☞ Mr. Wheeler is the accredited agent for the *Era*, in Cincinnati, Ohio.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1858.

THE ERA FOUR MONTHS FOR FIFTY CENTS.

We have not heretofore encouraged subscriptions to the *Era* for less than a year, but the state of political affairs, which for the next few months promises to be of peculiar interest to every friend of Freedom, and the hope of greatly enlarging the *Era's* circle of readers, that the people may be prepared to vote understandingly at the approaching fall elections, for the men who are to represent them in the next Congress, induce us to offer the *Era* on the following terms:

Ten copies for four months, beginning March 1st, five dollars, in advance.

This will afford an opportunity to our friends to give the *Era* a wide circulation, and also enable those subscribers who have been compelled to discontinue their subscriptions on account of the "hard times," to continue at a small advance of money.

We accompany this offer with the expression of our earnest hope that, where it is practicable, subscriptions will be sent in for a year.

☞ The following contributions are on file for publication, just as soon as we can find room:

Mr. Carey on the History of our Currency.
The Public Lands—Voice from Minnesota.
Sunrise on the Rhigi.
Bassani's Choice.
The Old Maid's Story.
The Pilgrimage of Freedom.
The Mind's Possessions.
Woman.
Irish Jamie's Slippers.
The Wife's Mistakes.
Æsas Aura.
The Martyrs.

☞ MR. FESSENDEN'S SPEECH.—We regret exceedingly that we have been compelled to omit portions of this admirable speech, for the purpose of crowding the main part of it in the *Era*. Our desire is to accommodate our friends in Congress, and at the same time provide for all our readers, to the best of our ability, and to the extent of our room.

☞ We are under obligations to our voluntary agents for their continued efforts for the *Era*. They understand its worth and the demands of the Cause.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF SLAVERY EXPOUNDED IN THE SENATE.

Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, was once a poor man and an industrious mechanic. He gradually improved his condition, became an active politician, was elected a representative to Congress, and signalized himself by advocating Land Reform, the Homestead bill, and several measures calculated to make more operative the Democratic element in our institutions. Next he was chosen Governor of Tennessee, and lately he has taken his seat in the Senate of the United States, a Senator for six years.

It might be supposed that such a man, self-made, the advocate of radical Democratic Principles, having worked his way to the highest political honors, up from the ranks of the industrial classes, the classes who live by their own labor, not that of others, would not feel called upon to stand forth as the champion of a system of labor which subjects one portion of the human race to the absolute will and sole uses of another portion. But all speculations as to the course of Southern politicians must fail, which overlook the oppressive domination of the Slaveholding caste over the mind of the South. No matter what the origin, the antecedents, or the general sympathies, of a public man from that section, he must recognise paramount allegiance to that ruling class, if he would escape degradation. Opposition, or even indifference to its pretensions, in the present state of public opinion in the slave States, will consign a man to obscurity, if not something worse.

In the personal discussion which took place last week in the Senate between Senators Bell and Johnson of Tennessee, Mr. Bell intimated that his deep pecuniary interest in Slavery entitled him to more confidence on the part of slaveholders than could be claimed by some others. Mr. Johnson, willing to consider the remark as personal, availed himself of the occasion to announce that he owned a few slaves:

"I have not got many slaves; I have got a few; but I made them by the industry of these hands. Can the Senator say as much? What I own cost me more labor and toil than some who own thousands, and got them because they were the sons of moneyed people."

And so, this man of the People stands up before the world, boasting of his ownership of a few slaves, as if it were a patent of nobility! But, not satisfied with the announcement that he belongs to the Ruling Order, he takes care to inform it that he understands the philosophy of Slavery just as well as if he owned a thousand negroes—that he understands the reason of denying wages to working men, just as well as if he had never been in the habit of working for wages, and claiming them as his right. "I think," he proudly exclaims, "I understand the basis on which the institution of Slavery rests;" and then he proceeds to present the philosophy of the subject, as follows:

"Just so long as men are organized as they are, physically and mentally, one having more brains and more intellectual power than another, there will be different classes in society. Take the physical man alone, without reference to the intellectual, and force him in contact with the principles of production, and you will see that, under certain circumstances, one is enabled to produce more than another. This results from our organic structure.

"Let me illustrate my meaning by an example: Here are two men, one of whom has double the physical strength of the other. Let us talk about things plainly and homely. I know this may be considered in bad taste by some, but sometimes the simplest similes best explain a subject. Take these two men, the one having twice the physical strength of the other, and put them to making rails. I know that is not a Senatorial term, but it is a common thing in this country. The man of double physical strength will make twice as many rails in the course of a day as the other. Is not that a difference between men? The man of double the physical strength will increase in wealth, in anything to which you apply his labor, twice as rapidly as the other man. So it is with the exercise of his brain. This grows out of the organic structure of mankind.

"When you form a community out of individuals, they commence the work of production, intellectual and physical; and, as society moves on through time, we find some occupying the lower places and some occupying the higher places. I do not care whether you call it slavery or servitude; the man who has menial offices to perform is the slave or the servant, I care not whether he is white or black. Servitude or Slavery grows out of the organic structure of man.

"All the talk which we hear in deprecation of the existence of Slavery is idle, and a great portion of it mere twaddle. Slavery exists; it is an ingredient of society, growing out of man's mental and physical organization; and the only question for us to discuss is, what kind of Slavery we shall have; not the existence of Slavery, for it is in society; it is an element, an ingredient that you cannot get rid of, so long as man's organic structure is what it is. Will you have white or black Slavery? Shall it be voluntary or involuntary? These are the only questions. As to the great thing itself, about which there seems to be so much difficulty, it exists beyond the reach and the control of man, unless he can reconstruct society, and, after he has done that, reorganize the material of which society is composed."

Very shallow and confused, Mr. Johnson. On subjects which you comprehend, and where you have the right side, you can be perfectly explicit, and speak to the point. The fact that your argument for Slavery is on its face unintelligible, and, when subjected to interpretation, utterly without point, shows that you either have not studied the question, or have no heart for it.

Suppose one man have twice the physical strength of his neighbor, is that a reason why he should seize him, send him to his field, and make him cut rails for nothing? If so, you might have to change places with some of your slaves.

Suppose Senator Bell have twice the intellectual power of Senator Jones, is that a reason why he should seize him, and drive him to work on his plantation?

Is the *amount* of a man's *production* to decide whether he shall be a slave or slave-owner? How much production shall crown him with masterdom, how little, sink him to serfdom? or, shall the *quality* of the product be taken into account? Suppose one man write books to instruct and amuse the People, but continue poor, producing nothing that may be eaten, drunk, or worn—shall he be a *slave!* Suppose another deal in rags, lay by odds and ends, stint himself, lend money like a usurer, and by and by come forth a millionaire, the very impersonation of Mammon—shall he be a slave-owner?

This Senatorial philosopher must answer many questions before he can make his theory fit any case at all.

"When you form a community out of individuals," says Mr. Johnson, "they commence the work of production, intellectual and physical; and as society moves on through time, we find some occupying the lower places, and some occupying the higher." Well—what does that prove? That the former should be slaves, the latter, slave-owners? That the former should work for nothing, be bought and sold like beasts, and the latter live upon their earnings, be the buyers and sellers? Mr. Johnson's reading must have furnished him with a few facts in regard to the progress of society. In the beginning of the communities which have grown up into nations as they now exist, the masses of the people were slaves; a few great barons monopolized all power and dignity. As "society moved on through time," in the language of the philosophical Senator, the masses began to emerge from obscurity, the barons to lose power—the lower places became higher, the higher, lower—until Slavery finally ceased, and, although ranks and classes still existed, the law recognised all men, whatever their position, as equal in rights, and equally entitled to protection. The progress of society, Mr. Johnson, is from Barbarism and Slavery, to Civilization and equal Freedom.

Unable up to this point to make a single statement bear upon the conclusion that Slavery exists as a normal institution, unable to show the slightest logical connection between his theory about production and the progress of society, and this most dismal conclusion, he quits metaphysics somewhat impatiently, and boldly ventures a downright assertion which he evidently fancies must decide the whole question. "I do not care whether you call it Slavery or servitude; the man who has menial offices to perform is the slave or the servant, I care not whether he is white or black."

"Menial offices" are services rendered by servants, more particularly domestic servants—and servants are of two kinds, free and slave. Servitude is a word defining service in general—Slavery is only one form of servitude. To say that the man who performs menial offices is the servant or the slave, is simply to say, that he performs menial offices! And such is the sum and substance of this tremendous assertion by our philosophical Senator. We suppose he intended to assert, that the man who performs menial offices is a *slave*, be he white or black. If he did not mean this, he meant nothing: if he did mean this, he uttered an absurdity. Your coachman, your ostler, your waiter, your valet, perform menial offices, and therefore, you say, are slaves, whether they be white or black. Let us see. Your coachman, for example, is a free white man. You make a contract with him to pay him twenty dollars a month, for which he agrees to take care of your coach and horses, and to drive you. If you fail to pay him, he can sue you: if he does not like your service, he can leave you at the end of the month. Do you make contracts with a slave? Can he sue you? Can he leave your service? If you strike your free coachman, he can strike back, or bring an action against you for assault and battery. Can your slave do that? On election day, he mingles with other independent voters, and probably votes one way, while you vote another. Is your slave a voter? You reckon your slave as your property—price, $1,200—you can bring him to the auction-block, while you keep his wife and children in your house, to serve your wants. Can you deal thus with your free coachman?

The man who cannot understand the difference between free labor and slave labor, is not fit to enlighten the Senate of the United States on the philosophy of Slavery.

Still, dissatisfied with his own arguments, Mr. Johnson takes refuge in vague generalizations. "Slavery exists"—"grows out of the organic structure of man"—grows "out of man's mental and physical organization"—"exists beyond the reach and control of man, unless he can reconstruct society, and, after he has done that, reorganize the materials of which society is composed."

"The *organic structure* of man"—what is it, Mr. Johnson? A body and soul—and to the soul belong understanding, reason, conscience, will, appetites, passions. The great duty of man to himself is, to seek his own highest development and happiness, spiritual and physical, and this can be done only by subjecting his appetites, passions, and affections, to the rule of conscience. His duty beyond himself is, to love God with all his heart, and his neighbor as himself. Such is man's "organic structure"—and in what part of it does Mr. Johnson find authority, warrant, or excuse, for Slavery—for a system which subjects one man to the absolute will of another, makes one man the property of another, to be used by him, for his own sole pleasure and profit? When a man, inflamed by revenge or anger, strikes another dead, he acts from an "organic" passion, if Mr. Johnson so pleases, but in violation of the law of his "organic structure," which demands that reason and conscience should reign supreme over appetite and passion. He is a murderer. Theft, fornication, drunkenness, slavery, grow out of "organic" passions, to use Mr. Johnson's favorite term, but passions, which, instead of being in subjection to the law of man's "organic structure," have trampled upon the law, and trimphed over reason and conscience. The "organic structure" of man requires that he should respect the rights of his fellow man as he respects his own; that he should be as careful to avoid injuring his neighbor's interests, as his own; that he should be willing to allow him the same opportunities for usefulness, happiness, and progress, as he seeks for himself—in a word, that he should do to others as he would have others do to him. The exact opposite, in all points, of this great law of man's "organic structure," is *Slavery*, which, Mr. Johnson says, is so identified with that structure, that you must not only reconstruct society, but the materials out of which society is formed, before you can get rid of it! We show him a better way: conform yourself to the great law of justice, do as you would wish to be done by, and you will cease to be a slaveholder. Live in perfect harmony with your "organic structure," and you will be neither a slave nor slave-owner.

THE DEFEAT OF THE ARMY BILL—The First Great Measure of the Administration.

The defeat of the Army Bill in the Senate is a severe blow to the Administration. It had set its heart upon the measure, and could hardly doubt of its success in a body in which it was nominally sustained by thirty-seven out of sixty-two members. The Washington *Union*, commenting on the opposition to it, gives utterance in vulgar terms to the indignation of the Administration:

"It is not at all surprising that the Black Republicans should pursue this course, and that the neophytes, who have been recently initiated into their mysteries, and who worship so devoutly now at the dusky shrine where Greeley, Abby Kelly, and the Senator from New Hampshire, kneel and cry aloud—it is natural enough that this conglomerate brotherhood should pig together in the same sty. But it is worthy of 'especial wonder' that Democrats should be found to vote persistently with them to defeat the measures of the Administration, and in the attempt to enforce upon it a measure and a policy which would only embarrass it, and which was intended by its supporters to embarrass it.

"The true friends of the Administration measure did wisely and nobly in killing the monster which sprung from the loving embraces of Douglas, Hale, & Co., and in throwing the responsibility of the disasters which may follow upon the right shoulders."

In its blind anger, the *Union* strikes at friends as well as foes, for the substitute it so bitterly denounces was the work specially of Mr. Pugh, of Ohio, and Mr. Johnson, of Tennessee; and no one did more to defeat the original bill than Mr. Toombs, of Georgia. Possibly the Administration may succeed, by flourishing its whip all at the ears of these Senators, in bringing them to repentance.

The record of the proceedings on this army bill is anything but flattering to the Administration. First, it submitted a project for a large and permanent increase of the standing army, involving numerous appointments, through which the President would have been able to bring his patronage to bear decidedly on the course of legislation. The Committee on Military Affairs, a majority being friends of the President, rejected the project, and through their chairman, Mr. Jefferson Davis, reported another bill, the first section of which provided for adding thirty companies to the regular army, two to each regiment; the second section, authorizing the President to raise the number of the rank and file of each company when in the field from fifty-six to ninety-six. The whole number, thus added, would be 7,000, making the regular army twenty-five thousand strong. The increase was to be permanent—no provision was made looking to future reduction. The reasons urged in support of it were, the necessities of the service, and the wants of the country. The Republicans were united in opposition to any permanent increase of the regular army, and it was soon found that the Administration party could not be rallied in support of such a policy.

As for the project of the Administration, it was hardly treated with respect. Mr. Gwin, on the 27th of January, moved it as a substitute for the bill of the Committee, but it received only eight votes, and of them two were cast by members who thought it would be easier to kill the substitute than the original bill.

After many debates, in which the opposition to the bill reported by Mr. Davis grew stronger and stronger, Mr. Toombs moved to strike out the first section, so as to reduce the number of troops demanded, from 7,000 to 4,000.

Mr. Davis, anxious now for the fate of the measure, pledged himself to withdraw the second section, if the first were permitted to stand; and Mr. Biggs, of North Carolina, agreed to vote against striking it out, with the understanding that a provision should be moved making the increase temporary.

February 11th, the motion to strike out the first section was lost—yeas 25, nays 26.

Yeas—Messrs. Bell, Chandler, Collamer, Crittenden, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Gwin, Hale, Hamlin, Harlan, Houston, Johnson of Tennessee, King, Pugh, Simmons, Sumner, Toombs, Trumbull, Wade, and Wilson—25.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Bayard, Biggs, Bigler, Bright, Broderick, Brown, Cameron, Clay, Davis, Evans, Fitch, Hammond, Hunter, Iverson, Jones, Mallory, Mason, Polk, Sebastian, Seward, Slidell, Stuart, Thomson of New Jersey, Wright, and Yulee—26.

A proviso was then adopted, proposed by Administration Senators, making it the duty of the President to reduce the army at the end of two years, or sooner, if the exigency of the public service required, to its present force—and the second section was stricken out.

February 18, the fourth section of the bill changing the order of promotion, was stricken out, on motion of Mr. Chandler of Michigan, Senators Hunter and Mason of Virginia, voting with others for the motion.

By this time, the bill had been radically changed—first, so as to provide for an increase of only four thousand men; secondly, to provide for a temporary, not permanent, increase—and these changes were the joint work of Republican and Administration Senators. A permanent increase of the standing army was against the feeling of a large majority of the Senate.

The question now arose, shall the increase be of regulars or volunteers? Mr. Wilson moved a substitute, proposing the employment of volunteers, but subsequently yielded his own project to one of Mr. Johnson of Tennessee, for the employment of volunteers, not to exceed three thousand men. At the same time, Mr. Hunter gave notice of a substitute, providing for the increase of regular troops, to the number of four thousand.

The question being taken on Mr. Johnson's substitute, February 25th, it was lost:

Yeas—Messrs. Bell, Broderick, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Dixon, Doolittle, Douglas, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Hale, Hamlin, Harlan, Houston, Johnson of Tennessee, King, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Toombs, and Wilson—23.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Bayard, Benjamin, Biggs, Bigler, Brown, Clay, Crittenden, Evans, Fitch, Green, Hammond, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Mallory, Mason, Pearce, Polk, Pugh, Sebastian, Slidell, Stuart, Thomson of New Jersey, Wright, and Yulee—26.

The *Union* is not surprised that "Black Republicans," and "their neophytes," maligning Mr. Douglas and his friends, should "pig together in the same sty." In the preceding votes changing the character of the bill, such men as Hunter, Mason, and Biggs, "pigged together in the same sty" with the Black Republicans, to use the elegant language of this Administration organ. In this vote, it will be observed that while Mr. Stuart, one of "the neophytes," votes with the Administration, Toombs and Johnson of Tennessee "*pig together in the same sty*" with "the Black Republicans."

Mr. Hunter now moved to amend the original bill, by striking out all after the enacting clause, and inserting a provision the effect of which would have been to add about three or four thousand soldiers, rank and file, to the regular army, should the President deem the exigencies of the service to require such an addition—to serve for two years, when they were to be discharged.

Mr. Pugh, of Ohio, moved a substitute, providing for the addition of volunteers, not regulars, to be employed only twelve months, instead of two years. This was adopted:

Yeas—Messrs. Bell, Broderick, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Crittenden, Dixon, Doolittle, Douglas, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Hale, Hamlin, Harlan, Houston, Johnson of Tennessee, King, Pugh, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Toombs, Trumbull, and Wilson—26.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Bayard, Benjamin, Biggs, Bigler, Brown, Clay, Evans, Fitch, Green, Hammond, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Mallory, Mason, Pearce, Polk, Sebastian, Slidell, Stuart, Thompson of Kentucky, Thomson of New Jersey, Wright, and Yulee—25.

And this amendment was then adopted, as a substitute for the bill reported by the Committee, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Bell, Broderick, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Crittenden, Dixon, Doolittle, Douglas, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Gwin, Hale, Hamlin, Harlan, Houston, Johnson of Tennessee, King, Pugh, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Toombs, Trumbull, and Wilson—27.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Bayard, Benjamin, Biggs, Bigler, Brown, Clay, Evans, Fitch, Green, Hammond, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Mallory, Mason, Pearce, Polk, Sebastian, Slidell, Stuart, Thompson of Kentucky, Thomson of New Jersey, Wright, and Yulee—25.

In the affirmative—"Black Republicans," 18; "neophytes," 2, Broderick and Douglas; "pigging together in the same sty" with them, (in the language of the President's organ,) Bell, Crittenden, Gwin, Houston, Johnson of Tennessee, Pugh, and Toombs.

The question was then taken on the bill, as amended—that is, on Mr. Pugh's bill—and it was decided in the negative:

Yeas—Messrs. Bell, Biggs, Broderick, Cameron, Crittenden, Douglas, Green, Gwin, Houston, Johnson of Tennessee, Mallory, Pugh, Seward, Stuart, Thompson of Kentucky, and Toombs—16.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Bayard, Benjamin, Bigler, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Clay, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Evans, Fessenden, Fitch, Foot, Foster, Hale, Hamlin, Hammond, Harlan, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, King, Mason, Polk, Sebastian, Simmons, Slidell, Sumner, Thomson of New Jersey, Trumbull, Wilson, Wright, and Yulee—35.

So the bill was rejected.

Read the comment of the President's organ on this vote:

"The true friends of the Administration measure did wisely and nobly in killing the monster which sprung from the loving embraces of Douglas, Hale, & Co., and in throwing the responsibility of the disasters which may follow, upon the right shoulders."

The *Union* is as blind as a bat. Mr. Douglas took no part in shaping the bill or the amendments. "The monster" was the offspring of Messrs. Johnson and Pugh, firm friends of the Administration; and if all who voted against it finally, acted "wisely and nobly," and are the "true friends of the Administration," the Black Republicans must be preeminent favorites at the White House, for they constitute a majority of the negative vote; while such false friends as Biggs, Green, Houston, Johnson of Tennessee, Mallory, Pugh, and Toombs, voted for the "monster!"

But, leaving the *Union* to scold its friends in its own select style, we congratulate the country that there is to be no increase of a Standing Army, and that a bad Administration has failed in its first great measure, in a body where it boasts an overwhelming majority. In the record presented, our friends will observe the consistent and manly position occupied throughout the struggle by the Republican Senators: And they will observe another thing—that Mr. Seward voted all the way through precisely the same way, in perfect consistency with his declared policy, which was, to grant the President a certain number of troops, for a *limited* time and a specific purpose.

THE TEST—THE PROSCRIPTIVE POLICY OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer*, while warmly advocating the admission of Kansas as a State under the Lecompton Constitution, deprecates the policy of making it a party test:

"If every Democrat who differs from the Administration in regard to the propriety of accepting the Lecompton Constitution is to be denounced as an enemy by the adherents of the Administration, there will soon be such a schism in the party as may leave Mr. Buchanan but a handful of friends—we mean men who are received into brotherhood by those who would drive off from him every Democrat who opposes the admission of Kansas without further conditions. It seems to us that such a course is suicidal."

The Washington *Union* does not think so. It insists upon "party allegiance to the measures of admission"—"a measure," it says, "which the *Enquirer* proposes to float without rudder or rudderman, upon the troubled waters of our politics." And the *Union*, in this matter, doubtless speaks by authority. Already it characterizes Mr. Douglas and his associates as "the neophytes of Black Republicanism," and classes them with "Greeley and Abby Kelly," types of all that is disorganizing and odious in Southern opinion. The President also has commenced dealing vengeance on the heads of the political friends of the Illinois Senator, and Governor Wise, if he does not find himself an object of the open hostility of that functionary, must calculate on the loss of his confidence.

The "organ" cannot find epithets bad enough for the independent members of the Democratic Party who insist upon the right of the People of Kansas to decide upon their own Constitution. In an editorial of Tuesday last, they are stigmatized as "absconding Democratic politicians of the North"—"apostate Democratic coalitionists"—"refuse Democratic politicians, who have sloughed off from the national party to join the howling and rabid secessionists"—"exhibiting all the impotent animosity to the cause which they hate because they betrayed it, that foiled malevolence could inspire"—"apostate men who have deserted their party for their party's good:" it finds their likeness in the "viper which sought to sting the bosom which had warmed it into life"—in "the venomous and impotent reptile," "which bit the file in impotent rage"—and it looks forward to that hour when "in proportion to the honor and triumph of the National Democracy, in this achievement" [forcing a Constitution upon a reluctant People,] "will the shame and disgrace of the apostates from their cause be crushing!"

The Administration—for it is responsible for this vindictive policy—has drawn the sword and thrown away the scabbard. Its resolve is, a war of extermination. Douglas, Walker, Wise, Stanton, and other advocates of Popular Sovereignty, against Buchanan, Calhoun, and the Delaware Crossing, are never to be forgiven—they and their friends must be destroyed.

But, will this be an easy achievement? Is the poor old gentleman at the White House, who has fallen into the hands of the Disunionists, equal to this formidable enterprise? Is Douglas, for example, the man to bow submissively to Executive vengeance? Has he no friends, no strength in the Democratic Party? Does he not represent a sentiment in that Party which would rather ally itself in the present crisis to the Republican movement, than be crushed out by Executive Despotism, acting in support of an infamous usurpation?

The Administration fancies that it will have an easy task to reconcile the Party to its policy. Having a clear majority in the Senate, it will hasten the Lecompton Constitution through that body, and it relies upon its patronage to secure its passage through the House. Once admitted, the question of Kansas can no longer be an issue—the Democratic masses, having nothing to quarrel about, will again harmonize, leaving the few disaffected, rebellious leaders without an issue, without support. The Party will rally around the President, while *they* will lose all position and influence, or, to save themselves from political death, be constrained to take refuge in the Republican Party. The Slave Power, and the President, its agent, of course are not altogether blind to the hazards of such a game. The rebel leaders may prove more formidable than they imagine. They may be able to produce such a division in the Democratic ranks at the North as shall result in the utter overthrow of what is called the National Democracy, but what is, in fact, the Slavery Party. Some of them, owing to their sectional position, will be probably disabled for active effort; but Mr. Douglas and his friends may be able, by co-operation with the Republicans, to take signal vengeance on the Power that is waging unrelenting war against him. Whether the Administration and the slaveholders take these possibilities into the account or not, they are now too far committed to recede without loss of power and position: they must go forward in the course they have marked out, cost what it may.

GOVERNOR WALKER.

The letter of Governor Walker to the Anti-Lecompton Convention of Indiana, dated February 20th, is a sufficient answer to the report set in circulation by the *Philadelphia Bulletin*, that he had retreated from his position, and gone over to the Administration on the Kansas Question. He reiterates without qualification the views he maintained in his letter to the President, and which he had advocated in Kansas. He asserts that he never would have accepted the Governorship, but with the explicit understanding that the People should have the right to vote upon the Constitution by which they were to be governed; and that the President knew this. Mr. Walker does not say, in so many words, that the President betrayed him, but he plainly shows that that is his opinion.

He says, Revolution and Civil War were impending in the Territory, and could be prevented only by the bayonet, or by the wise and safe policy he advocated, of submitting the Constitution to the popular vote. The President was fully apprized of the state of things—and he knew that peace was preserved only by the pledges given to the People that they should have a fair opportunity of voting upon the Constitution.

"These were pledges well known to the President and all his Cabinet. They were pledges given by me in good faith, and any abandonment of them now on my part, after the people had accepted and acted upon them, would be to cover myself with infamy and dishonor. Whatever, then, may be the action of the wavering, timid, or corrupt, menace and proscription have no terrors for me."

And if these pledges were given with the knowledge and sanction of the President and Cabinet, as Mr. Walker asserts, how can they escape the "infamy and dishonor" which he says would attach to him, had *he* abandoned them. After reviewing the oppressive course pursued by the Administration towards Kansas, Mr. Walker exclaims, indignantly—

"Where are we, and in what direction are we drifting? Are we upon the banks of the Bosphorus or Danube, or upon soil consecrated to popular sovereignty by the blood of the Revolution? Is it Executive edicts or sovereign rights that constitute the liberties of our country? Are we freemen 'who know our rights, and knowing dare maintain,' or are we vassals, serfs, or slaves, palace slaves, that will crimge or change at the stamp of the foot of a master? Is it the people and the States, as represented in the Senate and House of Representatives, who are to record their votes as indicated by their unbiased judgment; or are they merely to register Executive edicts, under penalties for refusal of denunciation and proscription? Is the President the master or the servant of the people, that he should thus dictate to them, or their representatives, under threats of exclusion from the party of their choice? Is Democracy a name and a shadow, or a substance? It means the *power of the people*. This is its vital essence. Or has it lost its true signification, or are we moving from it with viewless but rapid strides towards despotic power, to make and unmake the rules of political faith, under pains and penalties abhorrent to the souls of freemen? Is this the eighty-second year of our independence, or is it the first year of *American Monarchy*, that is now dawning upon us?"

The last year of King James, by the grace of Slavery.

TUESDAY IN CONGRESS.

In the Senate, Mr. Collamer continued and concluded his able speech in defence of his minority report upon the Kansas bill.

In the House, the bill fixing the number and compensation of clerks, messengers, and laborers, in the employ of the House, came up for debate. The bill reduces the amount paid for these officers of the House. The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Senate's joint resolution in reference to the doings of the Naval Board was called up by Mr. Seward, of Georgia, on a motion to reconsider. Mr. Davis, of Maryland, made a spirited speech against the resolution. Mr. Mills, of South Carolina, followed in an eloquent speech in its favor, and against the action of the Naval Board. Mr. Chapman followed upon the same side.

POLITICAL SUMMARY.

A mass meeting of the Democrats of Indiana opposed to the Lecompton iniquity met at Masonic Hall, Indianapolis, February 23. The attendance was very large, and the enthusiasm great.

Resolutions were adopted, proclaiming the right of the people to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States, as guaranteed to Kansas and Nebraska by the organic law, and by the principle of the Kansas-Nebraska act, practically applied; that Congress is bound to admit new States only upon Constitutions which have been ratified at a fair election by the vote of the people; that, by the Kansas-Nebraska act, in the people was vested the right to ratify or reject by the ballot-box at a Constitution framed for their government; that after January, 1858, neither Kansas nor any other Territory ought to be admitted into the Union, unless the qualified voters have been permitted to exercise the right of accepting or rejecting the Constitution framed for them; that the policy of forcing Kansas into the Union upon the Constitution which she has already legally rejected at the ballot-box by a large majority, is ruinous; that Stephen Arnold Douglas is entitled to the gratitude and applause of the American Democracy, for his bold and triumphant vindication of his principles of self-government; that the Convention pledges him their firm and undivided support; and that the Convention recommend that a general Convention of the Northwest assemble at Chicago, or some suitable place.

Parson Brownlow, of Tennessee, has commenced his series of lectures on Slavery at the South. The character of his lectures we may learn from the subjoined extract, which we get from a New Orleans journal:

"When I get to heaven," continued the reverend gentleman, "where I expect to go after my death, if I find a regular-built Abolitionist there, I shall conclude that he has practised a fraud upon the doorkeeper; for, in my opinion, a Kansas agitator and Freedom shrieker has no more business in our Father's Kingdom than Commodore Paulding had in Nicaragua when he captured the filibusters."

The Special House Committee of fifteen upon Lecompton held a third meeting on Wednesday evening of last week, all the members being present except the Hon. John Letcher, who was detained at home by indisposition. Various propositions were offered, upon which the vote was 7 to 7; each being consequently lost. A resolution was adopted, calling upon General Calhoun for some further information. The committee finally adjourned until the succeeding Wednesday night.

The *States*, of this city, says:

"In seventy or more of the hundred counties of Illinois, meetings have been held by the Democracy, and resolutions unanimously adopted, disapproving, in the strongest terms, the policy of admitting Kansas with the Lecompton Constitution. The Democracy of the remaining counties will hold meetings, and utter similar opinions. The Illinois Democracy are united on this question."

Mr. Christy, a Democratic member of the Ohio House of Representatives, on the 20th, rose to a question of privilege. He denied, in the broadest possible terms, and denounced as false and groundless, the story that any portion of the Democratic members of the Legislature had written private letters to Senator Pugh, withdrawing the instructions of the Ohio Legislature against the Lecompton Constitution.

We printed Senator Pugh's denial of the story in our last paper.

For the National Era.

THE MIND'S POSSESSIONS.

BY PHEBE CARY.

There is no comfort in the world
But I in thought have known,
No bliss for any human heart
I cannot dream my own;
And fancied joys may often be
More real than reality.

I have a house in which to live,
Not grand, but very good,
A hearth-fire always warm and bright,
A board with daintiest food;
And I, when tired with care or doubt,
Go in and shut my sorrows out.

I have a father, one whose thought
Goes with me when I roam;
A mother, watching in some door
To see her child come home;
And sisters, in whose dear eyes shine
Such fondness, looking into mine.

I have a friend, who sees in me
What none beside can see,
Who, looking kindly on me, says,
"Dear, you are dear to me!"
A friend, whose smile is never dim,
And I can never change to him.

My boys are very gentle boys,
And when I see them grown,
They're truer, braver, nobler men
Than any I have known;
And all my girls are fair and good,
From infancy to womanhood.

So with few blessings men can see,
Or I myself could name,
Home, love, and all that love can bring,
My mind has power to claim,
And life can never cease to be
A good and pleasant thing to me.

KANSAS NEWS.

Under date of February 13, the Lawrence correspondent of the *New York Times* writes:

"The Territorial Legislature practically closed its session at 12 o'clock last night, and Gov. Denver closed all communication with them at that hour, as he claims that the forty days, to which they are limited by the organic act, expired at that time.

"An important question to the people of Kansas hangs upon this contingency. The chief act of the session—the great measure of the times, to which the people of the whole country look for relief, viz: the bill providing for the election of delegates to a Constitutional Convention—was not sent to the Governor until Wednesday morning, the 10th instant; and he is allowed three days in which to examine all bills by statute. By this limitation, the Governor holds the bill in his pocket, and the session runs out, while the people have no relief. I enclose the bill entire.

"At a late hour last night, Mr. Hanna offered the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

"'*Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Kansas, the Council concurring*, That we do hereby, for the *last time*, solemnly protest against the admission of Kansas into the Union under the Lecompton Constitution; that we hurl back, with scorn, the libellous charge contained in the message of the President accompanying the Lecompton Constitution, to the effect that the freemen of Kansas are a lawless people; that, relying upon the justice of our cause, we do hereby, in behalf of the people we represent, solemnly pledge ourselves to each other, to our friends in Congress and in the States, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honors, to resist the Lecompton Constitution and Government by the force of arms, if necessary; that, in this perilous hour of our history, we appeal to the civilized world for the rectitude of our position, and call upon the friends of Freedom everywhere to array themselves against the last act of oppression in the Kansas drama.

"'*Resolved*, That the Governor be requested to immediately transmit certified copies of these resolutions to the President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and to our member in Congress, and that the same be presented to both branches of Congress.'

"A Mass Convention meets to-day, to consult for harmony and success. The Topeka Legislature are passing laws."

The members of the famous Lecompton Convention, it is well known, have nearly all fled the Territory. We copy below two advertisements from the Kansas *Star of Empire*. Messrs. Wells and McKown were members of the Lecompton Convention:

Notice.—By order of the Probate Court of Douglas county, K. T., I will proceed to hire to the highest bidder, in the city of Oxford, Johnson county, K. T., near little Santa Fe, Mo., on the first day of January next, four negro women, one negro man, and two negro boys, the property of Newton Carry, deceased. Given under my hand, this 15th December, 1857.

W. S. WELLS.

Slaves for Sale!—I offer for sale, privately, two valuable servants. The conditions of the sale will be the securing of a good home, where humane treatment will be extended. Call at this office, upon GEORGE W. MCKOWN.

The Territorial Legislature, previous to its adjournment, passed an act defining the judicial districts of Kansas. The object of the act was and is to assign Judges Cato and Lecompte districts without population. The Kansas correspondent of the New York *Post* says:

"You will perceive that the bill assigns Judges Lecompte and Cato to districts bordering on the Rocky Mountains, and almost untenanted, except by Indians; and gives to Judge Williams, who has not yet rendered himself obnoxious to the Free State men, the entire populated portion of the Territory. Of the thirty-seven Representatives present at the final passage of the bill, but one, Mr. Bennett, the Pro-Slavery member from Atchison county, voted in the negative; his sole remaining political colleague, Mr. Miller, begging to be excused from voting. Lest some of your readers should imagine that the Territorial Legislature, in their eagerness to express their dislike and abhorrence of these two 'unjust judges,' have transcended their powers, I will remind them that the organic act of Kansas expressly confers that power upon this body! Thus are these sharks of the Administration likely to be caught within the meshes of its own net. It will certainly catch them, or drive them to other waters, either of which effects will be equally salutary and acceptable."

The Leavenworth *Times* says that the judges and clerks of the Shawnee election have been arrested, and testify that the poll at Shawnee was taken to Westport, and 300 names added thereto at that place. Mr. Clarkson, Postmaster at Leavenworth, was burned in effigy, and threats were made to hang him, if caught.

One of the clerks swore that there were but about 163 honest votes polled. The polls closed at nine o'clock P. M. Early the next morning, he and the other clerk went over to Westport, Mo., and there, in Col. Boone's store, added several hundred names to those of the *bona fide* voters. The names were read to them from some list, by a son of Rev. "Tom Johnson" and other Pro-Slavery men. The judges certificates (which had been made out on separate sheets of paper) were pasted on at the foot of these bogus returns, and they were then sent to Calhoun.

The Kansas correspondent of the *National Intelligencer*, writes:

"Shawnee precinct, as you will remember, returned over nine hundred votes. C. C. Gogfray, one of the clerks of the election there, was examined under oath. After some hesitation, he finally gave a full history of the affair. He swore there were but about one hundred and sixty-three honest votes polled. The polls closed at nine o'clock, P. M. Early the next morning, he and the other clerk went over to Westport, Missouri, and there in Col. Boone's store, added several hundred names to those of the *bona fide* voters. The names were read to them from some list, by a son of Rev. 'Tom Johnson,' and other Pro-Slavery men. The judges' certificates (which had been made out on separate sheets of paper) were pasted on at the foot of these bogus returns, and they were then sent to Mr. Calhoun. The judges corroborated this testimony fully, and swore that several hundred names had been added to the returns after the polls were closed and they had made out their certificates.

"The Spring Hill returns showed a Free State majority. The Pro-Slavery messenger by whom they were sent in, never delivered them, and now swears that he lost them on the way."

We have received the first number of we believe the first daily paper in Kansas, entitled the *Daily Times*. It is published at Leavenworth, and is edited in a spirited manner.

The last number of the Kansas *Herald of Freedom* received at this office denies, in the strongest language, the assertions of Eastern newspapers that it is in favor of the Lecompton Constitution. We quote its language:

"We have but one voice in regard to that instrument. Rather than live under it, other than for the brief period required to frame a new Constitution, we are in favor