

which any such powers were attempted to be conferred.

6. On the contrary, the Colonies were completely under the control and authority of the English Law and the British Constitution, as much so as the Government of Great Britain itself; so that the Colonial Legislatures were, equally with the King and Parliament of Great Britain, inhibited from legislating on any subject.

7. Above a century ago, Governor Pownall, one of the most eminent constitutional jurists of Colonial times, said of the common law: "In all the Colonies, the common law is received as the foundation and basis of their laws." In the Declaration of Rights, made at the Continental Congress, at its first session, in 1774, there was the following resolution: "Resolved, That the respective Colonies are entitled to the common law of England." &c., &c.—Weld's Power of Congress, p. 14.

In my next letter I shall show, on the highest judicial authority, (the decision of the Court of King's Bench,) that Slavery was never legalized in England. It could not be for the reasons already adduced; viz: that Slavery is incompatible with the British Constitution and the common law of England. And it has now been shown that the Colonies, equally with the Mother country, were under the authority of that constitution, and under the control of that law.

By what authority, then, or by what right, did the colonists hold slaves? What power had the Colonial Legislatures to legalize Slavery? No such authority was derived, or could be derived, by any possibility or by any official document or legal instrument, *have been derived*, from the Crown, the Parliament, or the Judiciary of the Mother country. The Colonies neither claimed nor exercised any legislative authority in their own right, as independent sovereignties, while they remained Colonies, which was until the fourth of July, 1776. It is certain, therefore, that there could have been no legalized Slavery in this country previous to that epoch, whatever may have been the case since.

As Slavery never had been legal in England, and under the Constitution and common law of England, could not become so here, could it ever have been legal in the Colonies? If Slavery was illegal in England, because it was contrary to the common law, how could it be legal in the Colonies, where the authority of the same common law was recognized? And if the English courts could discover and decide its illegality, why could not the Colonial Courts do the same? And why were the courts bound to do it, as well as the courts of England?

WILLIAM GODELL.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 1854.

RENEWALS AND NEW SUBSCRIPTIONS—WHO RESPONDS!

The time has come when we must call upon subscribers whose terms are about expiring, to renew; and, while doing so, to send new names with their own. The first half of the present volume of the Era will close with the last of this month. We have just sent out a special request to our voluntary agents, to join in a determined and vigorous effort to enlarge our list. The time is auspicious. People are aroused on the subject of Slavery, and need information. Only the first great triumph of the Slave Power has been won. Further and more dangerous aggressions are meditated. The Anti-Slavery sentiment of the country needs organization. To promote the great cause of Union for the sake of Freedom, the most active efforts ought now to be made, to increase the circulation of newspapers opposed to Slavery.

The Era needs a special movement in its favor. Some of its best agents during the last twelve months have diverted their labors to the establishment of local Anti-Slavery papers. We do not complain of this, but we would like to see no more than a few weeks to the Era, which has no local support, and must depend alone upon the general interest felt in the vigorous maintenance of such a paper at the seat of Government? In brief terms, let us say that, where they succeed in adding to our Weekly list six thousand subscribers, it would not only carry on a Daily Era, although it might enable us to relieve ourselves from the embarrassments in which that has involved us.

Let every agent use his best exertions for the paper. Let every subscriber whose time is about to expire, renew promptly, and send at least one new name. We repeat our terms, and shall keep firm standing, as a guide to the efforts of our friends:

TERMS OF THE NATIONAL ERA.
One copy, 1 year, \$2. One copy, 6 months, \$1. Three copies, do., 5. Five copies, do., 8. Ten copies, do., 15. Ten copies, do., 8.

Voluntary agents are entitled to retain 50 cents commission on each new yearly, and 25 cents on each new semi-yearly, subscriber, except in the case of old subscribers. Twenty-five cents is the commission on the renewal of an old subscriber.

A club of three subscribers (one of whom may be an old one) at \$5, will entitle the person making it up to a copy of the Era three months; a club of five (two of whom may be old ones) at \$8, to a copy for six months; a club of ten (five of whom may be old ones) at \$15, to a copy for one year.

Money to be forwarded, by mail, at our risk. Large amounts may be remitted in drafts or certificates of deposit.

G. BAILEY,
Washington, D. C., 1854.

CALL FOR A CONVENTION IN OHIO.

We publish, in another column, a call for a Convention of the People of Ohio, on the 13th July, now in circulation in that State. Read it.

WE HAVE RECEIVED ALREADY TWO OR THREE WARM RESPONSES TO OUR SEMI-ANNUAL CIRCULAR.

They are the drops before the shower. We don't care how big a one.

ANOTHER CHAPTER OF LEONARD WRAY NEXT WEEK—MEANWHILE, READ THE BEAUTIFUL STORY OF MARTHA RUSSELL, ON OUR FIRST PAGE, AND ANOTHER LETTER FROM THE FAVORITE BILL SMITH.

THE FREE CITIZEN.—IN PUBLISHING THE PROSPECTUS OF THIS PAPER, AN ERROR OCCURRED IN REGARD TO THE TERMS. IT SHOULD READ: 10 COPIES WILL BE SENT FOR \$15. THE PROSPECTUS WILL BE FOUND CORRECTED IN THIS PAPER.

CONGRESSIONAL SKETCHES—GERRIT SMITH.

We publish in another place some Congressional Sketches, from one of our Pro-Slavery exchanges. Gerrit Smith is lauded to Heaven; Chase, Seward, Sumner, and Giddings, are eulogized in other places. The former, we doubt not, will endorse their praise as calmly as the latter their abuse! For their conduct, we may say, "We unto you, who all men shall speak well of you"—and for his, "He shall make even his enemies to be at peace with him."

LET MILL MEN, SEEKING A GOOD OPENING FOR BUSINESS, READ MR. CAMPBELL'S ADVERTISEMENT, AND ADDRESS HIM BY MAIL.

A THRILLING SPECTACLE.—A little child, only three years old, got upon the roof of a three-story house in Fourth avenue, New York, on Wednesday evening, and approached the eaves, and, swinging his hat in his hand, looked down with the utmost composure on an excited and trembling crowd. Some gentlemen, with great presence of mind, got up on the roof, quietly, and coaxed the adventurer to the outside, when they seized him and bore him away to his mother, half frantic with fear, in the room below. It was a moment of terror to all but the little fellow himself.

ARGUMENTS AND VOTES, NOT TREATIES.

The Louisville Journal and other Southern prints that opposed the passage of the Nebraska Bill, now that it is consummated, labor to assuage the Northern agitation aroused by it. They publish extracts from Northern papers, claiming that, after all, the Bill does not materially damage the interests of the free States, and from Southern papers, denying that slaveholders have gained anything substantial from it. We understand all this. They fear that the People of the free States may be driven to tremble under the foot of the old parties, the instruments of the Slave Despotism, and organize against its usurpations; and all their habits shrink from the terrible excitement they suppose would necessarily result.

While appreciating their love of peace, we would remind them that no peace is worth having which is purchased by the sacrifice of justice—no peace can be honorable, stable, or beneficial, which is secured only by habitual concessions to the demands of a tyrannical interest. They must judge for themselves of the policy that best suits their circumstances—they cannot judge for the North and West. The People of the free States have been outraged, and they were craven and foolish not to resort to the ballot-box for redress.

"The more violent the Northern men," says the Journal, "will be against a general repeal of Slavery, so far as they think they can do so without palpably transcending the limits of the Constitution. They will be for excluding in all their section of country the most thoroughgoing Slavery, not pledged to the most thoroughgoing Slavery; they will be for restoring, if practicable, the Missouri Compromise restriction to Nebraska and Kansas; they will be for approving the Wilmot Proviso to every Territory hereafter admitted into the Union, no matter what its latitude or longitude; they will be for excluding Slavery from the District of Columbia; and they will be for the modification and emancipation of the Fugitive Slave Law, by cutting out all such of its provisions as tend to give it the slightest efficacy."

Now, we hardly need say that if a party, intent on such purposes, shall so far succeed at the North as to obtain the power of control in Congress at any future time, the Union will be severed. If the people of the North, who are a numerical majority of the Republic, shall on account of any real or imaginary provocation, use their power in a manner manifestly injurious or insulting to the South—if they shall exercise it tamely or wantonly, the South will not hesitate to dissolve the existing partnership, be the consequences what they may."

The Slaveholders have gone to the extreme of the Constitution, and beyond it, for Slavery, and the Union was not dissolved; but should the North go to the extreme of the Constitution, and not beyond it, for Liberty, the Union will inevitably be dissolved! The Slaveholders have done what they had no right to do, and the Union was not shaken; should the North do what they have done, the Union goes to ruin! Four hundred thousand petty despots have everything their own way, and the Union is safe. There are some tremulous people who come to the conclusion that they shall not have their own way, but yield to the will of the majority, the Union is blotted out! What does all this mean? Simply this—that the Union of these States is founded upon Slavery; that its great use is, to minister to the benefit of Slavery; that its guiding principle ought to be, the will of the Slaveholders; that supremacy is their right, subordination the duty of all non-slaveholders. This is the plain, unmistakable policy of the Louisville Journal.

As a matter of fact, the Slaveholding Oligarchy have waged "a general warfare" for Slavery, excluded from Congress every man not pledged to the most thoroughgoing Slavery, and sent to Congress, who, in defiance of the will of the North, and in the face of a solemn compact, have repealed the Missouri Compromise. It has broken down every safeguard against Slavery in every Territory of the Union; enacted and maintained Slavery in the District of Columbia, and forced upon the free States a Fugitive Slave Act, in derogation of the guarantees of the Constitution, of the sovereignty of the States, of the Principles of the Common Law, and of the claims of Humanity. And yet the free States have submitted, without dissenting the Union. Now, when it is proposed that they shall, through the ballot-box, peacefully exercise their power, and shall take precisely the reverse action, undo what the Oligarchy has done, and place this Federal Government as much on the side of Freedom as it has been on the side of Slavery, the Journal denounces such a policy as insulting, injurious, and tells us that on its consummation "the South will not hesitate to dissolve the existing partnership, be the consequences what they may!"

Well, all we have to say is this: Before God and man, had we the power, this day would we subject the Oligarchy to the test—this day give them an opportunity to execute that promise that they have made, and shall take precisely the reverse action, undo what the Oligarchy has done, and place this Federal Government as much on the side of Freedom as it has been on the side of Slavery, the Journal denounces such a policy as insulting, injurious, and tells us that on its consummation "the South will not hesitate to dissolve the existing partnership, be the consequences what they may!"

As to Disunion, our contemporary has evidently not studied the subject. So long as the Slaveholding Class can govern the Whig and Democratic Parties, control the organization of Congress, determine the Legislation of the country, fill the Presidential chair, govern the Territories through the Executive Power, command the Treasury, Army and Navy, and dictate our foreign policy; in a word, hold thirty-one States subject to its will, and use them for its aggrandizement, it will no more dissolve the Union, than give freedom to its slaves, or set fire to its plantations.

But, suppose this condition of things should cease—suppose the subject States should recover their independence, the subject People their power; that the non-slaveholders should succeed in overthrowing the slaveholding Congress, in obtaining the control of the Federal Legislature, Executive, and Judiciary, of the Treasury, the Army and the Navy, determining both the domestic and foreign policy of the Government, what then?

Certainly, the Union would no longer be cherished by the Slaveholders as the great instrument of their ambition; it might indeed, become a source of discontent and apprehension to them; but, the question would be, could they afford to dissolve it? Recollect, they would be out of power, and, instead of the patronage and consequence which Power always confers, they would have no allies in the free States.

and in the slave States would have emboldened rival interests, brought into life and enlivened by an Administration pervaded by the spirit and controlled by the ideas of Liberty. What could they do? How would they set about the work of Disunion? Where would they begin? How much of Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, of Kentucky, of Tennessee, of Missouri, of Louisiana, of Texas, could they carry with them? What would be the motive to Disunion? An outrage upon their honor? How could their honor be outraged by the act of the Federal Government, to which they are entitled under the Constitution? If four hundred thousand Slaveholders may control the Federal Government, without outrage to the honor of the masses of the People, two millions of non-slaveholders may do the same, without outrage to the honor of the Oligarchy.

Would they dissolve it, for the purpose of carrying forward their schemes of territorial and political aggrandizement? How could they execute such schemes, thro' solely upon their own resources? Where would be their ships, their money, their men, and their land? France and England, could they easily render assistance to them, and Mexico might defy their power. Their gigantic project of a boundless Slave Empire would be extinguished forever by a dissolution of the Union.

If neither honor should demand, nor ambition find its advantage in, a dissolution of the Union, certainly no economical interest would be promoted by it. Their peculiar system of labor would require free trade with the North, just as it now does, and the development of their resources would need just as much of Northern capital. The Union, no longer an instrument of their ambition, no longer subservient to their schemes of sectional aggrandizement, would still be necessary to their security and their economical interests. Only in one event could there arise a motive strong enough to impel Disunion, and justify the act. That event is the passage of the Nebraska Bill, and the resolutions upon the Nebraska Bill, adopted by the so-called Democratic State Convention, held at Indianapolis on the 24th inst, over the protest of the Whigs, and the presence of a majority of which he evidently controlled, and that we sympathize with the large and respectable minority, who were overruled and misrepresented in that Convention."

THE REGENERATION OF CONGRESS.

"BE IT REMEMBERED, "That so much of the Missouri Compromise of 1820 as prohibited forever the legislation of human slavery in any part of the Territory of the United States north of 36 deg. 30 min. north lat. and east of the Rocky Mountains—that is, all of the Missouri Compromise which was favorable to Slavery, has been repealed by the passage of the Nebraska-Kansas bill of Stephen Arnold Douglas; and that the Representatives from the free States who voted therefor, are as follows:—

Indiana—John T. Caldwell—1.
Maine—H. H. Hilditch—1.
New Hampshire—Harry Hubbard—1.
Connecticut—Colin M. Ingersoll—1.
Tennessee—None.
New York—Thomas W. Cumming, Francis R. Cuttine, Peter Rowe, John J. Taylor, William M. Tweed, Hiram Walbridge, William A. Walker, Mike Walsh, Theodore R. Westbrook—4.
Pennsylvania—Samuel A. Bridges, John L. Dawson, Thomas B. Florence, J. Glancy Jones, William H. Kurtz, John McNair, Asa Peacker, John Robbins, Jr., Christian M. Straub, William H. Witte, Hendrick W. Wright—11.
Ohio—David T. Dismy, Frederick W. Greer, Edwin R. Olds, Wilson Shannon—3.
Indiana—John G. Davis, Cyrus L. Dunham, Norman Eds. Wm. H. English, Thomas A. Hendricks, Jas. H. Lane, Smith Miller—7.
Michigan—James C. Allen, Willis Allen, Wm. A. Richardson—3.
Michigan—Samuel Clark, David Stuart—2.
Iowa—Bernhard Henn—1.
Wisconsin—None.
California—Milton S. Latham, Jas. H. McDougall—4.
The same bill passed the Senate without amendment on the 23th, 25 to 13—Senators from the free States voting in it—as follows:—

New Hampshire—Moses Norris, Jr., Jared W. Williams.
Connecticut—Isaac Toussaint.
New Jersey—John R. Thomson, William Wright.
Pennsylvania—Richard Brodhead, Jr., John C. Ingham, Peter A. B. Widener, William A. Briggs, James Shields.
Michigan—Lewis Cass, Charles E. Stuart.
California—William M. Gwin, John B. Weller.
Iowa—George W. Jones. Total 14.

By the votes of these men, representing free labor constituencies, one million square miles of territory, heretofore shielded from the power of Slavery, is now open to the most unrelenting and struggling North, (and whereof all that part entering to the advantage of Slavery has been fully secured and enjoyed) has been opened to practical action, it will be brought into the Union as Slave States. Shall not free people mark their betrayers?"

New York Tribune.

It has been proposed to send the People of the free States tender their verdict upon the Nebraska Bill, by returning to Congress every Free State member, Whig, Democratic, or Independent Democratic, who voted against the measure in all its stages, and by rejecting every free State member who recorded his vote in favor of its passage.

We second that proposition—with a qualification. To this extent, at least, let there be a fusion of Parties. Did he vote for the Nebraska Bill? Did he vote against it through all its stages? If he voted for it, veto him—if against him, not only on his final passage, but in the preliminary stages, or legislation, or amendments. If he does it, it will honor never be forgotten. It will reflect honor on the People of the free States, it will dismay and weaken the slaveholding Oligarchy, it will be a stunning blow to Serenity; and, without involving a sacrifice of principle by any party, will amount to an emphatic recognition of the paramount importance of the Anti-Slavery issue raised by the Nebraska Bill, and at least prepare the way for the co-operation of all parties in behalf of Freedom.

We should like to see a recommendation of this particular policy embodied in the resolutions of the State and Primary Conventions of the People everywhere—with a qualification. If carried into practical action, it will do more than anything else to strengthen the spirit of freedom among members of Congress. Let them know that no clique of demagogues or party managers, at the instigation of the devil or of the Administration, shall succeed in destroying their political standing at home, and they will feel need for fresh encounters with the Slave Power. They will confront without fear the fire in their front, if the friends of Freedom will guard them against "the fire in the rear."

Already, we see the harpies of the Administration in the North are at work on the reputation of the Democratic members who stood manfully for the rights of the free States. Every effort will be made to destroy them. Let them be bold, and fear not; let them throw themselves upon the sympathies and support of the friends of Freedom, making no concessions or qualifications, which shall render it difficult for genuine Anti-Slavery men to sustain them.

We repeat, however,—this policy we advocate—subject to a qualification; and that is, under no circumstances could we countenance the return to Congress of any member, no matter if he voted all the way through against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, if he should be in

favor of the Fugitive Slave Act, or regarding the legislation of 1850 as a finality, or of maintaining Slavery within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. In view of making a Party of Freedom, let us begin right—take and maintain the whole ground we are entitled to under the Constitution.

The Pittsburgh Gazette, in favor of a union of the friends of liberty, after remarking that the several parties in Pennsylvania have made their nominations for the office of Governor, urges union in the Congressional districts:—"As the different parties have selected their candidates for Governor, we suppose there is now no hope of the Anti-Nebraska sentiment of the State being concentrated on one man. The nominations are yet to be made in the Congressional districts, and there is not too late to secure united action. What we propose, and should rejoice to see, is that in every Congressional district a convention of Anti-Nebraska men shall be held, composed of voters of all parties, opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, which convention shall nominate a candidate for Congress."

The Albany Evening Journal seconds this motion.

"Such a union is practicable, and may be rendered efficient. Those who have been true whether Whigs or Democrats, should be sustained, while no man, not known to the district as in sympathy with Freedom, and willing to be judged of on the merits of his own measure just enacted, and of all others of a kindred character, should receive the suffrages of the People.

"Such a union for such a purpose, honestly formed and faithfully adhered to, would result in the election to Congress of a majority who would stand the tide of injustice and oppression—efficiently bring the work of repeal, and the restoration of the Missouri Compromise already indicated by the Propagandists."

In Indiana, late proceedings in the District represented by Daniel Case, show that the People have already begun to execute their will. An immense meeting in the court-house at Lafayette, of men of all parties, was addressed by Mr. Price, in a speech, severely denunciatory of the Nebraska Bill and its supporters, after which the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:—"Resolved, That we heartily approve of the conduct of the Hon. Daniel Case, as Representative in Congress, in the discharge of his duty in voting against the Nebraska bill, and tender him our cordial thanks for his manly course."

Resolved, That great moral questions are at issue, we will not suffer our consciences to be bound down to party creeds or party nominations, but we pledge ourselves on all such occasions to vote for such measures, and such men only as we believe will illustrate and enforce our principles, regardless of party organizations or consequences.

Resolved, That we will repudiate and denounce the principles promulgated in the resolutions upon the Nebraska Bill, adopted by the so-called Democratic State Convention, held at Indianapolis on the 24th inst, over the protest of the Whigs, and the presence of a majority of which he evidently controlled, and that we sympathize with the large and respectable minority, who were overruled and misrepresented in that Convention."

THE PEOPLE SPEAK.

Tuesday, 6th inst, was held the first election for municipal officers of the consolidated city of Philadelphia, including the former county and city, and embracing a larger population than that of South Carolina. The Administration Party completely protested, and the Whigs and Democrats, in consequence of the occasion to said President Pierce and Senator Douglas that they have committed a fatal blunder in the passage of the Nebraska bill. Robert I. Conrad, candidate of the Whigs and Know Nothings, was elected Mayor, by a majority of 9,000 over Richard Vaux, Pierce candidate; Isaac T. Halsehurst, Whig, City Solicitor, by a majority of 11,000; John N. Henderson, Whig, City Comptroller, majority 8,000; Adam Mueh, Whig, City Commissioner, majority of 3,000. Of the 24 wards, 20 give majorities for Conrad, and elect to the City Council 17 Whigs, 1 Pierce men, and 3 Reformers. Twenty-two wards return to the Select Council 17 Whigs, 4 Pierce men, and 1 Reformers.

How much the "Know Nothings" had to do with the result, it is impossible to say; but the Pierce men themselves admit that one great element of their defeat was the passage of the Nebraska Bill. A morning paper in this city says, the election "seemed to be a contest between Conservatism and Radicalism." That may answer for this latitude, but nobody in Philadelphia so understood it. The Whigs, in fact, made opposition to the Nebraska Bill and Slavery the extension the main issue, and put forth the most fervent appeals to the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the community. A great meeting, held a few evenings before, the Hon. H. C. Moore, President, said the people present had assembled to declare their preference for the municipal ticket headed by Conrad and Halsehurst, and "also to denounce the Administration for the consummation of the Nebraska injury."

Mr. McMichael said "everything to the spirit of Slavery was perished in the interests of those present could not but suffer to a fearful extent. In the South, all labor is degraded, while in the North, labor is dignified, and the people who work are respected in the Southern States. The people of the South seemed determined to make a system government of the country. They had already governed the country for many years, but they had never taken bread out of our mouths. But it never had made such strides as with the last few weeks, by the passage of the Nebraska Bill. Thirty years ago, the South had entered into a solemn compact with Slavery, which could not be extended after a certain line. This compact has been violated, and now all the Territories were open to Slavery."

Ex-Governor Johnston was then introduced to the meeting. He said that, "there was any error in his appearance at the assembly, it was an error of anxiety for the success of a good cause, and was threatened, and the Slave Power from 1812 to the present day, and referred briefly to what was his prospect. He said plainly that the country would be agitated by this question of the extension of Slavery; and that the only issue in the present agitation would threaten to dissolve the Union, if we dared to open our lips. The Governor proceeded to discuss the question at length, and with his usual force and eloquence.

"The Hon. Robert T. Conrad was then introduced to the meeting, and received with cheers. He said that he was "extremely sorry to see the meeting, and that he was glad to see the Whigs and Democrats united in their opposition to the Nebraska Bill. He congratulated those assembled upon the prospect of a complete triumph of Tuesday night. He announced that he had voted entirely in favor of the Whig ticket, and that he would support the Nebraska bill, but had not had an opportunity to reply. He took this occasion to say that he had abstained from voting, and that he would support Congress, under the influence of a corrupt Administration, by which the Territories had been opened to Slavery."

The editorials of the North American, for some time before the election, are in a similar strain—nothing of what the Intelligence styles "Conservatism," about them: "They were full of determined Anti-Slavery sentiment, and will be recalled to mind that the Independent Democratic Committee of Philadelphia, some time before the election, questioned the several candidates as follows:—"Are you opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise?"—"Are you opposed to the extension of Slavery to the Territories of the United States?"—"Are you in favor of the freedom of the public lands to actual settlers?"

The Pierce candidates declined to reply to these questions, on the ground that national issues should not enter into local elections. Opposition candidates, and Judge Conrad, as we have seen above, gave an emphatic answer affirmatively, in his speech.

The letter of Mr. Halsehurst was peculiarly explicit and hearty.

"1. I am decidedly opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.

"2. I am opposed to the extension of Slavery to the Territories of the United States, directly or indirectly.

"3. I am in favor of the freedom of the public lands to actual settlers."

And he was elected by a majority of 11,000, although he ran also against a Native American competitor.

These facts tell their own story. Philadelphia has put the stamp of her reprobation upon the Nebraska outrage, and the Administration and Congress have committed a fatal blunder. And what that city has done, Pennsylvania will do next October, if all her citizens who cherish the Anti-Slavery sentiment, will agree to work together for the overthrow of the Administration Party. Divided now, there is yet time for union and a concentration of their efforts. There is yet time for friendly interchange of views among the leading men of all the parties opposed to the Nebraska injury, and the series of measures which it is the forerunner. Let them recall that it was their State which turned the scale in favor of the Nebraska bill. It was the solid phalanx of Pro-Slavery voters, from that State which Pierce, Douglas, and the Administration, relied for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. A more than a binary responsibility rests upon her citizens, in this crisis, and they will be inexhaustible if they neglect any honest effort to rebuke them who have misrepresented her, and make her voice henceforth potential for freedom.

FOR THE NATIONAL ERA.

JUNE.
BY WILLIAM ALBERT SUTLIFFE.

The livelong day, the summer weather,
Chased by the soft, sweet dew,
The light and shadow go together,
Over the browning wheat.

And after the starting daytime closes,
Patiently, white, and high,
The moon peeps into the evening roses,
Out of her hazy sky.

Under the hill where the sun shines dimmer,
Shrunk from the eager beam,
The brook goes on, with a full glimmer,
And makes for a dream.

Over the grass and moistened meadows
The steady gray hawk wings,
And down comes the shifting shadows,
The merry small birds sing.

My tired feet, from the broad sun going,
Tread the curling moss,
And my eye doth see, mid the green leaves showing,
The fair clouds flit across.

Give me a bed with a brook-fall high me,
Pattering low and sweet;
And a glimpse of the Dryads glancing by me,
With white unbanked feet.

Give me a brown-leaved volume olden,
Quaint with its antique dyes,
Leading the full-flowered fancies golden,
Back to a swelling strain.

And a vision of ancient groves and meadows,
And a faint gleam through the myrtle shadows
White temples of the gods.

Then shall the sky, with its deep-blue glory,
Telling of Heavenly cities,
Mistily blend with the gentle story,
Draped in the rhyme.

So shall a ray of sunshine brighten
Life's ever twilight steps,
And a pure starlight come to lighten
My dim way 'er the deeps.

ACQUIESCENCE.

What think the Slavery Propagandists of the signs of the times? Beyond all doubt, there was a temporary lull of excitement after the legislation of 1850. The old parties everywhere gave indications of acquiescence. Leading presses that had advocated the Wilmot Proviso, gave up agitating, and the country wanted peace, Slavery, after all, had not gained much, and, besides, there was no use attempting a movement for repeal. One measure could not be repealed, without repealing the rest; and some, it was desirable, should continue to stand.

Look abroad, now, Mr. Douglas, and see whether the storm has abated. Does New England give token of acquiescence?—twelve hundred United States soldiers required to enforce the Fugitive Slave Act in Boston—bells tolling in its principal towns, on account of the surrender of a single, helpless fugitive—its intelligence agency taking measures to organize the Anti-Slavery movement of the whole country for efficient action—its men of wealth and learned leisure, who in 1850 were willing to submit even to the Fugitive Act for the sake of the Union, now demanding its repeal—its presses, of all parties, not fed by Executive bounty, uniting in condemnation of the Nebraska Bill, and a call for retribution upon the heads of its authors!

In the loud protest of the New York Press and People, a sign of acquiescence? Does your overwhelming defeat in Philadelphia look like a ratification of your deeds? Do the great movements now in progress in Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and Wisconsin, for State Conventions on the 13th of July, to take measures to punish the Representatives of the free States who have forced this abominable measure upon the country, and to organize the People against the Slave Power and its allies, indicate a subsidence of agitation, a reconciliation of the Public Mind to the iniquity just perpetuated?

God bless the People do not acquiesce. They have been betrayed and outraged, and they will be made to feel their power at the ballot-box.

THE PRESS AND THE PRIVILEGES OF CONGRESS.

"It seems that some of the Northern presses were heartily hoaxed into the belief that a Northern Senator had been menaced in this city on account of his denunciation of the Nebraska bill. We are happy to be able to say that our citizens are a law-abiding and order-loving people, and were in no wise moved to acts of outrage or outrage towards any public functionary by the intemperate denunciations of some of our Administration papers."

National Intelligencer.

The Intelligencer is good-natured, and does no more than justice to the citizens of Washington. But, it is entirely mistaken in assuming that no violence was threatened against Mr. Sumner. Violence was threatened, and the Washington Union, the organ of the President, provoked the threat. During the proceedings in the fugitive case in Boston, that journal, in its issue of Sunday morning, contained an editorial, fiercely and wantonly assailing Mr. Sumner, associating him with the violent resistance to the execution of the fugitive act in Boston, charging him with instigating and leading it on, and holding him up as a fit subject for popular indignation. A more wanton, unadvised, and ferocious personal assault we have seldom seen in any newspaper.

The result was a strong popular excitement in Alexandria, and among the idlers of this place, and in the former a meeting was privately held, for the purpose of considering some measures for inflicting personal indignity upon Mr. Sumner, or seizing and holding him as a hostage, should the case in Boston terminate unfavorably for the claimant. This meeting calculated upon a certain amount of co-operation in Washington.

This movement, finally discouraged by the more discreet citizens of Alexandria, was provoked by the intemperate articles in the President's organ. The Pro-Slavery papers here may try now to make merry over the matter, as if the Senator from Massachusetts had been frightened as shadows. Mr. Sumner, we can tell them, is not easily frightened. He is an advocate of the Cause of Peace, and his habits as a gentleman lead him to shrink from brawls or brute strife, on the street or in the Senate; but he has the courage of his convictions, and any crisis, and fully believes in the right of a man to defend his person against violence, by the precise amount of force that may be necessary. Quiet and peaceably disposed, he is not apt to be frightened by shadow or substance.

But that violence was contemplated, and that the half-formed purpose was provoked by the appeals of the President's organ, there can be no doubt. Nor has it yet succeeded in curbing its mob instincts. Mr. Giddings, on a question of privilege, brought to the notice of the House, yesterday, a paragraph printed in its columns, by one who signs himself an "Old Fogey," plainly calling for violence against himself, and those who sympathize with him on the floor of Congress. It is as follows:—

"Those who, like the Abolition incendiaries, Parker, Phillips, Giddings, and others, are incessantly proclaiming their hostility to the laws and the Constitution, and stimulating the passions, and cherishing the feelings of a sacred duty, in my opinion have no claim to the protection of those laws or that Constitution. They are the apostles of sedition, violence, and murder; they are few-natured—wild beasts of the forest, knowing no law and no restraint but their wild, ungovernable instincts; and, like

DEMOCRACY—THE BALTIMORE PLATFORM.

THE NEBRASKA ISSUE.

First, let us "break on the wheel of public opinion" the Senators and Representatives from the free States who voted for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. That is the duty of all parties in the North and West, of fair and honest dealing, and of the purpose sought to be accomplished by the people of these States, is to reach the Senate, and to regenerate the Legislatures of the States, and they misrepresent, and through them the passage of resolutions requesting their resign. As to the Representatives, should they dare to come before the People for election, let there be a union of voters, and a vote of party, against him. It would be shameful to suffer any party prejudice, theory, or metaphysical abstraction, to divide and promote his re-election, and to strip the Senator and Representative who voted against the repeal. This would be a political blunder.

It would secure the return of some of those who, while favoring the repeal of the Bill in its preliminary stages, merely sought their names against it on the heels of the election, and whose position with their voters was openly and consistently for the Bill, and who no more claim to re-election, than cowardly hypocrisy, and treason, have to respect and a fidelity.

Nor, in selecting candidates for next Congress, should we confine ourselves to a single issue presented by this Bill. The Single issue will put forth new demands, giving rise to other questions of far greater moment than the repeal of the repealing clause of the Nebraska bill. Let us have no fragmentary, piecemeal, ready to confront the Slave Power, and its length and breadth of its demagogic strip it of its usurpations.

A leading paper belonging to the Administration Party in Maine, which has studied and approved the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform, and notwithstanding the attempt to induce its adherence to this measure a test of party loyalty, denounces the Washington Union, and asks, for its course in this respect—what ground think you? On the ground that such a policy would violate the Baltimore platform? Hear it:—

"The Washington Union cannot fight for the drive Democrats from the Baltimore platform, or into infidelity to the creed of the Baltimore platform,