many others. It is true, also, that this class of girls come nearer getting the money they earn, than others, who make a poorer appearance. For these shrewd, money-getting men, in their heartlessness, oppress those who seem most friendless and most needy. Yes, the very ones that they should (if they were men with souls, and worshipped any other God than money) be most kind and just to, if any difference was made, always fare worse at their hands.

I have in this humble way endeavored to show some facts, and seek some redress for a class that really needs the sympathy of every honest heart, though I have only shown one drop of the ocean of injustice that the work girls of the city experience weekly, and are compelled to submit to. Alas! How true it is that

"Man's inhumanity to man
Makes countless thousands mourn."

I have been at work several years, and know what I write to be true. Yet I, myself, have not felt these acts of injustice near so much as I know many others have. And here let me say, that up to my sixteenth year I went to the public schools that our city is so blessed with, and may say that I have had advantages (which perhaps though I've poorly improved) before I went out to work as a "sewing girl," and that now, while at work, I only pay my beloved aunt half price for board, and when I am out of employ, she in her kindness boards me for nothing but what service I render her in housekeeping affairs. But how few there are, comparatively, that have these advantages, and how many who, just as soon as they are out of work, and are unable to pay, are often turned out of their boarding-house into the street, to their everlasting ruin! My heart is so full that I cannot express what I feel, or tell what I know; but if you will do an act of noble kindness, for which many a poor girl will ever thank you and bless you, as it may tend to arouse to a sense of justice some in this city who profess to worship the God of Isaac and Jacob; also some others, who profess to believe in and worship the blessed Redeemer. This is most respectfully sent by SUSAN LEE,

*A Sewing Girl.*

## SPEECH OF MR. SHERMAN IN REPLY TO MR. CLARK OF MISSOURI.

*Friday, January* 20, 1860.

Mr. Clark, of Missouri, having said that Mr. Sherman had had two opportunities of explaining his connection with the Helper book—

Mr. Sherman. I will say that that opportunity has never been rendered to me. When the gentleman introduced his resolution, offensive in its character, at an improper time, in an improper manner, he cut off—what he says now he desires to give—an opportunity for explanation. It is true, that, three days afterwards, when the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Millson] appealed to me, I stated to him frankly how my name became connected with that paper. I did not sign the paper; but it seems that Hon. E. D. Morgan, a member of the last Congress, and a friend of mine, came to me when I was in my place, and asked me to sign a recommendation for the circulation of a political pamphlet, to be compiled by a committee, of which Mr. Blair, a slaveholder of Missouri, was one, from a large book by Helper, a North Carolinian. I said to him that I had not time to examine the book; but if there was nothing offensive in it, he might use my name. Thereupon, this gentleman attached my name to that paper. This information I did not have at the time the gentleman from Virginia addressed me; but I said to him I had no recollection of having signed the paper, but presumed I had, from my name appearing in the printed list. I subsequently acquired it from Mr. Morgan, whose letter was published. That, I believe, was sufficient, under the circumstances. I know there are members on that side of the House who have considered it as satisfactory, and my friends so regard it. At the time, I stated that I had not read the book, that I did not know what was in it.

The gentleman alludes to another time. The other day, when this subject was again brought before the House by him, in language which, although he claims to be courteous, I could not regard as such, when I was, by implication, but with a disclaimer of personal offence, charged with disseminating treason, with lighting the torch in the dwelling of my Southern brethren, and with crimes of which, if I was guilty, I should not be entitled to a seat upon this floor, I then rose in my place, and told the gentleman from Missouri that if he would withdraw that resolution I would answer this book page by page, or those extracts one by one, and tell him whether I approved them or not. The gentleman refused to withdraw the resolution. Long ago he was notified by me, and my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morris] announced on the floor that his resolution was regarded by me as a menace, and, if withdrawn, would lead to a frank avowal or disavowal. I say now, Mr. Clerk, that I do not believe it is the desire of the honorable gentleman to give me that opportunity. If he does desire it, I am willing to do now what I said I would have done then. And I say, with equal emphasis, that never, so help me God, whether or not the Speaker's chair is to be occupied by me, will I do so while that resolution is before this body, undisposed of. I regard it as offensive in its tone, unprecedented, unparliamentary, and an invasion of the rights of representation. Under the menace clearly contained in it, I never will explain a single word contained in those extracts. [Applause from the Republican benches and the gallery.] If the gentleman will withdraw his resolution, even for a moment, to relieve me from the menace—he may reinstate it afterwards if he chooses—I will then say what I have to say in regard to those extracts. But while it stands before the House, intended as a stigma upon me, and sustained by an argument without precedent in parliamentary history, he cannot expect me to say more than I have done. I believe not only my friends, but the gentlemen on the other side of the House, who have a sense of honor, believe that my position is correct. I know that some of them regard my statement made on the third day of the session as full and satisfactory, and all that, under the circumstances, it was proper for me to indicate.

For gentlemen now to press this matter; to agitate the country; to spread these extracts all over the South, and to charge the sentiments of this book upon me and upon my associates here; to proclaim, day after day, that the Republicans entertain these sentiments and endorse them, is not that ingenuous, candid, and manly course, which a great party like the Democratic party ought to pursue. While we may conduct our political quarrels with heat, and discuss matters with zeal and determination, it ought to be done with fairness and frankness. The mode in which this resolution has been pressed before the country, and I, with my hands tied and my lips sealed as a candidate, have been arraigned, day by day, is without a precedent, not only in history, but in party caucuses, in State Legislatures, in State Conventions, or anywhere else.

Mr. Clerk, I said, when I rose the other day, that my public opinions were on record. I say so now. Gentlemen upon the other side have said that they have examined that record to ascertain what my political opinions were. They will look in vain for anything tending to excite insurrection, to disturb the peace, to invade the rights of the States, to alienate the North and South from each other, or to loosen the ties of fraternal fellowship by which our people have been, and should be, bound together. I am for the Union and the Constitution, with all the compromises under which it was formed, and all the obligations which it imposes. This has always been my position; and these opinions have been avowed by me on this floor, and stand now upon your records. Who has brought anything from that record against me that is worthy of answer?

It is true that the other day one gentleman did say I objected to the introduction of a bill. So I did; but, when the gentleman who introduced the bill made what I conceived to be a satisfactory explanation, I withdrew it. That was all I could do, and that it was proper for me to do. And, sir, the country will take notice that that is the only accusation made against me while I have been a candidate for Speaker before this House. If there be any others, bring them forward.

Mr. Hindman. As I am the Democrat referred to by the member from Ohio, will he permit me to refresh his recollection as to some other points which I made in regard to his record? I charged the gentleman with having previously advocated upon this floor the exclusion of slavery by Congressional legislation from certain Territories. I charged him with having avowed his intention to oppose the admission of new slaveholding States into this Confederacy. I charged him with having branded the fugitive slave law, an act based upon the Constitution of his country, as a savage and inhuman law. I charged him with having stigmatized a domestic institution of the Southern States of this Union as an injury to the master and a crime against the slave. Those matters are yet to be met by the gentleman, and I call his attention to them.

Mr. Sherman. In other words, I am charged with being a Republican. That is my offence; none other. I have never sought to invade the rights of the Southern States. I have never sought to trample upon the rights of citizens of the Southern States. I have my ideas about slavery in the Territories, and at the proper time and in the proper way I am willing to discuss the question. I never made but one speech on the subject of slavery, and that was in reference to what I regarded as an improper remark made by President Pierce in 1856. I then spread upon the record my opinions on the subject, and I have found no man to call them into question. They are the opinions of the body of the Republicans. They are the opinions which I now entertain. Gentlemen are at liberty to discuss these questions as much as they choose, and I will bear my share of the responsibility for entertaining these opinions.

But I now speak to my personal record.

Mr. Hindman. Will the gentleman allow me before he proceeds further?

Mr. Sherman. The gentleman will excuse me. Again: these gentlemen, while publishing in their speeches all over the country that I am, in effect, a traitor, &c., by implication, it is true, disavowing, as I am glad to say each of them have done, any design to be personally offensive, but in a way that answers the same purpose; yet, when called upon to show proofs or specifications, they fail to do so; and the only act for which I have been arraigned before the American people is that, in a moment when I was sitting here, busy at my desk, and one of my friends, and late a member of this House, came to me and asked me to sign a paper recommending the publication of a political tract; that, when I authorized my name to be put to that recommendation, by that very act I became a traitor, and would place the torch in the hands of the incendiary. I say this is not fair argument. And I again repeat that, if my friend from Missouri [Mr. Clark] desires to know what my sentiments are in regard to the extracts read at the Clerk's table, the only portion of the Helper book I have seen or read, I will give them if he will remove a menace from me. I never did do anything under menace. I never will. It is not in my blood, and these gentlemen cannot put it there. [Applause from the Republican benches and the galleries.]

Mr. Clark, of Missouri, sought the floor.

Mr. Sherman. The gentleman will excuse me. I have, so far as I am concerned in this contest, been quiet and patient. I desire to see an organization of the House opposed to the Administration. I think it is our highest duty to investigate, to examine, and analyze the mode in which the executive powers of this Government have been administered for a few years past. That is my desire. Yes, sir, I said here, in the first remark I made, that I did not believe the slavery question would come up at all during this session. I came here with the expectation that we would have a business session, that we would examine into the business affairs of this Government, and that we would analyze the causes of the increased expenditures of the Government, and the proper measures of redress and retrenchment. I did not believe that the slavery question would come up; and, but for the unfortunate affair of Brown at Harper's Ferry, I did did not believe there would be any feeling on the subject. Northern members came here with kindly feelings, no man approving the foray of John Brown, and every man willing to say so; every man willing to admit it as an act of lawless violence. We came here hoping that, at this time of peace and quiet, we might examine, inquire into, and pass upon practical measures of legislation tending to harmonize the conflicting elements of the Government, and strengthen the bonds of union. The interests of a great and growing people present practical questions enough to tax the ability and patriotism of us all.

Such was our duty; but the moment we arrived here—before, sir, we had even a formal vote—this question of slavery was raised by the introduction of the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri. It has had the effect of exciting the public mind with an irritating controversy. It has impaired the public credit, and retarded the public business. The debate founded upon it has been unjust, offensive, wrong, not only to the Republicans here, not only to those with whom I act, but to all our common constituents, North and South. The gentlemen who have advocated that resolution have stirred up bad blood, and all because certain gentlemen have recommended that a compilation be made of a book. Even yet we may retrieve the loss of valuable time. We could now go to work, organize this House, and administer the powers of this House with fairness and impartiality.

In conclusion, let me say, that by no act or effort have I sought the position I now occupy before the House. The honor was tendered me by the generous confidence and partiality of those with whom it has been my pride to act, politically. Their conduct in this irritating controversy has justified my attachment.

If I shall ever reach the Speaker's chair, it will be with untrammeled hands, and with an honest purpose to discharge every duty in the spirit which the oath of office enjoins; and to organize the House with reference to the rights and interests of every section, the peace and prosperity of the Union, and the efficient discharge of all the business of the Government. And whenever the friends, who have so gallantly and liberally sustained me thus far, believe that my name in any way presents an obstacle to success, it is my sincere wish they should adopt some other. Whenever any one of my political friends can combine a greater number of votes than I have been honored with, or sufficient to elect him by a majority or plurality rule, I will not stand in this position one hour; I will retire from the field, and yield to any other gentleman with whom I act, the barren honors of the Speaker's chair; and I promise my friends a grateful recognition of the unsolicited honor conferred upon me, and a zealous and earness co-operation. [Applause from the Republican benches and the galleries.]

## CASSIUS M. CLAY'S SPEECH.

The following account of the able speech of Mr. Clay, at Frankfort, is from a Whig and proslavery paper published in that city. It will be read with interest.

From the Frankfort Commonwealth.

CAPT. CLAY'S SPEECH.

According to notice previously given, Capt. C. M. Clay addressed a large audience of Kentuckians from the steps of the Capitol on Tuesday night, the hall of the House of Representatives having been closed. He was respectfully and courteously listened to, and had no reason to complain of those present in any particular. All expectations of personal violence, or any description of indignity, if anything of the kind was expected, were fortunately disappointed; the fair fame of the capital of chivalrous old Kentucky was not sullied by brutal and cowardly mob violence; nor can it be said that slaveholders shrink from the arguments of the enemies of their institutions. And, indeed, there was nothing in the speech of Mr. Clay to which the most ultra pro-slavery man might not have listened without feeling that his self-respect had been violated; for while the speaker forcibly and fearlessly proclaimed his determined opposition to the institution, his sentiments were avowed without insult to those who differed with him. The speech was a moderate one in tone and language, and dictated, we thought, by a conciliatory spirit. It was an attempt, in many respects successful, to show how and wherein the Republican party had been misrepresented by Governor Magoffin and Senator Breckinridge, and to place the principles of that organization in what he believed to be their true light before the people of Kentucky. Mr. Clay has generally been regarded an ultra anti-slavery man, as he certainly is, yet there were few that heard him who, while widely differing even from the comparatively moderate doctrines asserted in his speech, did not concede that if Mr. Clay represented truly the principles of the Republicans, they were not quite so desperate a set of scamps as they had been led to believe. He denied all affiliation with, or endorsement of, the views of John G. Fee and the Abolitionists of Berea settlement, but at the same time denied the rumors that he had justified their removal from their homes in Madison county; his position was one of perfect neutrality between them and the gentlemen who gave them warning to leave.

He condemned the John Brown raid, and challenged the world to prove that a solitary Republican was engaged in it, directly or indirectly. The party with which he acted were opposed to any intermeddling with slavery in the States where it exists, either by the action of the Federal Government, or by the people of the North; and regarded all such interference as officious and unwarranted by justice or the Constitution. Each State was sovereign over its own affairs, and had the right to settle the question for itself. The doctrine of the Republican party, upon which he planted himself, is, to prevent by all legal means the extension of slavery into free Territories, and in none of their platforms had they declared themselves in favor of the repeal of the fugitive slave law. He would vote for Seward, Chase, John Bell, Edward Bates, and most heartily for John J. Crittenden, of Kentucky.

It would be unjust to Mr. Clay, were we to attempt to give a synopsis of his remarks, as his speech will be published in full in a few days. There was nothing approximating an incendiary idea in his speech; and while we regard his views as heretical, and, if carried out, calculated to excite bad feeling and to produce mischief, yet we cannot think that the fact of the speech being made in Frankfort will result in harm. On the contrary, it is as well that the erroneous impressions concerning the designs of the dominant party in the North should be corrected, in order that the South, attributing to them ends and aims which they have not in view, may not act hastily or without fully comprehending what their opponents really desire.

From the Christian Inquirer.

## OVERCOME EVIL WITH GOOD.

It has been pithily said, that to return evil for good is like devils; evil for evil, like beasts; good for good, like men; but that to return good for evil is like God and like Christ. For God sent his Son, while we were yet sinners, to save us; and that Son prayed for his crucifiers, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Is it not strange that this pure and divine sun-heat of benevolence has melted so superficially the frost-bound earth, and that hate, force, and blood, are still, to such a lamentable extent, the legal currency of even the Christian realms and States? Modern Great Britain is the only nation, thus far, that seems to understand—at home, at least, whatever she may do abroad—how to reform her own institutions without revolution, to build up *while* pulling down, and to adopt the sublime conservatism of nature, and the unceasing renovation of Providence. We do not account for this steady march of improvement by the mere interpenetration of humane and Christian sentiments in the Court, Cabinet, and Councils of the fast-anchored isle; but also largely to that sound common sense which is a signal Anglo-Saxon element. But, however it comes, it is a national method of great merit, and is worthy of admiration and adoption.

For, if we will really consider it, to reform evil with evil, to write the laws of God in blood, to use compulsion in bringing men to do right, to argue with hate and bad feeling, to help one class by injuring another class, to resort to vengeance, and to seek to give energy to the Gospel of Truth and Love, the only final renovater of society, by the use of carnal weapons, is the same sort of mismatching of means and ends that it would be to attempt to employ a steam engine to educate the human mind, or to screw on a torpedo to our parlor grate to warm our apartments. For moral ends there must be moral instruments; for the correction of evil, the potent medicine of good; for the conquest of error, the victorious power of truth; and for the elevation of society to a Christian platform, the Archimedean leverage of Christian ideas and sentiments. We cannot fight evil successfully with evil, or drive out darkness by darkness, or overcome selfishness and sin with hatred, wrath, and evil-speaking. We know well the temptation to resort to satire, denunciation, and ridicule, against the abuses and follies of mankind; but they are sharp-edged tools, dangerous to handle, and that return to plague the inventor. We have conquered our opponent, not when we have got the best of the argument, or put him so palpably and decisively in the wrong that he is stung to madness by his defeat; but we mine and undermine the heaviest fortress of wrong, oppression, and wickedness, when we surround it with the circumvallations of love, and besiege it with the hosts of good intent.

We know how ridiculous such counsel of resistance or of non-resistance appears to most men; how little faith they have in moral means or moral suasion, and how much confidence they repose in the bloody arbitrament of arms. But the history of the world reveals how coarse, ineffectual, and *mal apropos*, the devil's engines are to do the Lord's work.

These remarks are, we believe, not untimely. The destiny of our country, with a promise such as the world never before saw for magnificence, involves perils as vast and impending as its promise. Terrible wrongs and evils are compounded with invincible elements of good. The nation heaves with the fermentation of tremendous mixtures of acid and alkali, and the rumble of earthquakes and volcanoes runs under our feet. Liberty and slavery are steadily drawing nearer, as all men cannot but see, now for these forty years, to wrestle for the final mastery. It is a doom that cannot be averted. It is written in history, and foreshadowed in prophecy. But if we are true to ourselves, as individuals and as a nation, and keep on the divine plane of action of overcoming evil with good, we may even work out of this knotty problem a brilliant truth, and develop a nobler and manlier national soul by the conflicts that have knit our bones and toughened our sinews. We see no cause of panic. We do not believe, and never shall till our eyes see the catastrophe, that slavery or any other cause can dismember this Republic, and convert us into the fratricides of Mexico and South America. There is too much good sense, English pluck, and Christian principle and feeling, to allow it to be done. The crisis can be used (and every year we have a crisis in this country) to give a higher tone to our civilization, a more generous nationality, a richer and broader brotherhood.

But not in wrath, and clamor, and evil-speaking; not by force of arms; not by war, and bloodshed, and insurrection, can the great boon of freedom and peace be secured. God's work requires to be done in God's spirit. Ever so little of truth is, in such a warfare, worth ever so much of windy eloquence. Ever so faint a breath of love opens the gates of wrong more effectually than ever so fierce a storm of hate. The fable of the sun and wind is in point. We are non-resistants so far as this, that we do not believe that by insurrection, and revolution, and the violent measures of political *bouleversement*, the bolts of ruin can be drawn out of these black and threatening clouds, and the nation set forward on its great career. But we do believe in the well-nigh omnipotent power of love, for this, we know, is the very nature of God; and it is on this principle that He has formed the world, ordained its laws, inspired its children, and decreed its destinies. He, therefore, who acts, speaks, counsels, plans, and lives, in this Godlike and Christlike spirit of love and boundless good will, and never allows the foul sediment of anger and malice to be stirred up in his lower nature, is not a non-resistant to evil in the sense of not resisting it at all, because he does not use force of arms and rough external appliances, and kill his fellow-men; but he is all the more effective and angelic resistant and conqueror of evil, because he uses the nimble and all-subduing weapons of God Almighty. Armed with the artillery of love and benevolence, he can attack and overthrow idolatry, despotism, slavery, war, intemperance, and every evil and every sin known to man. What is ever needed most imperatively of all things, therefore, is, in addition to true wisdom, more of real good will and sincere desire to do right, and to act the brotherly part, and never to lose faith in the duty, ability, and glory, of working for the good of man in the spirit of the Creator himself. In other words, what is needed is simply more of the spirit of Christ. "He," said Channing, "who in debate does not lose his temper, nor allow any feeling of ill will to arise towards his opponent, is always master of the position." The same is true of the greater contests of systems and communities. The victory is ever with right, and truth, and God-abounding love—if not to-day or to-morrow, yet in the end. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

A NEGRO SENTENCED TO DEATH FOR ASSISTING A SLAVE TO ABSCOND.—*Charleston Jan.* 28.—Francis Mitchell, a porter of the steamship Marion, was to-day sentenced to be hung on the 2d of March, for assisting a slave in his attempt to leave the State on said steamer.

The railways now being constructed in Spain exceed one thousand miles in length.—*American Railway Review.*

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

Messrs. Pettingill & Co., S. B. 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. Innis, Salem, Mass.; Thomas Wheeler, Cincinnati, Ohio; L. T. Park, Mount Union, Ohio; Joseph Hughes, Philadelphia, Pa.

# WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1860.

☞ All letters for the *National Era* must be addressed to MRS. M. L. BAILEY, *National Era, Washington, D. C.*

The Index to Volume XIII of the *Era* is now ready, and will be furnished, free of charge, to any subscriber who may express a desire to have a copy.

## TUESDAY IN CONGRESS.

In the Senate, after the morning business, Mr. Hunter, of Va., spoke at considerable length upon the bill for the protection of the States against invasion.

The House, after several dilatory motions, proceeded to ballot for Speaker, which resulted as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Whole number of votes cast | 233 |
| Necessary to a choice | 117 |
| Of which Mr. Pennington received | 116 |
| Mr. McClernand | 91 |
| Scattering | 26 |

A motion was then made to adjourn, which motion was lost. Subsequently the Republicans agreed to an adjournment, with the distinct understanding that the other side would consent to a ballot in the morning.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS. — The Republican members of the House of Representatives held a caucus on Saturday last, in compliance with a call made by Mr. Sherman on the Friday previous, on the floor of the House. It is understood that Mr. Sherman withdrew his name, and that an understanding was arrived at to vote for Mr. Pennington, of New Jersey, which, as the reader will see, was done on Monday.

THE FRIENDS OF THE FOREIGN-BORN CITIZENS.—The Sham Democracy have again evinced their preference for the negro to the Irishman and German. In vain will they attempt to whitewash the vote given on Monday last, for Mr. W. N. H. Smith, of North Carolina, and to set up the plea that he is an Old-Line Whig, and not a Know Nothing. The question is, not whether Mr. Smith has ever joined a Know Nothing lodge, but whether he sympathizes in the peculiar views of that party, and whether he was not elected to Congress in consequence of his "American" principles? Can it be denied that Mr. Smith has taken ground in favor of an extension of the term of naturalization? That is the question!

It is true that he is an Old-Line Whig, but it is well known that nearly all the Old-Line Whigs who have co-operated with the American party have adopted their principles. John Bell, we believe, has never joined a Know Nothing lodge, but he has made strong "American" speeches. We had always heard Mr. Smith classed among the "Americans," and we have no doubt that he is as fully committed to their principles as any follower of the dark lantern. The dodge of denying that he is a member of the order will not do. The Northern Democracy have recorded their votes in favor of a man of "American" principles for Speaker, and they will in vain attempt to shirk the responsibility.

LETTER FROM MR. BOTTS.—The Hon. John M. Botts has written an able letter, in reply to members of the Legislature, upon the politics of the day, and traces the agitations and excitements of the times to the reckless demagogism of the Sham Democracy. He says that the remedy is a return to the principles of the framers of the Constitution, which neither gave to Congress the power to legislate slavery into the Territories, nor authorizes the South to force it upon them by lawless violence. On the contrary, he justly states that the framers of the Constitution excluded slavery from all the territory under their control. Mr. Botts insists upon the enforcement of the fugitive slave law, but he is willing that it shall be so modified as to remove from it well-founded objections.

HARK FROM THE TOOMBS!—Mr. Toombs, of Georgia, made one of the most fierce, fiery, and portentous demonstrations in the Senate on Tuesday of last week that that body has yet listened to. He denounced not only individuals, but whole States, without discrimination. His language and the intonations of his voice were in admirable keeping with the gloomy ferocity which seems to be his governing sentiment. We should not have felt surprised if this Southern Boanerges had called down fire and brimstone, or called it up, to consume the enemies of slavery. As an orator, Mr. Toombs belongs to the school of the Rev. Melchizedeck Howler, and his sepulchral notes are well calculated to make timid people shudder and quake.

SUPERSERVICEABLE.—Mr. Douglas bids high for Southern support. In his bill for the protection of the South against invasion, he has gone further than such men as Jefferson Davis can follow him; and we see that some of the most ultra pro-slavery presses are protesting against his bill as an invasion of State rights. Mr. Douglas was determined to cut under the President, at any rate, and has succeeded in disgusting the genuine lovers of slavery by his readiness to atone for past offences.

PROTESTANTISM IN ITALY.—One of the most auspicious signs of the times is the progress of Protestantism in Italy. There can be little doubt that the revolutionary spirit in that country owes its vitality to the under-current of free thought in religious matters which has for a long time been in motion; and now that the Italians enjoy some degree of political freedom, the Protestant feeling begins to manifest itself in the public sale of the Bible, and worship of God after Protestant ideas. It is said that the people of Florence, to the number of five hundred, meet together every Sunday, to study the Scriptures. Whole villages have been converted to Protestantism, and are known as Protestant. The new Government of Tuscany seems determined to preserve the freedom of public worship, in spite of the priesthood. This reformation in religion, it may be hoped, will go on, until the last stronghold of error, ignorance, and superstition, is overthrown. It is the star of hope to Europe, without whose guidance political revolutions can only result in the useless destruction of human life. Civil liberty cannot coexist with spiritual despotism; and the converse of the proposition is equally true, that political despotism cannot subsist in conjunction with religious freedom.

THE WISE CONSPIRACY IN 1856.—At a recent Union meeting in Knoxville, Tenn., Judge Bailey, formerly of Georgia, made a speech, in noticing which, the *Whig* of that city remarks:

"The Judge made one startling disclosure, which was new to us all. He said, that during the Presidential contest, Gov. Wise had addressed letters to all the Southern Governors, and that the one to the Governor of Florida had been shown to him, in which Wise said that *he had an army in readiness to prevent Fremont from taking his seat, if elected*, and asking the co-operation of those to whom he wrote!"

## TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE—THE NAPOLEON PAMPHLET.

The signs of the times indicate that the temporal power of the Pope is hastening to its termination. It has long been known that his Holiness has lost all moral power over the people who are under his immediate government, and that but for the presence of foreign armies his subjects would be in open rebellion against his authority. The Pope is said to be, personally, an amiable and benevolent man, but his Government, in the hands of a corrupt priesthood, is an unmitigated and insupportable despotism. No sooner was war declared by France and Sardinia against Austria, than the subjects of the Pope in his more northern provinces, in common with those of Tuscany, Lombardy, and Parma, revolted, and set up a provisional government for themselves. The Austrian troops which had held them in subjection to the priestly tyranny being driven out, they have ever since maintained their independence of the Pope; and his temporal authority has since the war been confined to the city of Rome and the provinces south of it.

One of the most difficult questions to be adjusted by the proposed Peace Congress is that relating to the disposition to be made of these revolted subjects of the Pope. Are they to be reduced to their former subjection, or are they to be allowed to dispose of their own fortunes? Austria and the ultra Catholics, including those of this country, insist that the rights of a free people must be crushed under the iron heel of despotism, and that the province of Romagna must, at all hazards, and at any sacrifice of blood, be resubjugated.

In singular and most honorable contrast to this Austrain policy which Bishop Hughes and the Catholic priesthood of this country sustains, the Emperor of France, though an almost absolute monarch, insists that the people must be protected in their rights of self-government. A pamphlet has appeared in Paris, with the semi-official approbation of the Emperor, and which is believed to have emanated directly from him, in which this subject is discussed with masterly ability. We cannot praise the writer for directness and frankness, but a more adroit or more forcible presentation of the subject, in the difficult circumstances by which it is surrounded, we can scarcely conceive of. The Imperial author is all deference and reverence for the Holy Father and for Mother Church. He insists that the temporal power of the Pope must be maintained. An elaborate argument, more specious than solid or sincere, is offered in support of this proposition. "If the Pope were not a temporal sovereign," says the Imperial pamphleteer, "he would be either French, Spanish, Austrian, or Italian, and the title of his nationality would deprive him of his character as universal Pontiff. The Holy See would be nothing more than the stay of a throne at Paris, Vienna, or Madrid. It was so at a former period, and a successor of St. Peter had the misfortune to allow his authority to be absorbed in the 'Holy German Empire.'"

But the pamphlet goes on to define what the temporal power of the Pope should be; and the paradoxical position is laid down with apparent seriousness, that "the smaller the territory, the greater will be the sovereign." And again: "It is only possible, if exempt from all the ordinary conditions of power—that is to say, from everything that constitutes its activity, its development, its progress. It must exist without an army, without a Parliament, so to say, without a code of laws or a court of justice."

This temporal government should be confined to the city of Rome; and, in the same spirit of mockery, the pampleteer says, "but this sovereignty must not render it obligatory upon him to act a political part, for the Pontiff, instead of finding in this power a guaranty of independence, would find only a condition of servitude for himself, or a necessity of servitude for his people." And therefore "municipal liberties, as extensive as possible, should release the Papal Government from all the details of administration, and thus give a share of public local life to those who are disinherited of political activity." In other words, the temporal government of the Pope is to be nominal over the city of Rome, and real nowhere.

The real temporal advantage which the Napoleon pamphlet proposes to secure to the Pope is a handsome revenue, to be contributed by the Catholic Powers. His Holiness would do well to accept a composition in Peter's pence for the loss of his misgoverned provinces. It would be an almost intangible addition to the budgets of France, Austria, Spain, and the smaller Catholic States of Europe and America, to guaranty a far more splendid revenue to the Pope than he can raise by the severest system of taxation from the small provinces which have heretofore acknowledged his sway. "The city of Rome," says the pamphlet, "and the patrimony of St. Peter, must be guaranteed to the sovereign Pontiff by the great Powers, with a considerable revenue, that the Catholic States will pay, as a tribute of respect and protection to the Head of the Church. An Italian militia, chosen from the *elite* of the Federal army, should assure the tranquillity and inviolability of the Holy See."

It is admitted by the pamphlet that the Pope has a just title to Romagna and the other States of the Church, secured by the treaty of 1815. But what one treaty has given, another, for sufficient reasons, may take away. The Head of the Church has no armies which can reduce his revolted subjects to obedience, and, if he possessed the power, it would be highly derogatory to his character to exercise it. Who, then, shall do it for him? Shall France? "But she cannot do it. A Catholic nation, she would never consent to strike so serious a blow at the moral power of Catholicism. A liberal nation, she could not compel a people to submit to a Government which their will rejects." The pamphlet goes on to declare that "France is not used to such work," and to boast that, "under Louis XVI, we went to the New World, to help it to achieve its nationality. Belgium and the Danubian Principalities are indebted to us for their political existence. It is not the Emperor who could prove unfaithful to these generous traditions." And if France will not intervene, she will not let Austria do so. "And should we have run the risk of a great war, gained four victories, lost 50,000 men, spent three hundred millions, and shaken Europe, that Austria might, on the morrow of peace, resume in the peninsula the domination she exercised on the eve of her defeat?" "Should our soldiers have shed their blood in vain," and "should Magenta and Solferino only be trophies of contemporaneous history?" France, then, cannot intervene for the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope in the Romagna, and she cannot permit Austria to have recourse to force to compel the population to submission. Such is the manly and liberal view which the Emperor of France takes of the affairs of Italy and the papacy. It presents him in advantageous contrast with the Catholic bishops and clergy of this country, who, while they profess attachment to our system of republican liberty, are urging upon the Powers of Europe the re-subjugation of the Italians who have revolted against the odious tyranny of the Roman Pontiff. We trust that the Catholic laity in this country, like that of France and Italy, will revolt against the dictation of a priesthood whose cardinal maxim is, passive obedience to a foreign temporal despot.

It is alleged that the Pope and the Church claim no control over the consciences of the laity in temporal affairs. Here, then, is an opportunity to evince independence of priestly dictation, which, it is to be hoped, will be improved.

Before closing, we will give a few more brief extracts from the Napoleon pamphlet, which will serve to illustrate the spirit in which it is conceived. Louis Napoleon, as the monarch of France, is styled the eldest son of the Church, but it is evident that he has no exalted ideas of priestly rule. In showing the necessity of reducing the dominion of the Pope to the limits of Rome, he argues:

"In fact, a great State implies certain requirements which it is impossible for the Pope to satisfy. A great State would like to follow up the politics of the day, to perfect its institutions, participate in the general movement of ideas, take advantage of the transformation of the age, of the conquests of science, of the progress of the human mind. He cannot do it. *The laws will be shackled by dogmas. His authority will be paralyzed by traditions. His patriotism will be condemned by faith.* He must either resign himself to immobility, or rise even to revolt. The world will advance, and leave him behind. Then, of two things, one will happen—either everything will be extinguished in that people, and nothing will remain in it of the generous activity of public life, or else the noble aspirations of nationality will burst through, and it will become necessary, as we have witnessed already, for material force to supply the deficiencies of moral authority."

It would be difficult to find a stronger statement than this, of the fact that the age has outgrown the Church—that it has become a clog and a hindrance to civilization—and that the period has arrived when it behooves the great Powers of Europe to break the fetters of superstition which have bound the free thought and liberal activity of the people.

In proposing to restrict the temporal power of the Pope to the limits of Rome, in order to add to his dignity, the pampleteer lets off the following piece of solemn irony, which might excite the envy of Gibbon. It follows close upon the above quotation, in which the beauties of priestly rule are so graphically depicted. The writer says: "The existence may be admitted in Europe of a small corner of earth, free from the passions and interest which agitate other peoples, and devoted solely to the glory of God." * * * "After having given laws to the whole world, she can only retain her greatness by commanding souls. The Roman Senate has no other compensation worthy of it but the Vatican."

That this remarkable pamphlet is the production of the Emperor of France, or that it foreshadows his policy, we have not only the evidence of common opinion in well-informed circles in Europe, but the significant fact that Walewski, his Minister of Foreign Affairs, and cousin, was dismissed for denying that it emanated from the Emperor. His dismissal is said to have immediately followed his declaration that it could not be attributed to the Emperor while he remained in office.

The latest news from Europe, which will be found in our columns, goes to confirm the impression that France will vindicate the right of the Italians to liberty; and that the Pope will never have his lost possessions restored to him. The fact cannot be denied that Louis Napoleon, whose antecedents, and whose domestic Government, at the present moment, we alike disapprove, has acted on a large and liberal foreign policy, and we must accord to him, at least, a wise and sagacious selfishness, which appreciates and avails itself of the spirit of the age, if no higher motives. If France and Russia, the two greatest States of the European continent, must be ruled for the present by despots, we must regard it as providential that men like Louis Napoleon and Alexander, with intelligence to perceive the necessity of ameliorating the condition of the people, are chosen to direct their affairs; and that while the one is engaged in breaking the yoke of spiritual despotism, the other is employed in overthrowing that twin relic of barbarism, serfdom, or slavery.

## SOUTHERN PROSPERITY AND SOUTHERN POLITICS.

The Boston *Traveller* remarks:

"Of all people in the world, the slaveholders of the South have been in their business and in their pecuniary profits the most successful. Nothing like the magnitude of their large and continually increasing gains is known in the history of commerce and agriculture. The outturn of the cotton crop the present year will be enormous, and that, too, after having had last year the largest crop ever before known. The price at which it sells is very high, and the demand takes off the product as fast as it can be carried to market, while the Northern ships are taking it to market, as they will find at the close of the season, for less than the actual cost of transportation, as no return freights which will pay can be had. There is not much danger of disunion on the part of the South under such circumstances, for, with such palmy prosperity, it is unnatural to find either ill-nature or ferocity."

Unluckily for the logic of the *Traveller*, the ill-nature and ferocity" of the cotton-growers increases with their profits, and their threats of disunion go hand in hand with their success in planting. Whether their threats are serious, or only designed to frighten the North out of its opposition to the extension of slavery, is another question.

If the cotton growers knew which side their bread is buttered, their large profits would be a guaranty of good behaviour; for nothing is more certain than that disunion, if it were practicable, would be their undoing. A Southern Confederacy would impose burdens upon the people which they have never known within the Union, and would, after all, be inadequate to protect slavery against the insults and interventions of the great States of Europe and of the North.

Kenneth Rayner said, in the Legislature of North Carolina, eleven years ago, by way of dissuading that body from an ultra policy in regard to slavery: "Sir, the civilized world is against us." When will the slaveholders of the South learn this truth? When will they learn that the people of Europe are thorough-paced Abolitionists? The Southern politicians make a great mistake when they assume that all the commercial and manufacturing States of the world will still the voice of conscience in order to propitiate the cotton-growers. There can be no necessity for such a course. Cotton is a great product—a great staple of commerce—but the manufacturers and consumers are no more dependent upon it than the producers; and, indeed, no nation is so dependent upon the manufacture as the Gulf States are upon the growth of cotton. The whole cotton region would be rendered bankrupt by the failure to sell one crop, and the idea that Great Britain or France must abandon their hostility to slavery, in order to induce the slaveholders to sell an article which they must sell or become bankrupts, is simply childish absurdity. It is the very error of the moon.

The law which compels the planters to grow and to sell cotton to anybody who will buy, is as imperative as that which constrains the slave to delve, or to follow the plow. Indeed, the master has not even the poor privilege of running away, which the slave sometimes finds an opportunity to exercise.

Out of the Union, the South, as we have often said, would be the weakest country in the world, because one-third of its population, dispersed throughout its broad surface, are alien enemies, with no rights which the laws or customs of society respect, and no *amor patriæ*. The despotisms of Italy and Austria, which seem to totter to their fall, in consequence of the awakening spirit of liberty among the people, are in a happy condition compared with that of the South, if separated from the North. For the European despotisms, severe as they may be, recognise all classes as subjects, with acknowledged rights, entitled to equal protection; all are entitled to the fruits of their daily labors, and their chief complaints are, that the taxes are heavy, that the press is fettered, and that the liberty of speech is curtailed