poison Lydia White's cow!" This was received with Lydia White, who, at once catching and applying the allusion to Iphigenia, answered, "I believe there is nothing the Whigs would not do to *raise the wind!*"

Lydia's reply seems hardly worth the pains we made them laugh, but the flavour and humour of sacrificing a Tory virgin is of a much higher strain.

Charles James Fox in his "hot youth":

"Fox (in his earlier days, I mean), Sheridan, Fitzpatrick, &c., led such a life! Fitzpatrick (he assured me that he has played cards with Fitzpatrick at Brooks's from ten o'clock at night till near six o'clock the next afternoon, a winter standing by to tell them 'whose deal it was,' they being too sleepy to know.

"After losing large sums at hazard, Fox would go home—not to destroy himself, as his friends sometimes feared, but—to sit down quietly and read Greek.

"Fox once won about eight thousand pounds: and one of his bond-creditors, who soon heard of it, immediately presented himself, and asked for payment. 'Impossible, sir,' replied Fox; 'I must first discharge my debts of honour.' The bond-creditor remonstrated. 'Well, sir, give me your bond.' It was delivered to Fox, who tore it in pieces and threw them into the fire. 'Now, sir,' said Fox, 'my debt to you is a debt of honour'; and immediately paid him."

Another glimpse of Fox:

"I saw Lunardi make the first ascent in a balloon which had been witnessed in England. It was from the Artillery ground. Fox was there with his brother General F. The crowd was immense. Fox, happening to put his hand down to his fob, found another hand upon it, which he immediately seized. 'My friend,' said he to the owner of the strange hand, 'you have chosen an occupation which will be your ruin at last.' 'O, Mr. Fox!' was the reply, 'forgive me, and let me go! I have been driven to this course by necessity; my poor wife and children are starving at home.' Fox, always tender-hearted, slipped a guinea into the hand, and then released it. On the conclusion of the show, Fox was proceeding home, when he said to his brother, 'By God, cried he, 'my watch is gone!' 'Yes,' answered General F., 'I know it is; I saw your friend take it.' 'Saw him take it! and you made no attempt to stop him?' 'Really, you and Sheridan are so very good terms with each other, that I did not choose to interfere.'"

Chesterfield certainly ought not to have proved so much witticisms as these:

"Witticisms are often attributed to the wrong people. It was Chesterfield, not Sheridan, who said, on occasion of a certain marriage, that 'Nobody's son had married Everybody's daughter.'

"Lord Chesterfield remarked of two persons dancing a minuet, that 'they looked as if they were hired to do it, and were doubtful of being paid.'

"I once observed to a Scotch lady, 'how desirable it was in any danger to *have presence of mind!* 'I had rather be rejoiced, 'have *absence of body.*'"

With the subjoined anecdote we must cease quoting—for this week at least:

"I wish several times stayed at Oatlands with the Duke and Duchess of York—both of them most amiable and delightful persons. We were generally a company of about fifteen; and our being invited to remain 'another day' sometimes depended on the ability of our royal host and hostess to raise sufficient money for our entertainment. We used to have all sorts of ridiculous 'fun' as we roamed about the place. The Duchess kept (besides a number of dogs for which there was a regular burial-place) a collection of monkeys, each of which had its own apartment in a house at top. One of the visitors (whose name I forget) was celebrated for a parochial tenor, monkey, and play to it on the fiddle with such fury and perseverance, that the poor animal, half distracted, would at last take refuge in the arms of Lord Alvanley. Monk Lewis was there, and Sheridan at Oatlands. One day, after dinner, as the Duchess was leaving the room, she whispered something into Lewis's ear. He was much affected, his eyes filling with tears. We asked what it was he said. 'Why, the Duchess gave the Duchess spoke so very kindly to me!' 'My dear fellow,' said Colonel Armstrong, 'pray don't cry; I daresay she didn't mean it.'"

ENGLISH LAWS OF PROPERTY AS THEY AFFECT WOMEN.

To the Honourable the House of Commons, in Parliament assembled, The Petition of the Undersigned Women of Great Britain, Married and Single,

HUMBLY SHEWETH—That the manifold evils occasioned by the present law, by which the property and earnings of the wife are placed in and kept under the power of the husband, becomes daily more apparent. That the sufferings thereupon ensuing, extend over all classes of society. That it might once have been deemed for the middle and upper classes, a comparatively theoretical question, but it so no longer, since the increasing pressure of competition on every side fields of literature and art, in order to increase the family income by such exertions.

That it is usual when a daughter marries in these ranks, to make, if possible, some distinct pecuniary provision for her and her children, that she may be secured from and set aside by a cumbrous machinery of Trusteeship, proving that few parents are willing entirely to entrust the welfare of their offspring to the irresponsible power of the husband, to the chance of his character, his wisdom, and his success in a profession.

That another device for the protection of women, who can afford to appeal, exists in the action of the Courts of Equity, which attempt within certain limits to redress the inconvenience of the Law; but that instances are perpetually dishonest or unwise in the management of the funds entrusted to their care, and Courts of Equity may fail in adjusting differences which concern the most intimate and delicate relation of life; that legal devices, patched up on a law not made for such purposes, work but clumsily, and that here, as in many other departments of justice, a clearance of the ground is the chief thing necessary. That, since this is a truth, which has gradually come to be recognized in other departments of justice, upon trade, to titles of property in land, and to the legal machinery for conveying such property from one owner to another, &c., we would hope that before long it will also come to be recognised in matrimonial legislation.

That it is hard that women, who have shown their fitness for the duties of wives and mothers, and have suffered by women of station, and also by professional women earning large incomes by pursuit of the arts, how real is the injury inflicted.

That it is hard that women often bear heavily upon women protected by the forethought of their relatives, the social training of their husbands, and the refined customs of the rank to which they belong, how much more unequivocal is the injury sustained by women in the lower classes, for whom no such protection can be made by their parents, who possess no means of appeal to expensive legal protection, and in regard to whom the education of the husband and the habits of his associates offer no moral guarantee for tender consideration of a wife.

That whereas it is customary in manufacturing districts to employ women largely in the processes of trade, and as scuptresses, innadresses, charwomen and in other multifarious occupations which cannot here be enumerated, the question must be recognised by all as of practical importance.

That newspapers constantly detail instances of marital oppression, "wife-beating," being a new compound noun lately introduced into the English language, is a sense of injury, which the English gentleman have lately enacted drink-rent regulations.

But that for the robbery by a man of his wife's hard earnings there is no redress—against the selfishness of a husband, who wrung from her the sweat of her brow, and daily bread there is no appeal. She may work from morning till night, to see the produce of her labour wrested from her and wasted in a Gin Palace, and such cases are to be daily witnessed by your Petitioners.

That the law, in depriving the mother of all pecuniary resources, deprives her of the power of giving schooling to her children, and in other ways providing for their moral and physical welfare; it obliges her, in short, to leave them to the temptations of the street, so fruitful in juvenile crime.

That there are certain portions of the law of husband and wife which bear injustly on the husband, as, for instance, that of making him responsible for the debts his wife contracted before marriage, even although he may have had no fortune with her. Her power also after marriage, of contracting debts in the name of her husband, for which he is responsible, is too unlimited, and often produces much injustice.

That in rendering the husband responsible for the entire maintenance of his family, the law expresses the necessities of an age, when the man was the only money-getting agent; but that since the custom of the country has greatly changed in this respect the position of the female sex, the law of maintenance no longer meets the whole case. That since modern civilization, in indefinitely extending the sphere of occupation for women, has in some measure broken down their pecuniary dependence upon men, it is time that legal protection be thrown over the produce of their labour, and that in entering the state of marriage, women should be secure from freedom into the condition of a slave, all whose earning belong to his master and not to himself.

That the laws of various foreign countries are in this respect much more just than our own, and afford precedent for a similar legislation than prevails in England—and your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will take the foregoing allegations into consideration, and apply such remedy as to its wisdom shall seem fit.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

LADIES SANCTIONING THE ABOVE.

Anna Blackwell, Isa Blagden, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Sarianna Browning, Mrs. Cowden Clarke, Charlotte Cushman, Amelia B. Edwards, Eliza F. Fox, Mrs. Gaskell, Matilda M. Hays, Mrs. Howitt, Anna Mary Howitt, Mrs. Jameson, Harriet Martineau, Mrs. Julia Maynard, Mary Mohl, Bessie Rayner Parkes, Mrs. Reid, Miss Sewell, Mrs. Carlyle, Miss Aiwyn Mary Lovell, Mrs. London, Miss Leigh Smith.

FROM PUTNAM'S Magazine, for February.

THE RANGER.

BY JOHN G. WHITTIER.

ROBERT RAWLIN! Frosts were falling
When the sunset horn was calling
Through the woods to Canada.
Gone the Winter's sleet and snowing,
Gone the Spring, one's bud and blowing,
Gone the Summer's harvest mowing,
And again the fields are gray.
Yet a year, he's come not!
Faint and hinter hope is growing
In the hearts that mourn his stay.

Where the lonely, crowded city hides
Abraham's rock with teeth of iron,
Glares o'er wood and wave away;
Faintly from the mart and shipping,
Or, as thunder spent and dying,
Come the challenge and replying,
Comes the sound of flight and fray.
Well-a-day! Hope and pray!
Some are living, some are lying
In their red graves far away.

Straggling rangers, worn with dangers,
Homeward faring, weary strangers
Pass the lonely farm-house by;
Tidings of the dead and living,
Forest march and ambush giving,
Till the maiden grave their moaning,
And the lads forget their play.
"Sail, ship! sail away!"
Sighs a sad one, sick with grieving,
"Why does Robert still delay?"

Nowhere fairer, sweeter, purer,
Does the wooded frontier rise
Through his planted woodlands stray,
Than where hillside oaks and beeches
Overlook the lake, where
Silver coves and pebbled beaches
And green islets lie asleep.
Nowhere day, for delay,
With a tenderer look beseeches,
"Let me, let me linger yet!"

On the grainlands of the mainlands,
Stands the serried corn like train-bands,
Plume and pennon rustling gay;
Out at sea, the island-lands
Silver birches, golden boded,
Set with maples, crimson-jaded,
White sea-foam and sand-hills gray,
Stretch away, far away,
Dim and dreamy, as recorded
By the hazy Autumn day.

Gaily chattering to the clattering
Of the brown nuts down ward pattering,
Leap the squirrels, saucy and free;
On the grass land, on the fallow,
Drop the apples, red and yellow;
Drop the sweet pears and mellow,
Drop the red leaves all the day.
And still, and still
Sun and cloud, o'er hill and hollow
Chasing, weave their web of play.

"Martha Mason, Martha Mason,
Fetches fall of the apple!
Why you mope at home to-day;
Surely maiden is not shamed
Leave your quilting, leave your spinning;
What is all your store of linen,
If your heart be never gay?
Come away, come away!
Never yet did sad beginning
Make the end of life a play."

Overbending, till she's blending
With the flaxen skein's she's tending,
Pale brows mutter, lips nod away
From her face of patient sorrow,
Sits she, seeking but to borrow
From the sunny hope of morrow,
Solace for the weary day—
"Go you your way, lads and play!
Unto you the seeds we sparrow
And the lilly, let me pray."

"With our rally rings the valley—
Join us! Hey! the hive-cry cry!
"Join us!" cried the laughing May,
"To the beach we all are going,
And, you see, the task of rowing,
Weat by north the wind is blowing,
Blowing straight from the bay!
Come away, come away!
Time and tide are swiftly flowing,
Let us hasten to-day!"

"Never tell us that you'll fall us,
Where the purple beach-plum mellows
On the bluffs so wild and gray.
Hesten, ye maidens, hesten!
Hark, our merry mates are calling:
Time it is that we were all,
Singing tide-wind down the bay!"
"Nay, nay, let me stay;
Some one should be for Rawlin,
Is my heart," she said, "to-day."

"Vain your calling for Rob Rawlin,
Some red spawn his moose-nest's broiling,
Or some Frenchman has, sleeping gay;
Just forget, as he's forgetting;
What avails a life lonely
If some stars must needs be setting,
Others rise as good as they."
"O Cesar, I pray you at the bay!"
Martha cries, her eye-lids wetting;
"Fool and false the words you say!"

"Martha Mason, heed no reason,
Pritheo, pray, be a kinder face on!
"Cease to vex me," did she say:
"Better sit by the fire blazing,
With the mournful pine tree sighing,
And the wild birds o'er us crying,
Than to stand in many a prey;
While away, far away,
Turns my heart, forever trying
Paths the lost ones are seeming,
And I kneel, again to pray.

"When the growing dawn is showing,
And the hoary pines are waving,
And the horned moon pales away:
From a dream of him awaking,
Every sound my heart is making
Seems a footstep of his taking;
Then I hush the thought, and say,
"Nay, nay, it is early day!
Ah! my heart, my heart is breaking
For the day over far away."

Look up Martha! worn and swarthy
Gloves a face of manhood worthy;
"Robert!" "Martha!" all the say.
O'er work, and weary, and sad together,
Little cared the owner whither;
Heart of lead is heart of feather,
Noon of night is noon of day!
Come away, come away!
When such lovers meet each other,
Why should prying riders stay?

Bare the timbers, quench the embers
Of their red leaves, in December's
Hoary frost and chilly spray;
But the hearth shall kindle clearer,
Household welcomes sound sincerer,
Heart to heart and lips to lips.
When the bridal bells shall say:
"Hope and prayer have gone away;
Life is sweetcer, love is dearer
For the trial and delay!"

DEATH OF HEINE.

HEINE is dead! After many years of acute suffering, borne not with stoic firmness, but with epicurean gayety, his body paralyzed for all action but sensitive for all pain; his vivacious spirit shrinking in his bonds alone vivid and active to the last, at last yielded its hold on his brilliant intelligence on Monday. In his last moments he requested that silence should be kept about his coffin. Accompingly only the Rabbi of Paris, nor of friendly entry was heard at his grave. He was buried yesterday in the cemetery of Montmatre. Of the man Heine the best thing, perhaps now to be said is Judge not!

"Judge not: the workings of his brain
And of his heart thou canst not see,
What looks to thy dim eyes a stain,
In God's pure light may only be
A scar, brought from some well-won field
Where thou wouldst only faint and yield."

Deep scars and ever open wounds he must have borne about him. A German, he was an exile from the country of his birth. A Jew by blood, he was a stranger to Christendom. Not a Jew in his faith, he was an exile from Jewry. Sheridan's comparison of such to the blank left between the Old and New Testaments is so nally as it is prettily put. On this hopelessly blank page, Heine inscribed at one time insatiable creeds of speculative philosophy. Latterly they seem to have disappeared, or if they themselves—being in some sort suicidal and teaching their own immortality—yet the spirit of them, if they remained, however, whether the rest of the page were the *lubrica ara* of thorough scepticism, or bore a pantheistic or other theory—that cardinal point of his faith was *the Beautiful*. He was a pantheist in Art, and Art alone was an artist. He should have been born in Greece two thousand years ago. Goethe said that he wanted *time*, wherein I humbly beg to differ from that grand old heathen, who in himself specially inspired with high quality. If the Master had placed his weakness in his want of calmness, no objection could be made. Perhaps Goethe did not say this. It is Eckermann who makes the report. It is true that Goethe had small reason to speak kindly of Heine, and Eckermann had less. I must not attempt a criticism of Heine, or a review of his writings. I will only quote what Eckermann makes Goethe say against him, and quote the best answer to it from Heine himself.

"It cannot be denied (says Goethe) that he possesses many brilliant qualities, but he wants one thing—Love.

* * * As I said, he is altogether destitute of Love, and without that, nothing can be done."

Now among the lesser things that Heine has done, gently, lovingly, with human and natural sympathy, is the following picture. I translate literally, from the Reisebilder, page 168 of the third Hamburg edition, and the translation is worth reading, although I cannot bring over into my English, the music of the original.

"Judging by the sun, it was noonday, when I came upon such a herd [he is travelling on foot in the Harz] and the Herdsman, a good-natured, fair complexioned young man told me, that the mountain at whose foot I stood, was the old, world-renowned Brocken. There is no house for many miles around, and I must, and enough when the young man invited me to eat with him. We sat down to a *dejuner dinatoire*, that consisted of bread and cheese. The lambs snapped up crumbs we let fall, the pretty, clean-shaven heifers played around us, and tinkled roguishly with their bells, and smiled on us with their great contented eyes. We sat at meat right royally. My host seemed to me a real king, and as he chances to be the only king who has ever given me bread, I will name him royally.

"A king is the earth's boy,
The green hill is his throne,
Above his head the sun
As the lion, wears the crown.

"At his feet lie the sheep,
Soft flatterers, red-crossed,
Bright-eyed, and silent,
And they strut along proudly.

"Court-players are the goats
And the birds and the ling—
With their gay, silvery bells—
Are the royal king's orchestra.

"And it rings and sings so sweetly,
And sweeter by chime therewith
Water-fall and forest murmur—
And the king falls asleep.

"Meanwhile there must rule
The Minister, watch dog,
Whose gruff barking
Re-echoes round about.

"Meanwhile the young king:
Rolling is a merry game
Ah, I wish that I at home
Were now at my queen's side!

"'In the arms of my queen
Resting my royal head so softly,
And in her dear eyes
Lies my boundless realm!'"

—Correspondent of N. Y. Tribune.

A PLEA FOR PEACE.

COMMON politics lie beyond our province. We gladly leave to our powerful and sagacious contemporaries the duty of vindicating our rank in the scale of nations. We can answer slights on our rights of men and the wrongs of women. Even the Russian War has had for us only a secondary interest. Our labours fall, very happily for ourselves and for our readers, in the calmer regions of intelligence—regions rarely disturbed by intrusion of the fierce passions and storms which the blast of battle passes as a softened light, and the roar of bombardment is only heard in a sad and mournful monotone. Before we can deal with politics, they must generally have passed into history. But there are exceptions to our rule; and the question of a possible return to peace is certainly one of these exceptions. Surely such a rupture is unlikely! Yet the air grows heavier day by day. The idea is becoming familiar to many minds. Passions are rising. Every hour increases the danger, as nears to the cataract; and unless the good and moderate men of both hemispheres come to the rescue of their governments, a collision may take place. Under such an aspect of events, every voice to which the public will listen should be raised. The more cautiously we ourselves abstain in the ordinary times from pronouncing on the course of our national policy, the more we feel bound in this solemn moment to appeal to the true feeling and sedate understanding of our brethren on both sides of the Atlantic against the levity, the pride, or the incapacity which would urge the two nations into war.

War with the United States! The idea of such a war is incredible. If there be in the catalogue of moral calamities a "worse than Civil War," it is such a conflict as might arise between America and England. A civil war has generally some basis in reason. Some grand principle is at stake. Some right is drawn in defence of freedom—in defence of property—in defence of religion. As in our own civil war, a certain degree of romance, of chivalry, and of intellectual activity, often springs from the conflict and flourishes after its close—the blossom and the fruit of a spiritual tree. But what fruit, what blossom against America would have no single redeeming point. There is not—and there need you ought to be—any real ground of quarrel with the United States. The interests of the two countries are identical. The moral principles are the same. They have neither a language to divide nor a religion to estrange them. The same blood flows in the veins of their people. They have a common history—a common literature—a common tradition. They possess the same Bible. They have the same language and the same Milton. Blake conquered and Cromwell ruled for both. They have an equal interest in Raleigh, in Vane, and in Penn. Nay, their present state is as inexpressibly dear to them as ours is to us. By the light of the same old Saxon laws. They still drink at the same intellectual fountains, regardless whether the springs lie on the eastern or the western shores of the Atlantic. Irving, Bryant, Bancroft, Hawthorne, Longfellow are admired with as much pride in England as Scott, Thackeray, Tennyson, Dickens, Jerrold, and Macaulay in America. A war between England and America would be a war of brothers—a war of friend against friend. It would be a war against the affinities of race, against the unity of religion, against the affinities of trade. It would be a war in favour of barbarism, piracy, restriction—a war against the bounties of Nature, the enterprises of genius, the advances of civilization. Such a war would leave a gulf between the two nations deeper in Europe and America, and a feeling of shame and humiliation into every Anglo-Saxon heart, in whatever quarter of the globe it beats. Such a war would close the Gospel for nearly half the Christian world.

We say nothing about material interests. They go for much; but the moral interests far outweigh them. The interchange of thought is more important than the interchange of cotton, and for what are we threatened with an interruption of our friendly intercourse with our Christian kindred? Is any principle at issue? Are our liberties threatened—is our property unsafe? Not in the least degree. Only three slight and miserable causes for quarrel appear—the right of British cruisers to search treaty regarding that interesting savage, the King of Mosquito—a dispute about some wretched sandbanks lying off Belize—and a dispute about the attempt to enlist troops for the Crimea. The first two are quite insignificant. We might as well go to war about the century of Eel-Pie Island. We may be right or we may be wrong in our interpretation: the Americans think we are wrong. They seem to be right on the last point; and we all know that where private persons disagree about trifles, a courteous and conciliatory tone soon removes the cause of quarrel. About the third point—the attempt to enlist in the Republican territory—we are unquestionably in the wrong. In neither case is our honour engaged; in neither case does any principle which ought to be maintained stand behind the formal terms of the disagreement—thus presenting a true ground of quarrel, as in the Russian War, which has given to the nation such zeal and accept. Our statesmen might—and must—find in the resources of diplomacy a means of satisfying all interests without an insane appeal to the sword. Where we are clearly wrong, we should at once and fully admit our error, making the reparation which is fairly due. It is said the Washington Cabinet requires the withdrawal of Mr. Crampton. Surely this is no extreme or revolutionary request. Personal unpopularity has always been considered a sufficient reason for recalling the withdrawal of an ambassador. We could give a hundred instances in which sovereign powers have exercised this right. Under such circumstances withdrawal does not imply course. It merely implies that the personal relations of the envoy have become so unpleasant as to impede the transaction of public business. We have no right to attempting to recruit within the Union. Mr. Crampton was the instrument of the wrong. He has thereby rendered himself an object of suspicion at Washington. His withdrawal, therefore, is the request of the Washington Cabinet, would be in accordance with usage, and would be a sure pledge of the sincerity of our acknowledgment of the original error. Strong nations can afford to be graceful in their concessions.

The other points are too clear. Yet, if a proper spirit of conciliation presides at the discussion, we have no reason to fear a permanent disagreement. We have a right to expect that our diplomatists and public writers will approach the discussion in a pacific mood. Above all things, we deprecate a menacing tone. We cannot read without indignation the elaborate display of our national and military resources which some of our journals have thought proper to make. Every Englishman feels that he would not be put down by such a parade; and we must not forget that our descendants in America are just as haughty as ourselves. Let us, in our hour of impulse, cry aloud the sense of personal honour. Against ourselves the threat of force is the one argument that is sure, under all circumstances, to fail. Nor will the Americans be cowed by a menace of the Baltic fleet. We must impute our pots as if no fleets were in existence, and take our stand on the ground of history and reason.—*London Athenæum.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

THE CONVICT BANKERS.—It is said that Sir John Dean Paul, Bart., and Mr. Strahan, the convict bankers, are busily employed in prison, the former at tailoring, and the latter at chairmaking.

—MR. WILKIE, LORD.—On the recommendation of Lord Palmerston, the Queen has conferred a pension of £100 per annum on Dr. Samuel Lover, the popular Irish novelist and song writer.

—THE PAPER TOWER PALACE.—It is stated in a foreign periodical that the first printed newspaper of which any trace can be found, was printed in 1455, and gave intelligence of the peace of Karaman with the King of Cyprus, and the conquest of Scutari by the Turks in 1454. The statement is made by E. Grochet of Brussels, from a marginal note in the handwriting of Adrian de Bat, a Dutch monkish chronicler of the fifteenth century.

—The *Cork Constitution* mentions the fact that Mrs. Gore's novel, "The Banker's Wife," of which the villany of an unprincipled banker forms the ground-work, was published in Cork, and that the hero, an illustrious example of probity and good faith, and one in whom the office of banker was made honourable. Mrs. Gore is a creditor of Sir John D. Paul's bank, it is said, for £30,000, in which is included the sum paid by her voluminous writings. The baronet is one of the bankers recently sentenced to transportation for fourteen years.

—LAST LINES OF THE POET ROGERS.—In conclusion—Some time ago, a sentiment by Rogers within the last two years. The friend who favours me with them says: "I quote them from memory, just as I heard them from his own lips, as I sat beside him at Brighton watching their progress." Rogers.

TO A FRIEND ON HIS MARRIAGE.

Forth to the altar, and with her thou lovest,
With her who long has strew'd thy path with flowers,
Nor lose the blessed privilege to give
Birth to a new immortality in her
That, trained by you, may make a heaven on earth,
And, when the long year shall have run its round,
Bring back the blessed privilege to you.

—London Correspondent of the Inverness Courier.

—PRESENT CONSUMPTION EXTENDS TO INDIA.—British India and Europe consume annually, at the very lowest estimate 150,000 gallons of perfumed spirits, under various titles, such as eau de Cologne, essence of lavender, eaught, rum, &c. &c. Perfumery generally, and, however, confine itself to the production of scents for the handkerchief and bath, but extends to emparting odours to inodorous goods, such as cheese, salt, and, in fact, all which are consumed at the toilet of fashion. Some ideas of the commercial importance of this art may be formed, when we state that one of the largest consumers of perfumery, and, consequently, of Perfumes, is the Tobacco flowers, 60,000 lb. of cassia flowers, 54,000 lb. of rose leaves, 32,000 lb. of jasmine blossoms, 32,000 lb. of violets, 30,000 lb. of tuberoses, 18,000 lb. of lilies, besides rosemary, mint, lemon, citron, thyme, and other odorous plants in larger proportion. In fact, the quantity of odoriferous substances used in this way is far beyond the conceptions of the vulgar, and to a large extent, fabulous.

—"Children's books" are now totally different in character to those which we obtained in the days of our boyhood. There has literally just been published a child's volume, containing an account of the Chartist Meeting of 1848—the Chartist Meeting of the 10th of April in the same year—the Great Exhibition—the Gold Fields of California—the Irish Rebellion—the Irish Revolution—Sir John Franklin's Expedition—the Cholera in England—the War with Russia, the chapters devoted to which decribe the battles fought in the Crimea, gives extracts from letters from the Camp, together with an account of the Emperor Nicholas's death. After these things, we have Vienna Conference—the Imperial Visit to England—and a variety of events of the past and present, including events, which help to make up a book for politicians! Appended to the little work is an explanation of the military terms used in speaking of military matters!

A Lawrence correspondent of the *Leader* relates the following scheme resorted to by a young damsel in order to procure a husband: "A young lady, pretty and well educated, residing in the arrondissement of Pithiviers, has conceived the idea of putting herself up to lottery. There are to be 300 tickets at 1,000f. each, and to the fortunate winner she will give herself and the 299,000f. by way of dowry. The lady very properly specifies certain conditions to the purchase of tickets. She will only sell them to persons whom she may think will suit her, and, in order to ascertain that point, she exacts a half-hour's *tête-à-tête* conversation with each applicant. There is no limit of age imposed, but no more than one ticket may be taken by one person. The lottery will be drawn on the 25th of November next at the Mairie of Pithiviers. The married men are allowed to take tickets. It is said that a number of Englishmen have already become purchasers, and applications are coming in from all quarters.

A number of English gentlemen—Dr. Carlyle, Charles Dickens and John Forster publish the result of their appeal on behalf of Samuel Johnson's god-daughter, the aged Miss Lowe, and her sister. The sum raised is still but a little over £250; but it is to be remembered that, if such a life annuity as was proposed proves cheaper than we anticipated; and in addition to this there has been a letter to the Queen from the author of "Hypatia" Miss Lowe, Miss Lowe's father, is now discovered to have been the benevolent painter by whom Turner, at that time a barber's boy, was first encouraged, befriended, and saved to art, in return for which fine action an artist of the renowned admirer of Turner (whose name we need not indicate further) desires to gratify himself by bestowing upon the aged sisters, the Misses Lowe, and permitting us to publish such his resolution, if that can make it more binding. So that, on the whole, there is now as good as a fair pecuniary security of ease, with a very minimum limit, secured for these aged ladies; and thus, by one means and another, our small problem can be considered as done."

—AN IMPERIAL CRADLE.—A Paris letter in the *Independance* of Brussels states that the municipal authorities of Paris have already given orders for a magnificent cradle, to be used at the christening of the Prince Imperior and Empress. It will surpass, it is said, in taste and