the "Great Maelstrœm," and conversed with many persons about it during the three months I spent in the country. Some spoke only from hearsay; others had been on the spot. All concurred in reducing its marvellousness, but did not really tell me anything about the peculiarities of the place.

I had not thought to apply for the report of the Government surveys, which would have settled the subject at once. A few months later, however, while crossing the Swedish lakes, I fell into company with Mr. Hagerup, Minister of the Norwegian Marine. This gentleman was one of the three councillors, to whom Norway is by its Constitution entitled, at the Royal Court in Stockholm. He was returning to Christiana for his family. When a younger man, Mr. Hagerup had superintended the survey of the Norwegian coast, spending three years there in person. He was perfectly familiar with every island and fjord and current. He spoke English perfectly, and told me much of his country and of its marine. We talked of the Maelstrœm—the result of which was, that he afterwards sent me answers at length to six questions which I proposed in writing. These questions were first submitted to Major Vibe, now at the head of the hydrographic surveys of the Norwegian Government. The replies may therefore be received as giving us, in so far as they go, exactly *the best that is known of the Maelstrœm.*

Questions Proposed Concerning the Maelstrœm to Mr. Hagerup, Minister of the Norwegian Marine.

1. Do the common daily tides affect the water so much that it may not be safely passed in small boats?

2. Do the spring tides so affect it that it may not be passed even by powerful steamers—or how much *do* they affect it?

3. Does there *ever* exist such a *whirl* in the water that a large vessel would be in danger of being drawn under the surface?

4. May a steamer pass there, in time of both *storm* and *spring tide*, without swamping, provided she would not swamp at sea in the same storm?

5. Has there been any change in the violence of the current here, or any change in the bed through which it passes?

6. Are there any other currents on the Norwegian coast which are nearly as bad as or are worse than this?

Reply of Mr. Hagerup and of Major Vibe, Superintendent of the Norwegian Hydrographic Surveys.

1. "Although the Maelstrœm (between Lofoden and Mosken) at certain times, and under certain circumstances, of which we shall hereafter speak, may be dangerous for both smaller and greater craft, yet is the danger, *in general*, not of that extraordinary character which, especially in olden times, was supposed, and it can even at times be passed by boats. When the wind is steady, and not too violent, boats may venture upon it in time of summer, yet the rather at flood or ebb tide, for then it rests, or is still for a good half hour. At the point half way between flood and ebb, and the reverse, (*i. e.* half ebb and half flood,) it is most violent, and boats ought not then to attempt it."

2. "In general, and under the before-mentioned circumstances, it may be passed by large sail vessels or steamers; also in time of spring-flood and spring-ebb. The difference between these is nine and a half Norwegian feet, while that of the usual daily flood and ebb is only six feet."

3. "No; as before remarked, the Malestrœm may at times be still, and, with steady wind, be passed by large crafts, and that—when circumstances are favorable—even during the whole interval between ebb and flood, and *vice versa*. Whirls do not show themselves, or, at least, not in such strength as to prove dangerous for shipping. (See farther under No. 4.")

4. "To pass the Maelstrœm in storm, especially in winter, is entirely unadvisable for whatever craft, great or small; and, even when such craft could clear itself in open sea, it is neither to be expected nor hoped in the Maelstrœm. The following remarks will explain this:

"The direction and violence of the Maelstrœm are in a high degree dependent on wind and weather. When there blows on the sea a storm from the west, it runs continually, in winter, to the east, with a rapidity of six knots an hour, without changing its direction with the raising or falling tide. At the point of ebb or flood tide it may, indeed, slightly moderate, or even for a moment show itself quite still, but it immediately increases again in violence, and sets continually to the east. If at such a time the tide is rising, (i. e., goes from ebb to flood,) the stream becomes excessively violent and entirely unnavigable for either steamers or any other craft.

"In winter, it not unfrequently happens that, at sea, a bank of clouds shows a west storm, with heavy sea, to be prevailing there, while farther in, on the coast, the clear air shows that on the inside of the west fjord (east side of Lofoden) the wind blows from the land, and sets out through the fjord from the east. In such case, especially, an approach to the Maelstrœm is in the highest degree dangerous, for the stream and the under-current from opposite directions work there together to make of the whole passage one single boiling cauldron. At such times appear the mighty whirls which have given it the name of "Maelstrœm," (*i. e.*, the whirling or grinding stream,) and in which no craft whatever can hold its course. For a steamer, it is then quite inadvisable to attempt the passage of the Maelstrœm during a winter storm, and, for a sailing vessel, it may also be bad enough in time of summer, should there fall a calm or a light wind, whereby the power of the stream becomes greater than that of the wind, leaving the vessel no longer under command.

"At one place only in the stream there is shoal water found, called 'Horgan,' which at a depth of from seven to eight fathoms is always manifest; since the sea (even in entirely still weather, and without breaking on it) continually, as it were, boils and grinds, and thereby produces a scum-white surface. To avoid this shoal, one must hold either close under Hogholmene (the outermost reef on the north side of the island Mosken) or under Lofoden—better the latter.

"Between Hogholmene and the west point of Lofoden, where the passage is smallest—namely, about 12,000 feet broad—the current runs strongest. At some points, it sets in crosswise towards the land; namely, where it meets the returning current, which often runs as violently as the great current, but in an opposite direction.

"That part of the stream which is between Hogholmene and Mosken cannot be passed at all, as it is full of reefs and shoals.

"We may finally remark that the whirls in the Maelstrœm do not, as was formerly supposed, draw vessels to the bottom or under the surface, but that the violence of the whirls may fill them, thrust them against the land, or otherwise destroy them."

5. "No; no change has been remarked, either in the violence of the stream or in its bed. The latter consists in part of rock and stones."

6. "6. Strong currents are very common on the Norwegian coast, and some of them are still more violent than the Malestrœm, though they may not, like that, have different courses at different points. One of the best known is Saltstrœmmen, between Strœmœ and Kanaplundœ, in Salten-fjord in Nordland. This very narrow sound connects the said fjord with Skjærstad-fjord. The latter must thus, through this passage, receive the tide, and again, with falling water, return it to the Salten-fjord which sets in from the sea. Now, as Saltstrœmmen is scarcely nine hundred feet broad, while Skjærstad-fjord, inland from Salten-fjord, is some thirty miles long, it is easy to imagine that this passage may become violent and often impassable.

"The current also between Vaero and Rœst, and about the latter island, is very violent. Here there exists also a changing movement, since the direction of the stream goes the whole round of the compass in a period of twelve ours."

Such is the official report on the Maelstrœm. It will not fail to interest those who have been interested in the subject. We have long ago, all over the civilized world, given up the theory of a mysterious subterranean tunnel, swallowing up even the very whales that approach. But comparatively few have learned what *is* the peculiarity of the currents that have made this place so fabulously fearful, and, at times, so really dangerous of approach. We may surely still regard the spot with a tinge of awe. Its over and under currents, dashing wildly past each other, are more awe-inspiring than the stormiest sea that rolls and breaks straight onward against the rudest coast. TRAVELLER.

TO ADVERTISERS.—Business men will find it greatly to their advantage to advertise in the *Era*

Messrs. Pettengill & Co., S. E. Niles, and Joy, Coe, & Co., are our authorized advertising agents for Boston, New York, and Philadelphia.

The following gentlemen are accredited agents for the *Era*: G. W. Light, Boston, Mass.; J. A. Emerson, Salem, Mass.; Thomas Wheeler, Cincinnati, Ohio; L. T. Park, Mount Union, Ohio; Joseph Hughes, Philadelphia, Pa.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 11, 1859.

A CARD.

It is due to the subscribers of the *National Era* to state that the paper will continue to be edited and published under the provision made by its late editor and proprietor, in view of his intended absence in Europe.

The *Era* will remain true to the principles it has always advocated. Writers of eminent ability will contribute to its editorial columns. Its literary department will be placed in able hands, and no effort will be spared to make the paper as nearly as possible what it has always been.

The value of the *National Era* as the representative of free principles at the National Capital, and to the family of its late editor as their only available means of support, makes it my imperative duty to continue its publication without interruption.

MARGARET L. BAILEY.

Washington, July 11, 1859.

THE ELECTIONS.

Elections took place in several of the Southern States on the 1st and 4th instant. Our information as to the result is still quite imperfect, but we give such as has come to hand.

An election took place in Oregon, also, on the 7th of last month, of which we have just received the first intelligence. Two statements have been telegraph from Jefferson city and St. Louis, of the result, the first indicating the probable success of Stout, the sham Democratic candidate, while the more specific statement furnished by the Associated Press is that Logan, the Republican candidate, is elected by thirty majority.

Kentucky.—The result in Kentucky indicates a gain of two members by the Opposition, but the election of the sham Democratic candidate for Governor by a large majority, with some thirty majority in the Legislature. This will secure the election of a Democratic Senator to succeed Mr. Crittenden.

Tennessee.—In Tennessee, the sham Democrats elect Harris Governor by a reduced but still large majority. They also claim the State Legislature. The Opposition have carried six or seven of the ten members of the House of Representatives. Etheridge, who offered the resolution denouncing the slave trade, is said to be elected.

North Carolina.—North Carolina only elected Members of Congress. The Opposition have probably gained two members. Gilmer, who opposed Lecompton, is re-elected by a large majority, although he had a Whig as well as a Democratic competitor.

Alabama.—In Alabama the Black Democracy beat their Black Opponents out of sight.

Texas.—From Texas it is reported that General Houston is probably elected Governor over Runnels, the regular nominee of the Black Democracy.

Missouri.—An election took place in St. Louis on the 1st instant, for the election of various municipal officers and two members of the Legislature. The Republicans united with the Americans, and carried four-fifths of their ticket by fifteen hundred majority. For some local reason, three of the candidates put on the Republican or People's ticket are Democrats, and consequently elected with the others.

IS DRED SCOTT TO BE REPUDIATED?

The Augusta (Me.) *Age*, the central organ of the Maine Democracy, after quoting the resolutions adopted at the recent Maryland State Convention, adds:

"The Maryland Democracy had better run '*Dred Scott*' for the Presidency, and test the popularity of that juridical monstrosity before the American public!"

Now, we wish to have a distinct understanding on this point. Do the Democracy of Maine repudiate the Dred Scott decision? Do they dissent from the doctrine laid down by all recent "Democratic" authorities, that the Supreme Court is the supreme arbiter of constitutional questions, and that its decisions must be conformed to by the Executive and Legislative departments? Mr. Buchanan announced this idea in his inaugural, and it was re-echoed from Maine to Texas. If, however, the Maine Democracy have been brought to see that it is unsound, that it is the essence of Federalism, and that it was scouted by the old Jeffersonian Republicans, one and all, we shall be glad to know the fact. But we protest against the temporary denial of the faith of the "National Democracy" by the Maine Democrats, on the eve of an election, in order to avoid its odium. If the Maine Democracy are determined to dethrone Dred Scott finally and forever, we shall rejoice to know the fact, and shall hail it as a sign of returning health and vitality. But there can be but one certain evidence of their reclamation from their Federal heresies, and that is, an explicit renunciation of all connection with the men who support it. The Maine Democrats must know that Mr. Buchanan is not the only leading man of the party who acknowledges the authority of Dred Scott. Mr. Douglas is as deep in the mire as the President; and to support Mr. Douglas for the Presidency while he occupies his present position, is to support what the *Age* designates as a "juridical monstrosity."

THE SOUTHERN OPPOSITION.

The Richmond *Whig* is a strenuous advocate of the "union of the Opposition" in 1860. It cannot think of supporting the Democratic party, on account of its abolition affinities, but is sanguine of being able to rally the Opposition, North and South, upon its own platform, which includes a slave code for the Territories. Of the Democracy, it says:

"So help us Heaven, we are too sincerely attached to the institution of Slavery, we believe too fixedly that it is a moral, social, and political blessing, ever to ally ourselves with such a party as that! We have always believed Democracy to be the mother of Abolitionism. In its very name and essence it implies *the equality of all men*, and disallows the existence of classes, distinctions, and ranks. Its radical hypothesis is, that 'all men are by nature free and equal,' without respect to place of birth or complexion of skin. Slavery, the subjection of one class or race to another, is the antipode of Democracy. The Democratic dogmas of Mr. Jefferson led necessarily to the propagation of Abolition ideas and the formation of an Abolition party. It was legitimate and unavoidable, that from the womb of Democracy should be spawned such creatures as Birney and Hale and Wilmot and Gerrit Smith and Chase and Banks and Fremont and Van Buren, and a thousand other propagandists of the Democratic doctrine that no man has the right of mastership over another."

When a high-toned champion of Slavery, like the *Whig* editor, condescends to invite the aid of Republicans, they of course are to understand that, as an indispensable preliminary, they are to conquer their prejudices. We respectfully commend this paragraph to those Republicans who talk of union with the Southern Opposition.

DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES AND PLATFORMS.

The Democratic carpenters are at work night and day in the construction of platforms for their legion of Presidential aspirants to stand upon. We should have some hope of being able to keep our readers informed upon this subject of platforms, but for the incessant additions or modifications which they are undergoing. We have heard a great deal of "finalities," but we never arrive at them. Eleven years ago, the party adopted popular sovereignty, in all its length and breadth, as its political creed, and nominated General Cass, who first proclaimed it, as their candidate for the Presidency. He defined popular sovereignty to be the untrammelled right of the people of a Territory to establish or prohibit Slavery by their legislative assemblies, as well as in the formation of their State Constitution, preparatory to admission into the Union. Congress, he declared, had no right to interfere with Slavery in the Territories, either for its establishment or prohibition. The great Democratic party accepted this doctrine, and attested their faith in it by voting for General Cass. There was no third party at the South in the field, and he with his popular sovereignty received the endorsement of the entire party in the South. Mr. Calhoun, it is true, dissented from this view, and maintained that the slaveholders have an indefeasible right to carry their slaves into the Territories; but, in the great fight between the Whigs and Democrats which ensued in 1848, the dissenting voice of Mr. Calhoun was not heard, or not heeded; and the Southern Democracy, which now denounces this doctrine of Territorial sovereignty as being worse than the Wilmot Proviso, then clamorously defended it as the true theory of the Constitution.

The same doctrine was maintained by Mr. Douglas during the discussion which took place upon his proposition to repeal the Missouri Compromise in 1854. He then held the doctrine of Territorial sovereignty in all its amplitude. No Dred Scott decision then existed, and Mr. Douglas made his rule absolute. The Southern members sanctioned it fully. They applauded Mr. Douglas's appeals in behalf of the unrestricted right of Territorial legislation upon all subjects, and they reiterated them.

It was then thought that Territorial sovereignty would accomplish all that the South had in view, viz: the extension of Slavery. They took it for granted that the restriction upon the introduction of Slavery into the Territories west of Missouri being removed, the establishment of Slavery would be a matter of course. But their hopes were disappointed. Freedom proved stronger than Slavery, with Border-Ruffianism and the Federal Government to back it.

Here then was a necessity for a change of policy. The Cass-Douglas policy, of non-intervention by Congress with Slavery in the Territories, worked badly in practice. The South saw that there was little hope of Slavery extension, except on the theory of Mr. Calhoun, sanctioned by the Supreme Court, and sustained by all the power of the Federal Government. The demand was immediately made upon the party, and, as a matter of course, acceded to. The Dred Scott decision was got up in time for the inauguration of President Buchanan, and that high functionary proclaimed in his inaugural at the Capitol its leading feature, in advance of its delivery by the court. That decision lays it down that the Constitution carries Slavery into all the Territories of the Union, and that no power exists in the people thereof or in Congress to exclude it. Congress and the Federal Executive, on the contrary, are bound to protect the rights of slaveholders until a State Constitution is formed. Such was the decision of the Supreme Court in that famous case; and Mr. Buchanan took occasion to say in his inaugural, what he has since repeated in his Silliman letter, and in his first message to Congress, that no good citizen would presume to question it.

This decision immediately became the basis of the platforms of the Federalized Democracy. All sections or wings of the party recognise Dred Scott as a pillar of Democracy. Even Mr. Douglas acknowledges the sovereignty of Dred, but, while doing so, he undertakes to evade the consequences of the fatal admission, by insisting that the people of the Territories may, nevertheless, by non-legislation, and "unfriendly legislation," exclude Slavery.

This dodge of Mr. Douglas will not answer his purpose. It is illogical: and if the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court be binding upon the consciences of legislators and the people, Governor Wise, Davis, Mason, Brown, and, in a word, the whole South, are right in insisting that Slavery is entitled to Congressional protection whenever the people of the Territories attempt interference with the "rights" of slaveholders. The old Federal party contended, and the modern Federalized Slave Democracy contend, that this deference is due to the Supreme Court. They insist that when the Court decides upon the constitutionality of a measure, the people and their representatives are bound to acquiesce; thus making an unelective and irresponsible body of men supreme, not merely in the trial of causes involving the rights of property between individuals, but supreme as the arbiter of political questions. We hold, with Mr. Jefferson, that the court is not supreme in this sense. We hold, with him and with the Republicans of the old school, that the Supreme Court has no right to intermeddle with politics, or to decide political controversies for the co-ordinate departments of the Government. We therefore entertain no more respect for a political speech of Judge Taney than for one made by Mr. Buchanan. When the ermine of justice is dragged into the slough of demagogueism, it ceases to command respect. No man's opinions upon political topics are changed by being told that the Supreme Court has decided thus and thus. When the Supreme Court decisions were the reverse of the Dred Scott decision—when they sustained the right of Congress to exclude Slavery from the Territories—the authority of the court at the South was treated with contempt; and the Southern popularity of that branch of the Government dates back only a few years. But we are digressing.

Mr. Douglas, as we have said, admits the binding authority of the Supreme Court, but most illogically and unfairly attempts to shirk the responsibility it imposes, of protecting Slavery in the Territories. He should do one of two things. He should either repudiate the court, with Thomas Jefferson, or he should concede what the South demands, viz: Congressional protection to Slavery in the Territories, against the "unfriendly legislation" of the local Legislatures.

The genuine Southern doctrine, which, as we have intimated, is but the logic of the Dred Scott decision, is that enunciated by Governor Wise, and sanctioned by all the Southern leaders, viz: Congressional protection to Slavery in the Territories. Mr. Wise justly claims this as his platform; but we observe a general disposition among Southern politicians of both parties to crowd upon it, probably to the no small annoyance of the proprietor. Indeed, we doubt if there is a Southern Democrat, from Mason and Dixon's line to the Rio Grande, who does not now subscribe to the doctrine. In Kentucky there was a disposition manifested by the Democracy at the commencement of the late campaign to keep aloof from this doctrine of protection to Slavery, on account of its repulsiveness to their Northern allies; but immediately the Opposition took advantage of it, by assuming the ultra position which the Democracy had left unoccupied. The consequences of this *ruse* of the Opposition threatened to be serious, and the Democracy were brought to a sense of their error. They accordingly wheeled about immediately, and put themselves in line with their opponents. By this timely change of tactics, they have managed to preserve their ascendency in the State. In the other Southern States the Democracy at once adopted the theory of protection to Slavery. The Opposition in the Gulf States rarely permit the Democracy to show more devotion to Slavery than they do; but in Maryland, North Carolina, and Tennessee, we have been pleased to see exhibited a more conservative and manly spirit. We, however, see it stated, in the Richmond *Enquirer*, that the Opposition in Tennessee followed the pernicious example set them by their Kentucky brethren. We trust that this is a mistake; but the popularity in the South of everything which favors Slavery is so great, and the unpopularity of everything which falls short of the recognised standard of "soundness" is so manifest, that we have reason to fear that the statement is true. The Opposition of the South have strong inducements to take this step, and none to allure them in an opposite direction.

The Administration, together with the Hunter faction or section of the party, occupy the intermediate ground between the Douglas and Wise factions. The middle faction claim to be Non-Interventionists; but when pushed to the wall by the South, they admit that Congress is in duty bound to protect Slavery, but they avoid a direct collision with the Northern or Popular Sovereignty wing, by saying that intervention for the protection of Slavery is impracticable, and that to urge it is worse than useless, since it serves to bring the party into odium with the Northern voters, and thus to secure the triumph of the Republicans. But this middle party is destined to fall between two stools. It disgusts the North by its concessions of constitutional obligations to Slavery, and it disgusts the South by its cowardly plea of inability to execute them.

There are other relations of Slavery to the Federal Government which enter into and complicate the issues. The Naturalization question—or, rather, the question raised by recent letters and official papers of the Secretary of State, as to the extent of the obligations of the Federal Government to its naturalized citizens—is one of these. In the Le Clerc letter, General Cass distinctly states that the French Government requires military service from all natives of that country, and that their naturalization in this country will not, if they voluntarily return to France, protect them against that claim. In subsequent letters, he has modified and attempted to explain away this letter, but he still leaves the impression on the minds of foreign-born citizens that he will, at most, only protest against their enrollment in the military service of the European monarchs. Mr. Wise leads off in the opposite direction, and is ready to wade through seas of blood in defence of the rights of foreign-born citizens. Mr. Douglas keeps silent, while his Washington organ (the *States*) takes the most ultra ground in defence of the Le Clerc letter, and insists that the foreign-born citizen of this country is in a condition precisely similar to that of the fugitive slave of Virginia who escapes to Prussia. He is only free so long as he keeps out of the reach of the fugitive slave law.

Another subject, which begins to enter largely into the issues of the Presidential campaign, is the question of repealing the laws which prohibit the African slave trade. This proposition is urged by the Democracy as well as by the Opposition of the Gulf States. It is supported by all the leading men in that section, such as Jefferson Davis, Brown, Yancey, Stephens, and others. The three former affect to be opposed to the revival of the trade, but they insist on the repeal of the laws, as an act of respect to the institution of Slavery. So long as these laws remain on the statute-book, say these Southern patriots, there rests a stigma upon Slavery—an assumption that the institution is founded in wrong. We agree with them on this point. They are correct in saying that the laws which brand the origin of Slavery as piracy, and punish it with death, are based on the tacit assumption that Slavery is wrong, and should not be increased in amount.

We have seen decided symptoms of a disposition on the part of Governor Wise to favor this proposition of repeal, and for the same special reasons. One of the editors of his organ, the *Enquirer*, broaches it in an editorial letter, and defends it as essential to Southern honor.

Douglas takes the opposite course. He will not consent to be the Charleston nominee, if the slave trade is to be revived. But whether his proverbial fondness for compromises may not seduce him into acquiescence with the scheme as modified, we cannot say. His Southern friends will assure him that they have no intention of reviving the trade, but only propose to restore the long-lost State right of deciding the question. This view of the case will be entirely analogous to that presented by Mr. Douglas in regard to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. He disclaimed any desire to extend Slavery. He only wished to leave it to the people most concerned to say for themselves whether they wanted Slavery. We cannot therefore see how Mr. Douglas can resist this other Southern demand for the repeal of Anti-Slavery laws.

The Administration profess to be decidedly opposed to the revival of the trade; but whether they will stick to it remains to be seen. All we know is, that the laws are not put in force for its suppression.

Such, in brief outline, is the present aspect of Democracy. What it will be six months hence, we are unable to guess; but, undoubtedly, something quite different from what it now is.

HON. EDWARD BATES.—A writer for the New York *Express*, signing himself Hancock, has been reviewing at some length the character and pretensions of the various Opposition aspirants to the Presidency. He comes to the conclusion that Mr. Botts, of Virginia, is the man. Of Mr. Bates he has a kind word to say, but thinks that he is too much of a Free-Soiler to suit the South. It seems to be no part of this writer's policy to consult the tastes or wishes of the North, although, as every one knows, the votes which are to elect an Opposition ticket are to come from that quarter. Mr. Botts would stand no better chance to carry Virginia, or any other Southern State, if accepted as the candidate of the Republicans, than would any regular Republican in good standing.

This article in the *Express*, which is well written, and not illiberal, as coming from a representative of Southern views, confirms what we said last week upon the impossibility of uniting the Northern Republicans with the Southern Opposition. If Edward Bates would be unacceptable to the Southern Opposition in consequence of his supposed sympathy with the emancipation cause in Missouri, it is idle to talk of their union with the Republicans on any terms. Southern demagogues of both the old parties have been so long accustomed to dictate their own terms to their Northern allies, that it seems next to impossible for them to divest themselves of the notion that they have a hereditary right to do so.

THE DISUNION ARGUMENT.

The Black Democracy are in despair. Turn which way they will, they read the handwriting on the wall. They are beaten even now, some fifteen months before the election takes place; and in their despair they threaten to dissolve the Union, as the only means of avoiding the consequences of defeat—that is to say, the loss of the spoils. The Washington *States*, the organ of the Douglas party, has recently endeavored to atone to the South for its complicity with Douglas and his non-intervention, by raising the traitorous shout for disunion in the event of the election of a Republican President. This beggarly threat is re-echoed in the Southern press, and the *States* really begins to believe that its mock thunder will be accompanied by a thunder-bolt of disunion.

No greater mistake could be made. The South has too much at stake to carry out the idle and foolish threats of demagogues. In no part of the Union is there so much talk of its dissolution as in the hot-beds of Slavery; and in none is there so little ability to act out and survive such an event. Slavery outside of the Union would be at the mercy of the first rude hand which chose to assail it. A Southern Confederacy, supposing the formation of one possible, would be a mere provincial dependency of the great Powers of Europe and America, and would be compelled meekly to submit to their dictation. Those Powers would give laws to the South, say to it how many days or years of grace were to be allowed for finally winding up and obliterating the "peculiar institution," and on what terms.

But it is nonsense to talk of disunion. The thing is impossible, except with the free consent of the Federal Administration. The *States* newspaper has called upon the Southern members of the Cabinet to refuse the seals of office to their Republican successors. We have yet heard no response from them. The public will be glad to know if they meditate treason and perjury as the *finale* of their official lives.

We have been led to these remarks by reading the following paragraph in a Mississippi "Democratic" newspaper, called the "*Eagle of the South.*" The editor says:

"We have been divided heretofore, and have given and received some hard blows; but let them now be remembered only as honorable scars. Let us come forward, as one man, and take our position, clearly and unmistakably—let it be heralded from one end of the country to the other, that *the Southern States will not submit to the inauguration of a Black Republican President.*"

We will remind the editor that the recent "Democratic" State Convention of Mississippi, which represented all the Chivalry in the State, had this proposition of disunion under consideration, but, for some reason unknown to the outside world, it failed to put forth a threat of treason and rebellion in the event of the election of a Republican President. The wiser course was taken, of pledging the State, or rather the Democracy, to co-operate with the other Southern States "in whatever measures they may deem necessary for the maintenance of their rights as coequal members of the Confederacy." This was wise and prudent; and we predict that, if a Convention or the Legislature shall ever assemble with such an object in view, that it will advise the people peaceably to go about their business, and wait until the reserved rights of Mississippi are encroached upon by the Federal Government.

Of one thing the *Eagle of the South* and the Washington *States* may be assured, viz: *that there are not traitors enough in Washington, nor out of it, to prevent the inauguration of a Republican President.* If the conspirators think otherwise, they will in all human probability have an opportunity, on the 4th of March, 1861, of testing their metle and their strength.

WEST INDIA EMANCIPATION.

The first of August celebrations of West India Emancipation give occasion to the following remarks upon that subject by the New York *Times*. One of the editorial corps of the *Times* spent the winter in the British West Indies, and wrote for it a series of interesting articles upon the moral and physical condition of the people, as well as upon the pecuniary success of emancipation. The writer, according to his own statement and the tenor of his letters, was far from looking at the subject from the partial view of a philanthropist. Discarding all sentimental bias, he addressed himself to the investigation of the subject with the coolness of a commissioner in bankruptcy. The first and main question was, does emancipation pay? And, secondarily, have the negroes been benefitted by the boon of Freedom? After careful observation, he gave a decidedly affirmative answer to both interrogatories. The following extract from an editorial in the *Times* of August 3d is written in the same vein, and probably by the same hand. After enumerating the embarrassments through which the Islands have passed, the *Times* sums up as follows:

"But the clouds which have so long darkened the bright hopes of West Indian Emancipation are at length disappearing, and the problem, after a tedious probation, is working itself out. At their worst period of depression, the case of these colonies was not one without hope to those who examined it from a political but not from a plantocratic point of view. Barbados and Antigua clearly proved that plantation management was cheaper under the free system than under the slave; they proved that the African under Slavery and the African under Freedom were different beings; they proved that the freeman worked far better than the slave, as soon as he became sufficiently intelligent, and he soon did become so, to understand his own interest. With this fact demonstrated, as it has been most unquestionably demonstrated, it became the object of the proprietary to supply labor to those islands in which the Creole population was insufficient, or in which the negroes had left the estates for trade and other pursuits, under the impression, still entertained by a large majority, that the field labor in which they had been employed as slaves was degrading to them as freemen. After many attempts to introduce foreign laborers, it was at length finally determined that Coolies from Madras and Calcutta were best suited to the climate and the work. The system under which they have been, and still are, imported, is an admirable one—not to be confounded at all with the traffic, possibly worse than the slave trade, between Cuba and the Chinese Empire. The Madras and Calcutta Coolies brought to the Mauritius and the British West Indies are under Government supervision; they are transported at their own election from one portion of the British dominions to another; they are not more crowded in the vessels in which they are transported than steerage passengers in a first-class Atlantic steamer; upon arriving at their destination, their rights are jealously guarded; they select their own work, which they enter upon at once; they have house-rent and medical attendance free; they are entitled to and must be paid the average rate of wages; and after they have passed a term of industrial residence in the colony, they are sent home, free of expense, though many of them have amassed considerable sums of money. The obligation to send the Coolie back after he has completed his term of industrial residence is regarded by the planter as a hardship, for he loses his laborer at a time when he is most serviceable. But many of the Coolies prefer to remain, and those who do return home benefit the Colony by promoting immigration from the remote East. It would indeed seem that the West Indies are destined to be restored to more than their ancient prosperity by the poor Coolies of the East. *Ex Oriente Lux.* Eastern India is fast giving to her Western sister a thriving and industrious laboring population, and this is only the West Indian want. Lack of capital still prevents the importation of Coolies into all the colonies, but in those where the experiment has been honestly tried—as in the Mauritius, Demarara, and Trinidad—the scheme has been wonderfully successful. Within a few years, the cultivation of sugar has so greatly increased that the exports of these colonies have multiplied literally a hundred fold."

For the National Era.

ON THE DEATH OF DR. G. BAILEY.

BY SARAH FAUSETT.

A wail from the temple of Freedom,
Where labored the toiler true hearted;
A mourning from brave hearts arising,
But not for the noble departed!
We may mourn for one false to the promise
Of youth, that the world's breath has blighted;
For life structures crumbled and broken,
Souls darkened, no more to be lighted.

We may mourn for one fallen forever;
Lost truth, wasted lives, darkened vision;
But not for one only gone homeward,
Not for him who fulfilled the life mission.
Can we mourn for the honored, the noble,
Who passed with his manhood untainted?
Who, strong in the strength of the Father,
Not once in the weary way fainted?

Who unwavering stood in the conflict,
Fearlessly error's shrines shattered,
Silently, trustingly, bravely,
'Truth's seeds o'er the wilderness scattered?
Whose life was an anthem uprising,
Whose echoes the world shall hush never;
Calling us onward and upward,
It shall live and swell onward forever.

We may mourn, but not for the freed one,
Who from daybreak to morning passed only;
Mourn for the place he left vacant,
Mourn for the loved ones left lonely.
Shall the life song he chanted grow fainter,
And die in the tumult so weary?
Shall his footsteps be lost in the darkness,
When night o'er the valley lies dreary?

No; for great hearts in the life march,
Where darkest the shadows are lying,
Shall, note by note, answer that chorus,
Shall in deeds give an echo undying.
The footprints are bright where he wandered,
Undimmed in the dreariest even,
A pathway of life on the hillside,
Reaching up from our vision to Heaven!

A thousand souls groping in darkness,
A thousand lives blindly bowed lowly,
Shall ascend by the light of those footprints,
To life's far shining summits and holy.
Then honor the noble departed,
Not dead, only higher ascended;
Gone as a victor goes homeward,
Crowned, for the conflict is ended!

THE KANSAS CONSTITUTION.

The labors of the Constitutional Convention which assembled at Wyandotte have been terminated, as we have heretofore announced. The following are the principal features of the Constitution. The State will include an area of sixty-five thousand square miles, bounded on the east by Missouri, on the south by the 27th parallel of latitude, on the north by the 40th parallel, and on the west by the 23d meridian west of Washington. This cuts off the western half of the Territory, including the Pike's Peak region. The State will be a regular parallelogram, 310 miles long from east to west, by 210 in width from north to south.

The bill of rights reiterates the Declaration of Independence, that "all men are created equal," &c., and the Constitution prohibits Slavery in the usual form of words. Only one vote was cast against this clause in the Convention, viz: that of a Mr. Forman, of Doniphan county, who, it seems, was also a member of the Lecompton fraudulent Convention. Doubtless there were other so-called Democrats in the Convention, who would have voted with him if they had dared to do so.

The legislative power is to be vested in a Senate composed of 23 members, and a House of Representatives composed of 75 members. The Senate is to be elected for two years, and the House annually:

"*Elections.*—All elections by the people shall be by ballot, and all elections by the Legislature shall be *viva voce.*

"The general elections shall be held annually on the first Monday after the first Tuesday in November, until otherwise provided by law.

"*Suffrage.*—Every white male person of twenty-one years and upwards, belonging to either of the following classes, who shall have resided in Kansas six months next preceding any election, and in the township or ward in which he offers to vote at least ten days next preceding such election, shall be deemed a qualified elector at such election.

"1, Citizens of the United States; 2, persons of foreign birth who shall have declared their intention to become citizens conformably to the laws of the United States on the subject of naturalization."

EXTRAORDINARY LETTER FROM GOVERNOR WISE.

The following letter from Governor Wise to some person whose name is not given, has made its appearance in the New York *Herald*. The letter was evidently intended to be strictly private, and the person to whom it was addressed has been guilty of unpardonable negligence or bad faith towards his frank and confiding correspondent.

This letter will probably damage Governor Wise's prospects for the Presidential nomination more than any one of his numerous epistolary productions, although the shortest of them all. The game of politics, like the game of brag, requires a degree of coolness, assurance, and secrecy, which we fear Gov. Wise is wofully deficient in:

RICHMOND, *July* 13, 1859.

DEAR SIR: I thank you for yours of the 8th inst. I have apprehended all along that the Tammany Regency would carry a united delegation from New York to Charleston. For whom? Douglas, I know, is confident; but you may rely on it that Mr. Buchanan is himself a candidate for renomination, and all his patronage and power will be used to disappoint Douglas and all other aspirants. Our only chance is to organize by districts, and either whip the enemy or send two delegations.

If that is done or not done, we must still rely on a united South. A united South will depend on a united Virginia, and I pledge you that she, at least, shall be a unit. Virginia a unit, and persistent and firm on a sound platform of protection, to all persons of popular *vs.* squatter sovereignty, she must rally to her support all the South. The South cannot adopt Mr. Douglas's platform. It is a short cut to all the ends of Black Republicanism. He then will kick up his heels. If he does or don't, he can't be nominated, and the main argument against his nomination is, that he can't be elected if nominated. If he runs an Independent candidate, and Seward runs, and I am nominated at Charleston, I can beat them both. Or, if squatter sovereignty is a plank of the platform at Charleston, and Douglas is nominated, the South will run an independent candidate on protection principles, and run the election into the House. Where, then, would Mr. Douglas be? The lowest caudidate on the list. If I have the popular strength you suppose, it will itself fix the nomination. Get that, and I am confident of success.

The Hon. F. Wood is professedly, and really, I believe, a friend, and of course I would, in good faith, be glad of his influence, and would do nothing to impair it, and could not justly reject his kind aid; but you may rely upon it that I am not completely, nor at all, in the hands of Mr. Wood, or of any man who breathes. He has always been friendly to me, and I am to him, but always on fair and independent terms. There is nothing in our relations which should keep aloof any friend of either. He knows as well as any one can tell him, that his main influence is in the city of New York, and I judge what you say of his country influence is correct. But I am counting all the time without New York, and I don't fear the result. I am depending solely upon open position of principle, independent of all cliques, and defying all comers. We will overwhelm opposition in Virginia, and her vote will be conservative and national.

At all events, I shall always be glad to hear from you, and am yours, truly,

HENRY A. WISE.

We learn that the last Legislature of Texas contained thirteen "men of mark." Not one of them could write his name.

THE REVIEW.

The Roman Question. By Edmond About. New York: D. Appleton & Co. For sale by Taylor & Maury, Penn avenue.

The author of this little work has long been known to the novel reading community as a brilliant and entertaining writer. But in "*La Grèce Contemporaine*" and the present work he has won more enduring laurels.

In "The Roman Question" the author enters into a thorough and searching examination of the Government of the Papal States, and holds up with unsparing hand the various abuses practiced at Rome and throughout the Pope's dominions. The picture of the depravity and corruption of the Papal System is most graphically drawn, and the Roman Hierarchy is shown in all its native ugliness. It is not too much to say that this is the most entertaining and instructive book yet written on the Italian question, and we can cordially commend it to our readers.

The Romance of a Poor Young Man. By Octave Feuillet. New York: Rudd & Carleton. For sale by Franck Taylor, Washington, D. C.

A young man of noble birth has an extravagant father, who dies and leaves him penniless, with a sister, much younger than himself, to support. The sister is placed in a convent, and the young man under an assumed name becomes bailiff to a wealthy family in Brittany. In this family is a beautiful girl of seventeen, the heiress of the house. And now the affections come into play. We have a case of concealed love, with all the usual concomitants—a little fighting—some sweet speeches, and a great many soliloquies—to end, of course, in marriage.

But this happy consummation comes only when the young man has, by almost a miracle, come to the possession of an estate more than equal to that of the young heiress. This event is the moral of the story, if it can be said to have one. Business must be considered in every proper marriage, even by writers of romance. The fundamental idea of a French marriage is equality of fortune; and, unfortunately for the happiness of mankind, that idea is not peculiar to France. The book is an amusing one, and serves very well to beguile an idle hour.

THE PEACE.

The terms of the peace between France and Austria were not at the last dates settled. It is remarkable that Sardinia, though her possessions are to be enlarged, is not permitted to participate in the negotiations for peace. By the last advices, it seems that Austria peremptorily refuses to treat with Sardinia. This is