over our condition. We look to others for help, instead of helping ourselves. * * * The pecuniary difficulties of the colony can only be got rid of by patience, economy, and increased exertion. Experience will teach each man how far it is prudent to continue the cultivation of particular articles—how it may be practicable to lessen the cost of production of those articles—and in what way their production may be assisted by that of other commodities. Lamentations, either in verse or prose, over abandoned acres, dismantled mills, or ruinate pens and plantations, will not increase the sugar and coffee crops one pound, or add a single sheep to the flock or pig to the herd of the island."

Very recently, an intelligent professional gentleman, who has lived many years in Jamaica, has been agent for four estates, and has a farm of his own, informed me that the island greatly needed "Yankee farmers;" or, in other words, men like American agriculturists, who know what a plough is, and how to use it. Capable, temperate, and industrious farmers, with even moderate means, would, I am persuaded, do well there. They could earn a good living, and show both the emancipated and the white population how to cultivate the earth advantageously. Could the cry be raised in Jamaica, "Speed the Plough!" and the Home Government act reasonably toward its West India Colonies, discontent would soon give place to harmony and prosperity. L. T.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 10, 1850.

☞ Read the noble speech of Mr. Hale.

Mrs Southworth has failed this week to furnish her usual contribution. Next week she will resume her story. Meanwhile, a story from Martha Russell, on our fourth page, will attract attention.

The Debate on the Resolution of General Cass.—We have given up much room to the official report of the speeches of Hale and Clay on the resolution of General Cass. The General is getting more than he bargained for on his proposition.

Communications.—We have on hand more poems and prose contributions than we can easily count. The great majority of them will not spoil by being kept. They shall appear from time to time, as we can find room.

A Correspondent desires us to say to Mrs. Southworth, that "if she has any more *Zoes* left, she will please to inform him, as he has been looking for one for several years, and there are none such among his acquaintance.

"Can Mrs. Southworth's *Retribution* be sent by mail?" J. C. C.
Yes.

Missing Numbers.—From the great number of complaints received of the non-reception of No. 154 of the *Era* in those parts of Ohio that receive their papers *via* Pittsburgh, as the distributing office, we infer that a bag must have been lost out of the mail.

William Harned, No. 61 John street, New York, will forward any subscriptions for the *Era* that may be left with him.

OUR EXCHANGE LIST.

We are trying to reduce our exchange list within reasonable limits. Were we able, we would increase rather than diminish it. Some papers are of service to us; some, we think, may derive benefit from ours. With such we shall continue to exchange. A few published our prospectus, and claim the *Era* in return. Their claim shall be acknowledged, unless they insert the prospectus in an out-of-the-way place, where it will never be noticed. We do not ask any one to notice or announce the *Era*; but if he see proper to do this, in such a way as to indicate an intention to do it a substantial favor, we shall certainly exchange with him.

THE COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE.

In the construction of the Committees of the House, Mr. Cobb has shown himself an adroit manager. He has contrived to avoid the appearance of sectionalism, and at the same time provided a safeguard for all the interests of slavery.

Of the thirty-seven standing committees, 18 have chairmen from the free States; among them, some thorough-going Wilmot Proviso men. This seems liberal. But look again. Mr. McClernand, one of these eighteen, is entirely identified with the Slaveholding Interest, and he is chairman of the important Committee on Foreign Affairs; while Messrs. Bingham and Peck, two Wilmot Proviso men, head the insignificant Committees on the Militia, and on Expenditures in the State Department.

As to the composition of the thirty-seven Committees, on twenty-nine the majorities are composed of members from the free States. This seems very liberal. But look again. Of these twenty-nine, twenty-two are either unimportant, or involve hard labor with little responsibilty, while none of them can touch the question of slavery.

Five of the twenty-nine are important committees, and may be called upon to act in relation to slavery; and these contain majorities of free State members, but so selected as to secure the ascendency to slavery. To particularize—the Committee on the Judiciary has five Northern and four Southern men, but among the former is John K. Miller of Ohio, an unflinching supporter of the most extravagant pretensions of Slavery.

The Committees on Military Affairs and the Territories have each five Northern members, but among these five, on each committee, is Richardson of Illinois, who has never yet given a vote on the side of Freedom in any conflict between its claims and the pretensions of slavery. Both these committees are secured by his vote to the slaveholders.

The Committee on Private Land Claims contains six Northern men; but of these, Gilmore of Pennsylvania, and Harris of Illinois, always vote with the slaveholders. Messrs. Holmes of South Carolina, Mann of Massachusetts, Gilmore of Pennsylvania, constitute the Joint Committee on the Library; so that when in consultation with the Joint Committee of the Senate, there is but one man who represents the Literature of Freedom.

So much for twenty-seven committees of the twenty-nine.

Two others, one on Claims, one on Rules, are really important committees; and yet, by some strange oversight, to us inexplicable, there is a real majority on each of liberal men from the free States.

The other committees, including the very important ones on Ways and Means, the Post Office and Post Roads, District of Columbia, Indian Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Foreign Affairs, are all controlled by strong majorities of slaveholding members.

To sum up the new Speaker, elected by Northern Democrats under the plurality rule, originated by Northern Whigs, with satisfactory assurance before them that it would lead to such an election, has placed the following committees under the complete control of the slaveholding interest:

Committee of Ways and Means.
Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.
Committee on the District of Columbia.
Committee on the Judiciary.
Committee on Private Land Claims.
Committee on Manufactures.
Committee on Indian Affairs.
Committee on Military Affairs.
Committee on Naval Affairs.
Committee on Foreign Affairs.
Committee on Territories.
Committee on the Library.

The free States contain two-thirds of the white population of the country, and have a majority of thirty-nine Representatives in the House of Representatives; and yet, almost uniformly, through the action of the Whig and Democratic parties, the section of the Union containing only one-third of the white population, and having thirty-nine Representatives fewer in the House than the free States, fills the Speaker's chair, and controls very nearly all the important committees; or, rather, it is not a *section*, but a *class* that does all this. It is the class of Slave Owners, constituting not more than three hundred thousand persons, that uses these two old parties as means to secure its complete ascendency in Congress and the councils of the country.

Whose business is it to apply the remedy?

THE RESOLUTION OF MR. ROOT.

The strongest reasons justified the introduction of the resolution of Mr. Root, instructing the Committee on the Territories "to report a bill or bills providing for the Territorial Government or Governments of all that portion of the territory acquired from Mexico, not comprised within the State of California, and prohibiting Slavery therein."

Two Territories, Deseret and New Mexico, had taken steps for an organization, and their applications were ready to be referred to the Committee on Territories. That Committee had been packed with a view of suppressing all action in relation to Slavery, being constituted of five decided Slavery men to four Anti-Slavery men—so that, without positive instructions, no report containing the Wilmot Proviso could be expected from it. Besides, nearly a month had passed since Congress commenced; the People of the Territories were suffering for want of regular government; a protracted discussion was inevitable whenever the bills were reported; so that the sooner they were before the House the better. Several insidious movements for compromising the whole question, so as to secure the ascendency of Slavery, were in contemplation in the Senate; it was expedient to check these at the earliest moment. Every moment's delay exposed the ranks of the friends of Freedom to influences calculated to discourage and distract them. Hence the propriety of committing them all forthwith on the right side of the question; for it is the first step that costs the greatest effort. Add to all this the fact, that the President had thrown his weight in the scale against the policy of any action by Congress, independent of that of the Territories, and it is at once manifest that the sooner it was ascertained whether Congress intended to take his advice, the better it would be for the country.

"By awaiting their action," says he, speaking of the Territories, "all causes of uneasiness may be avoided, and confidence and kind feeling preserved. With a view of maintaining the harmony and tranquillity so desirable, we should abstain from the introduction of those exciting topics of a sectional character, which have hitherto produced painful apprehensions in the public mind."

The plain meaning of this is—abstain from introducing any Territorial bills prohibiting Slavery, or any bill for the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia—do nothing in regard to the Territories till the People there have settled in their own way the question of Slavery.

This advice was in entire concurrence with the views and position of General Cass, whose non-intervention doctrine the Northern Whigs had denounced as treason to the cause of Liberty. It was right that the country should know whether the Northern Democrats who had voted for Cass under a protest against this doctrine, and whether Northern Whigs who had stigmatized it as treachery, were honestly and fairly represented in Congress by men willing to rebuke such doctrine when inculcated in the annual message of a Whig President.

The resolution of Mr. Root, then, was just the thing needed, and it was moved precisely at the right moment. Such, we understand, is the judgment of the friends of Free Soil throughout the country. The editor of the *New York Tribune*, who will not be accused of any disposition to embarrass the Executive, or to approve premature action, especially on the part of a Free-Soiler, thus refers to the resolution:

"There was one good sign yesterday, and that was that a resolution of Mr. Root's for the organization of the Territories this side the Sierra Nevada, with the Wilmot Proviso, could not be shirked by means of an adjournment, or laid on the table. This is as it should be. There is nothing to be gained by trying to dodge the question. It must be met and decided fairly and squarely. The North says, too, that it must not be tinkered over with a compromise; and the North is in earnest, though it does not bluster as much as is the fashion in some quarters."

Mr. Stephens of Georgia moved to lay this resolution, so important to the interests of Free Soil, on the table. The motion, had it prevailed, would have been a final disposition of the resolution. In view of this fact, eleven members from the free States voted for the motion. We repeat their names: Bissell, McClernand, Richardson, and Young, of Illinois; Mann and Gilmore, of Pennsylvania; Miller, of Ohio; Gorman of Indiana—eight Democrats; and Brooks, Clark, and Duer, of New York, Whigs. From McClernand, Richardson, Mann, and Miller nothing else could be expected. They are all incorrigible offenders, veterans in the cause of Slavery—guiltless of a single vote, we believe, in favor of Human Freedom. Bissell, Gilmore, Gorman, and Young, have doubtless been sent here by constituencies as thoroughly pro-slavery as any in the South. Messrs. Duer, Brooks, and Clark, have chosen their company. We shall know hereafter where to find them. Mr. Duer published a card in the *Republic*, on the day following his vote, for the purpose of explanation. We rarely see that paper, and knew nothing of his card till our paper had gone to press. Last Friday for the first time it fell under our notice, and it is but fair to lay it before our readers:

House of Representatives,
December 31, 1849.

Gentlemen: A resolution was offered in the House of Representatives this morning, instructing the Committee on the Territories to report forthwith a bill or bills establishing a Territorial Government or Governments in that part of the recently acquired territory of the United States lying east of the Sierra Nevada, and prohibiting slavery therein. Upon a motion being made to lay that resolution on the table, I voted in the affirmative. Not having had an opportunity to explain the grounds of my vote in the House, I desire to do so, with great brevity, through the columns of your paper.

The resolution in question embraces the region known as New Mexico. As I understand our treaty of peace with Mexico, the inhabitants of that country have now a strong equitable claim to be admitted into the Union as a State. In the absence of any reliable information whether they desire to be so admitted or not, I shall not vote to impose upon them a Territorial Government, contrary, perhaps, to their will, and, if so, in violation of the spirit of a solemn treaty. Their wishes are at least entitled to a respectful and deliberate consideration; and, for myself, if they shall indicate a preference to come into the Union immediately in the same manner as California, I am prepared to accede to their request. I will say further, that it is my wish and hope, as it seems to me it ought to be of every lover of his country, that this latter course may be adopted by them; and I shall, consequently, oppose any precipitate action by which such course shall be frustrated.

I am aware that a vote against laying a proposition on the table is not equivalent to an affirmative vote in its favor; and that the difference probably between myself and many of my political friends is one rather of form than of substance. To avoid misconception, however, this explanation is not, perhaps, wholly unnecessary.

I need scarcely add, that if a Territorial Government shall hereafter appear to be necessary and proper, I am, as I always have been, in favor of the insertion, in every bill for that purpose, of a clause prohibiting slavery.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,
William Duer.

To the Editors of the Republic.

The explanation is insufficient. There is nothing in the treaty with Mexico giving New Mexico a claim to come into the Union, unless she desire it, be fit for it, and Congress consent. That she did not desire it, Mr. Duer must have known, if a careful reader of the newspapers. He must have known that the Convention in New Mexico had been called to form a *Territorial*, not *State* Government, and he must have seen the announcement in the papers, before the day on which Mr. Root's resolution was introduced, that Hugh N. Smith was on his way to Washington, as a *delegate* from the *Territory* of New Mexico. This information was contained in the *New York Tribune*, which, we presume, is deemed by Mr. Duer "a reliable" journal. And yet he alleges in justification of his vote against this important resolution of Mr. Root, "the absence of any reliable information," whether New Mexico desired to be admitted as a State or not. We do not believe this explanation will satisfy any sincere friend of Free Soil. They will see in it nothing to justify him in arraying himself with slaveholders and their special instruments, on this first real test question between Slavery and Liberty.

Eleven members from the free States showed themselves unfit to represent freemen upon this question. But they are here by the votes of non-slaveholding citizens. The free States have long had the representative power in their own hands, but Slavery governs them, because they are *not* all free States. The pro-slavery sentiment predominates in certain districts, and its offspring is seen in the McClernands and Millers of Congress. Party rises above the sentiment of Freedom in other districts, and the result is, the presence in Congress of men who make the cause of Freedom subordinate to the harmony of the party. When public sentiment shall become right throughout the free States, *Doughfaces* will become extinct, and all the representatives of freemen will be arrayed against the demands of the Slave Power. Till then, we must expect to see the free States prostrated before the power of the Slaveholders by free State votes.

ALABAMA GROWING CHIVALROUS.

Alabama bids fair to rival South Carolina in the article of chivalry. The Washington *Union*, always on the alert to apprise the Northern members of the danger that overhangs them, gives prominent place to a correspondence between the Alabama delegation and the Governor of that State, and to a report of his proceedings thereupon.

First we have a letter, signed by the Rev. Henry W. Hilliard, the rest of the members of the House from Alabama, and by Senator Clemens, addressed to His Excellency, H. W. Collier, Governor of the State, dated Washington, December 14th, 1849—during the struggle for Speakership. Solemnly and pathetically do they describe the condition of things at Washington. The South cannot, according to usage, elect its Speaker, and this, they think, makes a *crisis*, of which the Governor and Legislature should be instantly apprized. "For the first time in our history," they say, "these men (the Free Soil men) have acquired sufficient strength to enable them seriously to affect the action of the Government;" and in view of this awful fact they feel constrained by a solemn sense of duty to let the Governor and the Legislature know all about it. They endeavor in the following paragraph to nerve Alabama for the exigency, so that she may acquit herself gloriously:

"We think we are well acquainted with the spirit of the people of Alabama, and we believe that it is their fixed purpose never to submit to the threatened encroachment on their rights; that they will never submit to any act of the Government of the United States which excludes slavery from the territory acquired from Mexico, and which is the property of the States of this Union; that they will never submit to any act of the Government abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, and that they will demand that the provisions of the Constitution in regard to their property shall be faithfully observed. We trust that no further aggression will be made upon the rights of the slaveholding States, but we regard the existing state of affairs as so serious that we cannot forbear making this communication to you."

The Governor, penetrated with sympathetic horror, with breathless haste transmits the letter to the Assembly, and with a mind made up for the crisis, briefly remarks:

"The time for decided action has arrived; and I recommend to the General Assembly to announce the *ultimatum* of Alabama upon the great question which now convulses the Union."

The twenty-second of December was a memorable day in our annals. On that day, Governor Collier sent in his war message to the Legislature of Alabama, calling for its *ultimatum*, because the crisis had arrived in which the South could not secure the Speakership of the House of Representatives, and on that day the crisis broke in the election of Howell Cobb!

Our Southern brethren fear too much and trust too little. They fear too much the courage of Northern men, and trust too little to the Doughfaces. We beg them not to be premature in the exhibition of their alarm—their Northern brethren will always be the first to run. They should bottle up their choicest chivalry for rare occasions, and not waste it upon crises which always break of themselves. As it is, Alabama has played her last card for nothing—if she had only kept back her *ultimatum*, she might have held it in reserve for future use. Let her trust to her reverend representatives in Congress—they are quite equal to the crises which generally occur at Washington—nobody understands better how to operate on the nerves of Northern men.

Meantime, our readers must be curious to know what is the "*ultimatum*" of Alabama. The Legislature referred brother Hilliard's letter and the war message of the Governor to a joint Committee, *immediately*. The Committee prepared their report the same day. The report was adopted unanimously. After describing in a brief preamble the fearful state of things resulting from the action of the Free Soil Party in Congress, (numbering, we believe, 8 in the House and 2 in the Senate,) it recommends the following resolutions:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Alabama in General Assembly Convened, That we respond to the communication of his Excellency the Governor of the State of Alabama, made by our Senator and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, under date the 14th December, 1849; that we are well acquainted with the spirit of the people of Alabama, and we assert that it is their fixed purpose never to submit to the threatened encroachment on their rights; that they will never submit to any act of the Government of the United States which excludes the South from a fair and just enjoyment of the territory acquired from Mexico, and which is the property of the States of the Union; that they will never submit to any act of the Government abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, and that they will demand that the provisions of the Constitution in regard to their property shall be faithfully observed.

Resolved, That we behold, with surprise and indignation the failure to organize the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. We believe that this failure is not occasioned so much by a division of strength between the two great political parties in the United States, as it is by the refusal of the members of Congress representing what is known as the Free Soil party to cooperate in organizing the House, unless they can secure from the presiding officer, whose duty it will be to appoint the committees, some pledge to aid them in their purpose of directing the legislation of Congress against the interest and honor of the slaveholding States. Should these conditions be demanded of the representatives of Alabama, we say to them, never organize upon such surrender.

Resolved, That in the event of the passage of any law by Congress debarring the Southern States from a just participation in the possession and enjoyment of the Territories of the United States, we call upon the people of the slaveholding States to meet us in convention, for the purpose of taking such action as our rights may demand.

Resolved, That in the event of the passage by Congress of any act contemplated by the foregoing resolutions, the members of Congress from this State no longer participate in the action of a body so regardless of our constitutional rights.

The best resolution of the series is the last. True, we do not exactly see what right certain men elected by the People of Alabama for one purpose, have to instruct a certain other set of men, elected by the People for another purpose, to retire from their posts: perhaps a State legislator in Alabama ranks higher than a Congressman; or perhaps the Assembly elects representatives to Congress, though we do not find that in the Constitution of Alabama. But, be this as it may, we like the resolution, for we can easily imagine how, in the absence of five slaveholding representatives, even the Doughfaces might find it impossible to baffle any unwholesome anti-slavery measure. As a matter of prudence, the Rev. Mr. Hilliard and his associates will hardly absent themselves, unless they can induce some of the Free Soil members to pair off with them.

For the National Era.

ELLIOTT.*

Hands off, thou tithe-fat plunderer! play
No trick of priestcraft here;
Back, puny lordling! dar'st *thou* lay
A hand on Elliott's bier?
Alive, your rank and pomp as dust
Beneath his feet he trod;
He knew the locust swarm that cursed
The harvest fields of God.

On these pale lips the smothered thought,
Which England's millions feel,
A fierce and fearful splendor caught,
As from his forge, the steel.
Strong-armed as Thor! a shower of fire
His smitten anvil flung:
God's curse, Earth's wrong, dumb Hunger's ire—
He gave them all a tongue!

Then let the poor man's horny hands
Bear up the mighty dead,
And Labor's swart and stalwart bands
Behind, as mourners, tread.
Leave cant and craft their baptized bounds,
Leave rank its minster floor;
Give England's green and daisied grounds
The Poet of her poor!

Lay down upon his Sheaf's green verge
That brave old heart of oak,
With fitting dirge from smiting forge,
And pall of furnace-smoke!
Where whirls the stone its dizzy rounds,
And axe and sledge are swung,
And, timing to their stormy sounds,
His stormy lays are sung.

There let the peasant's step be heard,
The grinder chant his rhyme;
Nor patron's praise nor dainty word
Befit the man or time.
No soft lament nor dreamer's sigh
For him whose words were bread—
The Runic rhyme and spell whereby
The foodless poor were fed!

Pile up thy tombs of rank and pride,
Oh, England! as thou wilt;
With pomp to nameless worth denied,
Emblazon titled guilt!
No part nor lot in these we claim,
But, o'er the sounding wave,
A common right to Elliott's name,
A freehold in his grave.

J. G. W.

* Ebenezer Elliott, the intelligence of whose death reached us by the last steamer, was to the artisans of England what Burns was to the peasantry of Scotland. His "Corn-Law Rhymes" contributed not a little to that overwhelming tide of popular opinion and feeling which has resulted in the repeal of the tax on Bread. Well has the eloquent author of "The Reforms and Reformers of Great Britain" say of him—"Not corn-law repealers alone, but all Britons who moisten their scanty bread with the sweat of the brow, are largely indebted to his inspiring lays for the mighty bound which the laboring mind of England has taken in our day."

LITERARY NOTICES.

North British Review, for November, 1849.

What will probably be found most interesting in this Review is an article on Humboldt's Aspects of Nature, containing, among other things, some highly curious statements as to poisons, both animal and vegetable—very valuable, as incidental to the recent speculations about the causes of epidemics. Another is here added to the countless essays on Shakspeare—illustrating Ulrici's idea that each play is the development of some one text, or moral point, by a full-length notice of the "Merchant of Venice." This play, the writer thinks, is meant to exhibit studiously, in incidental expressions and details, as well as in the main plot, the contrast between the letter and the spirit of the law. Such speculations seem to be, if not true, at least as good as true. Some years ago, we were a good deal interested by a pack of papers entitled the "Promethean," edited by Goodwyn Barmby, a fervent worshipper of Shelley and disciple of Communion—papers which one knows not whether to call more devout or defiant, earnest or grotesque. We are glad to see that these, and the singular movement they represent, are made the subject of an elaborate discussion, the merits of which, however, for the present, we must take on trust. The character of the Review is a guarantee for that on "Locke and Sydenham," and the rest.

War with Mexico. By R. S. Ripley. New York: Harper & Brothers. For sale by Franck Taylor, Pennsylvania avenue, Washington, D. C.

The author of this work, a brevet major in the United States army, has drawn his materials not only from official documents, but from a personal observation of the country on both routes of operation during the Mexican war, an intimate acquaintance with many American officers, and some intercourse with those of the Mexican army. The literary merits of the book are respectable, but he certainly has not accomplished his aim, which, he says, "has been to be *impartial*." How an author, aspiring to the rank of a historian, manifests his impartiality and dignity and truthfulness, by adopting the vocabulary of a partisan, we have yet to learn.

Major Ripley prefaces his main narrative, with a review of the series of events resulting in the war, adopting the statements and views of those who can see nothing to be justified in the conduct of Mexico, nothing to be condemned in the action of our People or Government. Opposition to the annexation of Texas, on account of slavery, he regards as fanaticism, and opposition to the war that followed, as indicating a want of patriotism. To so great an extent does Prejudice pervert his judgment, that he stoops to charge the Abolitionists with "high treason," upon the strength of two anonymous letters, found in the Mexican post office!

"Almonte," he says, "after receiving his passports from the United States Government, had tarried long enough in the country to concoct, with some Abolitionists of black slavery, whose crazy philanthropy enabled them to look upon high treason with Mexican eyes, schemes of action by which they were to assist the Mexicans against their own Government, should the war break out and the hostilities be actually commenced."

One of the letters is from a crazy nobody, with no name, living nobody knows where. The other is without name or place of date, and there is not the slightest evidence that it was written by an Abolitionist, or even an American. In fact, there is no evidence of the genuineness of the letter at all. And yet, these are the evidences on which this man, pretending to write a *History*, charges Abolitionists with "high treason!"

An author who can give currency to accusations so grossly libellous, is either unable to discern between good and evil, Truth and Falsehood, or he is unprincipled. In either case, he is disqualified for writing History.

English-Latin Lexicon. By Charles Anthon, L. L. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. For sale as above.

This large and handsome octavo is very neatly printed and very substantially bound. No one who attempts to compose a Latin exercise should be without it. It is founded on the German-Latin Dictionary of Dr. Charles Ernest Georges, by J. Edmond Riddle, of St. Edmond Hall, Oxford, and the Rev. T. K. Arnold, who shared the work between them, devoting to it some years of hard labor. Dr. Anthon has revised the result of their labors, and adds to the first American edition, a copious dictionary of proper names, from the best sources.

The work is distinguished by a careful account of the use of words set down, their synonymical distinctions, the niceties connected with their employment by classical writers, and by various pertinent remarks and criticisms. From the character and attainments of the learned men employed on it, we must infer that it is all it professes to be—"the only English-Latin Dictionary that a student can consult with the reasonable hope of finding what he wants, and the certainty of being able to trust what he finds."

The Great Metropolis. 1850. New York: H. Wilson. For sale by W. Adam, Pennsylvania avenue, Washington, D. C.

This is the New York Almanac for 1850, containing, in addition to the usual Almanac matter, a clue to everything in New York which a stranger visiting there wishes to know. With this in his pocket, he will need no guide or instructer. We advise everybody going to the Great Metropolis to provide himself with this Almanac—it will be a wonderful convenience. And, if he extend his visit to Boston, he should purchase for his other pocket—

The Boston Almanac, for 1850. Published by B. B. Mussey, Boston.

Which ought to be for sale by all the Booksellers, if it is not. If possible, this exceeds even the New York Almanac in the variety of its details, containing numerous municipal statistics, and a complete Business Directory.

The Condition and Prospects of the Protestant Episcopal Church. By B. P. Aydelotte, D. D. Cincinnati: W. H. Moore.

We are under obligations to the author for a copy of this neatly printed and useful little work. Its subject is one that interests no small portion of our readers; and its author is a clear and sensible writer, a devoted Christian, a man of enlarged and liberal views on all questions that concern the higher interests of Humanity.

The Whale and His Captors. By Rev. Henry T. Cheever. New York: Harper & Brothers. For sale by Franck Taylor, Pennsylvania avenue Washington.

A book for young folk, discoursing of scenes of adventure and peril, rendered still more impressive by numerous handsome engravings. Withal Mr. Cheever is very instructive on the natural history of the whale, not forgetting to inculcate a good many moral lessons.

Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine. November and December.—New York: Leonard Scott & Co. For sale by W. Adam, Pennsylvania avenue, Washington, D. C.

The last two numbers of this favorite Monthly are highly attractive. Maga is growing quite liberal towards American Literature, condescending sometimes very graciously to notice its feeble efforts.

Herman Melville, who received a merited castigation for his "*Mardi*," is praised in the November number for his last work, "*Redburn*," which the reviewer thinks is a return to his original simplicity. *Christopher Under Canvass* also enriches this number. The one for December contains another chapter of a "Short Yarn," which has already reached the sixth part. It is a great sea story; some of its descriptions equal anything we have ever read of sea life. There are two political articles in this number, one on the National Debt, the other on Free Trade—both valuable for their facts and figures, though not for their reasonings.

MARYLAND AND RETROCESSION.

The *Washington Union*, commenting on the message of the Governor of Maryland, says:

The question of retrocession is now being considered and discussed, and it is important to its right and proper decision that the actual condition of Maryland, with regard to her resources and liabilities, should be made known by some authentic statement. We therefore extract a few figures, which will show the amount of the State debt which is yet to be redeemed:

Public debt on the 30th September, 1849		$16,164,813 44
Sterling bonds held by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company	$3,200,000 00	
Tobacco loan	161,984 15	
Interest bonds redeemed	260,118 38	
Sinking fund	1,892,537 61	
		5,514,640 14
Total public debt to be redeemed		$10,650,173 30

The statistics of the message authorize the conclusion that the receipts of each successive year, after the 1st December, 1851, will not fall short of $1,250,000; while the annual expenditures will only make such a deduction as justifies the Governor in stating that he "*will not be subjected to the imputation of temerity in venturing to predict the payment of the whole debt in less than thirteen years.*"

People in the District anxious for retrocession, if there be any such, may form some idea of the burthens to be assumed in becoming citizens of Maryland, by a very easy process.

The free population of that State is not far from 420,000; so that the public debt is in the proportion of about $25 35 per head.

The State of New York contains a free population of 2,800,000, and her public debt, according to the message of the Governor just delivered, is $22,895,000, or $8 17 per head, less than a third of the burthen sustained by every citizen in Maryland. Besides, one half of the revenue of Maryland is derived from *direct taxation*, the blessings of which, to the fullest extent, would be enjoyed by our good citizens, should the proposition for retrocession be carried into effect.

A MISCONCEPTION.

Week before last, speaking of the struggle that took place on the 22d ult., under the *plurality* rule, between Messrs. Winthrop and Cobb for the Speakership, we said—

"Only five northern Democrats outside of the Free Soil men proper were found voting against Slavery Extension. Those five were, Amos Wood of Ohio, a noble exception in his delegation—Ex-Governor Doty of Wisconsin, Ex-Governor Cleveland and General Booth of Connecticut, and Mr. Peck of Vermont, not one of whom could be persuaded from the beginning to the end of the struggle to vote against the policy of their constituents and their own convictions of right."

We understand that some persons have misconceived this paragraph, supposing that we referred to the entire struggle for the Speakership, from the beginning of the session. The context clearly shows that we referred only to the struggle on the 22d, after the adoption of the plurality rule. From the beginning to the end of *this*, Mr. Wood voted against Mr. Cobb, although during the first few days of the session, he had voted for him. We have heard it intimated, that, if *necessary*, Mr. Wood would have supported Mr. Cobb on the last trial. If this be true, we have awarded him more praise than he deserves—but we spoke from the record, and knew nothing beyond that.

CALL FOR A CHRISTIAN ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

The undersigned having been constituted a Committee for the purpose of calling a Convention of Christians, to consider upon the connection of the American Church with the sin of Slaveholding, do hereby invite our fellow-Christians, of all denominations, to assemble in convention at Cincinnati, on the third Wednesday in April next, to deliberate upon the important subject, and to adopt such measures as the Convention may in its wisdom devise for freeing the American Israel from this sin.

Among the many reasons which, in the opinion of the undersigned, render such a Convention desirable, we would mention the following:

1. The guilt of a wrong action is proportioned to the light and knowledge against which it is committed; and God having by His Providence fully revealed, through experience and discussions, the sinfulness of Slaveholding, the Church has no longer a cloak or excuse for continuing therein. These are not the days of ignorance, in which the sin can be winked at, but all men, everywhere, are called upon to repent and forsake it.

2. The injurious influence of sin in the Church becomes greater when it particularly attracts the attention of the world. Slaveholding has now drawn upon itself the observation of all men, and so universal has been the condemnation of the practice, that even the semi-barbarian refuses to tolerate what a portion of the American Church cherishes as a part of the Christian system, and thus the Gospel is evil spoken of, and its progress hindered at home and abroad.

3. We believe the influence of the Church to be so great, that no earthly power can destroy this sin, while, as now, it finds countenance and protection among the professed people of God; and that nothing can save it from speedy ruin so soon as the Church shall withdraw her support.

4. It has become a question of grave import, with a large number of Christians, whether each member of an organized body is not held responsible by God for the sin of the organization of which he voluntarily forms a part; and it is believed that a public and free interchange of opinions upon this point would produce a salutary effect upon the minds of hundreds of inquiring Christians.

5. A large body of American professors, influential from their numbers, wealth, and social rank, have deliberately chosen and publicly declared their position: They enshrine slaveholding in the church, and cherish and defend it as a practice agreeable to the spirit of the Gospel. To a body of Christians, large already, and daily increasing, it is a very solemn question, whether silence and inaction on the part of other portions of the Church do not give consent to these pro-slavery principles, and whether this consent does not make the sin ours, by adoption, and involve us in the consequences.

We therefore earnestly request our Fellow-Christians, of all denominations, to whom this Circular is sent, to obtain for it, as soon as may be, the names of such brethren as are friendly to the object, and return them to the Chairman of the Committee, at Cincinnati, on or before the first day of March next.

B. P. Aydelott,	E. Goodman,
Wm. Henry Brisbane,	S. H. Chase,
S. C. Stevens,	M. C. Williams,
A. Benton,	Levi Coffin,
Joseph T. Lewis,	James C. White,
Samuel Lewis,	Jonathan Cable.

Charles B. Boynton, *Chairman.*
Cincinnati, Nov. 20, 1849.

EXTRACTS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENCE.

Castleton, Vt., *December* 28, 1849.

The firmness with which the Free Soil members of Congress have maintained the principles of Liberty during the severe and protracted contest for Speaker, has commended them anew to the confidence of the country, and honored the party with which they are identified. The Whigs attempt to create prejudice against them because they voted for Brown, but without reason. Desiring to effect the organization of the House at the earliest moment, they were willing to go to the verge of their authority to effect it. Brown's professions were a full justification for their votes, and so the country will decide.

The Whigs had no right to ask their votes for Mr. Winthrop, for he had demonstrated, by his use of the *appointing* power as Speaker in the last Congress, that he would use it against the cause of Freedom; and he pertinaciously refused any intimation that his course would be changed. To vote for him in such a case was to dishonor themselves and prove as treacherous as their accusers. This could not be expected.

The South has triumphed on the Speakership, and I do not regret it, for more lessons are necessary to make the North understand slaveholders, and its own vassalage. It cannot fail to be seen that Northern *partyism* has again thrown that powerful office into the hands of the Slave Power, as it has so often heretofore done; and that there is no possible remedy but in its abandonment by the people.

Whigs will see the result of their *duplicate* policy. They presented a candidate of ability, but of the compromise class, much after the model of the Philadelphia platform; and falling of course to secure the support of the *Free Power* of the North, and also a portion of his own party of the South, he has fallen to the ground. So will the Administration. The sooner the Whigs of the North place themselves *fairly* on free principles, the better for them and the country.

Northern Democrats can see in this the working of that profligate policy, urged so strongly the last season, of re-uniting the party on the ground of neutrality, as a national party, to the issues of Liberty. They can see now what slaveholders mean by that, and what will be its certain results. They can see the trap now, for it has been *sprung*.

All is hastening the great, the inevitable issue between Freedom and Slavery, and the sooner the North girds up its loins for the conflict the better. The developments in Congress respecting the Speaker, Father Mathew, Mr. Benton, &c., are fast breaking down the shattered walls of party, and uniting the North for the support of Liberty and the Constitution. Gratifying proof of this has lately come to my knowledge. May it go on.
W.

Rochester, N. Y., *December* 24, 1849.

In a communication which you published last July, (I think,) correcting an error of Ellwood Fisher's on the first page of the Era, the writer stated that the Democratic party (contrasted with the Whig party) had always showed themselves hostile to the rights of the colored people, (in the State of New York;) that it "was not sufficient for the Democratic party to limit the suffrage of colored people, in the Constitution, to a $250 property qualification, but requiring them to possess a freehold of $250," &c. Recently, (say five weeks since,) in an editorial article on the "*result of the election in the State of New York*," you recognised the same *supposed fact*, viz: that the Whig party in that State was and had been more friendly to the rights of colored people than the Democratic, &c.

Now, sir, I think this is all error. In the political history of this State, I know no instance in which the *Whig party* have anything to boast of in this respect, or any credit for its friends to claim for it. At the formation of the Constitution of 1820, negroes were allowed to be electors on possessing a real estate qualification of $250, (it had been required of white persons prior to that time, and negroes had been excluded entirely.) The Democrats were largely in the ascendant at that time and this partial restoration to colored people of their natural rights was considered a Democratic measure, and was *openly opposed* by the Federalists. At the adoption of our recent "new Constitution," 1847, the question of negro suffrage—that is, whether colored people should be placed on a level with white people, on the subject of franchise, was submitted to the popular vote as *a separate question*, and was decided by a majority of over 150,000 against the equal rights of colored people—this was at a time when the two parties were nearly equal in number. It is nevertheless notoriously true that the strongest Whig counties in the State gave the largest majorities *against "equal suffrage to colored people."*

I have no great sympathy for the Democratic party, (old line,) but, give the Devil his due.

Your error undoubtedly comes from reading Whig newspapers, in which they eternally *claim* to be the *peculiar* friends of *every class* of people in the Union—being in the minority ordinarily, they can do so with a degree of impunity. It is in this way that *I* account for their success in getting the vote of the colored people of this State.
J. W. S.

Westminster, Mass., *Dec.* 31, 1849.

Permit me to say the cause of Liberty in old Massachusetts has received a new impetus from the position of the Free Soil members of Congress, that will tell on the future destinies of the country. I regret to see in your classification of the members of the House that Howe of Pennsylvania is set down as unqualifiedly a Whig. Now, I think this is a mistake, not only for the reason we cannot afford to spare him from this little phalanx of Free Soil worthies, but I think from his career thus far he has given as much evidence of his attachment to our principles as Mr. Tuck and some others whom you claim as in full communion. Mr. Tuck *finally* voted for Mr. Winthrop. Howe is the more excusable that he voted earlier, and upon "sober second thought" retraced his steps, and expiated his error by being true upon the *final* struggle. We should recollect the Free Democrats were placed in a trying position. Our champions for Freedom have not always been well sustained: the blame should attach where it belongs, to the constituents. All men have not the nerve of the veteran J. Q. Adams. He could stand by the guns, though he stood alone. Let our representatives feel that their constituents deeply sympathize with them in the "times which try men's souls." Let cheering responses come up to them from every free district, and my word for it they will not swerve from their duty.

No party at the present time is in better position than ours; no other party has its distinctive principles, with the path of duty plain before them; no other party has a truly comprehensive national policy.

By the way, is it not time, when classifying members, to designate them as Democrats, Whigs, and Free Democrats, without qualification, especially the F. D. proper? It gives too much importance to either of the old pro-slavery parties to make such an honorable use of their party names. Westminster.

I notice that you do not recognise the Hon. Walter Booth, from Connecticut, as a regular Free-Soiler; but this much I know, we sent him to Congress as a regular Free-Soiler, and I hope that he will not disappoint us. I know the man well, and believe that he designs to prove faithful to the trust reposed in him by his constituents, but if he does not, we want to know it.
Yours, truly, E. T.

We believe