

The Daily Era can be had every morning at the Periodical Stand of Mr. J. T. Bates, Exchange, Philadelphia; also, the Weekly Era.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1854.

SPEECHES OF MESSRS. SEWARD AND SUMNER.

The speech of Mr. Seward, published a few days since in the Era, and that of Mr. Sumner, which we close to-day, do credit to their high reputation, for scholarship, statesmanship, eloquence, political knowledge, wisdom, and integrity.

HON. MR. CRITTENDEN, OF KENTUCKY.

According to an accredited rumor in circulation in this city, this distinguished statesman has expressed his purpose of avowing, in a public manner, his hostility to the Nebraska-Kansas bill of Senator Douglas, on the ground of the continued binding obligations of the Missouri Compromise.

WHY AGGRESSIVE.

Conservative journals at the North, opposing the measure of Mr. Douglas for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, deplore the revival of an agitation, which they had fondly hoped was put at rest by the legislation of 1850.

Messrs. Smith and Everett, in the Senate, and gentlemen in the House, take care to accompany their opposition to the bill with disavowals of all sympathy with Abolitionism, and declarations of hostility to any excitement or discussion on the question of Slavery.

All this argues a lamentable ignorance of the nature and relations of Slavery. It shows that, notwithstanding the experience of more than half a century of the malign workings of this great social and political evil, notwithstanding the repeated sectional conflicts growing out of it, notwithstanding the philanthropic, ecclesiastical, and political movements in relation to it; after all the books written, the speeches made, and the resolves adopted concerning it, the popular mind generally has overlooked certain of its essential attributes, which render it inevitably a perpetual source of discord, danger, and agitation.

Now, it assails on the floor of Congress the right of petition, and proposes to subject the mails to inquisitorial examination. People become excited, indignant, but their wise men tell them that these offensive denunciations are merely the result of temporary resentment on the part of high-spirited gentlemen against the impertinent assaults of Abolitionists. A portion of Mexico is settled by American adventurers, who, in defiance of the local laws, establish Slavery; in process of time, they rebel, set up an independent Government, and, by a coup de main, ere the People of the United States have had time to say yea or nay, the new State takes its place as a member of the American Union, bringing an immediate accession to the Slave Power, with a provision for the undisturbed perpetuation of Slavery in a vast Territory, out of which four new States are to be formed.

The People are excited for a moment, are rather indignant that slaveholders should be so domineering and ambitious, but gratified on the whole by the augmentation of the nation's territory and resources, they look no further, and soon sink down into their accustomed apathy.

War is waged to acquire Territory for slaveholding purposes—the People are aroused, determined this time that Slavery shall not triumph. Sixteen Legislatures announce their resolve in the form of the Wilmot Proviso. A sharp struggle follows—the Proviso is abandoned—the Slave Power triumphs. Well, say they, what is done cannot be undone—everything is settled—at least in a finality—we shall have peace now.

Thus aggression follows aggression, each provoking a spirit of resistance, noisy and apparently vehement, but infirm and evanescent. In the end, the People give way before the steadfast purpose and concentrated energy of the Slave Interest, and resume their wonted occupations, without having learned wisdom by experience, or provided any safeguard against future aggression. The men who continue their resistance to Slavery as an ever-brooding element of mischief, they denounce as agitators, fanatics, monomaniacs, disturbers of the peace; and while they are thus setting their faces against agitation, the very Power which they imagine has been appeased by submission, is industriously plotting some new aggression upon their rights.

Will the Conservative men of the North, shocked at the breach of faith involved in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and yet alarmed at the idea of being found associated with the Anti-Slavery party in opposition to the movement, attend to a few considerations, which have hitherto escaped them?

Slavery is necessarily aggressive. This is the very law of its existence. It does not ask merely to be let alone—it demands homage and supremacy. Whatever its pretences about Non-Interference, it recognizes that policy only when intervention might interfere with its designs.

It is necessarily aggressive, for three reasons, which, always operating, render its aggressiveness unintermittent and perpetual.

1. It is an exception in our social and political system—an abnormal condition—which the general workings of our normal political and social institutions tend to reduce and ultimately remove.

The principles of Christianity proclaimed from the pulpit every Sabbath against it. Every other in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution, in every State of the Union is against it. Every set of

Government involving an assumption of the brotherhood of the human family, or an acknowledgment of the common origin of men, or a recognition of the rights and interests of the masses, is against it. To sympathize with Humanity anywhere, struggling against Despotism, to protest against unusual oppression in any country, to rescue a human being from the clutches of a foreign tyrant, is against it. All beneficent laws, all wise policies, all assertions of Democratic doctrines, are against it. Were it inert and passive, it would be swept away. This was the faith of the authors of the Federal Constitution. They knew that, in the system they were putting into operation, Liberty was the Rule, Slavery, the Exception—and they believed that the Rule would prevail, and the Exception cease. If we have not killed Slavery, was the remark of one of them, we have given it its death blow—it may linger for a time, but its doom is sealed.

But they overlooked another fact, of great importance in calculating the consequences of institutions, viz: that Exceptions sometimes become Laws. One vice will sap the foundation of many virtues. A single breach serves to let in a flood of evil. One exceptional Institution, driven by the instinct of self-preservation, to watch and work unceasingly against the general tendencies of the system of which it is a part, more than balances, at times, by its extraordinary action, the normal operation of that system. Those whose interests are identified with it, know that it can be maintained only by extreme vigilance and exertion. They anticipate threatened danger—they set themselves to work to counteract the spirit of the Constitution that barely tolerates it—they seek to appropriate to themselves the powers it confers, that they may shape them so as to strengthen, rather than weaken, their exceptional Institution. In this way, while the mass of the People are trusting quietly to the workings of Natural Laws, and the tendencies of a system generally conformed to them, without active exertions to enforce them, those few, sleepless, over-active supporters of an Institution which has been allowed simply as an Exception, are stealthily accumulating power, and changing the Exception to a general Law. The history of Slavery in connection with the Government of the United States proves this fact, which the Conservative opponents of Anti-Slavery agitation have entirely overlooked.

2. There is another reason for its aggressiveness, founded directly upon pecuniary interest. Slave Labor is generally wasteful and thriftless. The laborers are unintelligent and stupid, putting forth just enough brute energy, under coercion, for the performance of the tasks allotted them, but without interest in the proceeds of their own labor, and without stimulus to their inventive faculties, they never dream of devising labor-saving machinery, or of preserving the productive power of the soil they till. Besides, their labor is used chiefly in the growth of a few great staples, not for consumption upon the spot, but for exportation, for purposes of consumption in other regions. Thus, by a double process—reckless waste of productive power in the soil, and transportation to other climes of those products whose consumption would give back to the soil the vitality extracted from it—the system of Slave Labor is compelled constantly to seek an enlargement of its area. It can thrive only by constant accessions of new and virgin soil.

No labor-saving machinery, no amount of agricultural science or skill, no reform in the slave code, no change for the better in the habits of the planters, could have saved the British colonies from utter ruin under the system of slave culture. Without possibility of expansion, it had ceased to be profitable, and the planters had become overwhelmed with debt. Our Slavery is continental, not insular. Confined to its original limits, it would ere this have ceased to exist, or have undergone an essential change of character. In expansion, in accessions of new Territory, it has renewed its vitality, and maintained its rigorous nature.

Is a policy, necessary to its being, to be arrested by deceptive Compromises, or the lying resolves of Party Conventions, in favor of Finality? Slavery here, is continental, not insular, and is determined to keep open the Continent to its march. It finds Texas convenient, and annexes it; it believes a part of Mexico fit for its peculiar culture, and conquers it, although providentially that which it chiefly longed for has eluded its grasp. It sees some advantages in other portions, and proposes to buy them with the surplus in the Treasury. The Missouri Compromise is in the way, of establishing a Principle of Governmental Policy, which will give impunity to its schemes of acquisition Southwardly, and it demands its repeal. In all this, it is true to its instincts, acts in obedience to the law of its being. It never takes its eye from the object it aims at, never relaxes its purpose. Meantime, our Conservative friends, who are distressed whenever called upon to resist some signally flagrant aggression of this Power, suppose it to be something: out of the way, a very extraordinary, inexplicable thing, and as soon as the occasion passes, fold their hands and begin to talk in their sleep of the blessings of peace and harmony, and the mischief of agitation, never awaking to the truth, that the special aggression that aroused them, was but one development of a Policy which, inexorably determined by the necessities of Slavery, fears not God and regards not man.

Mr. Park Benjamin's witty, humorous, satirical, philosophical, and moral discourse on "Fashion," will be repeated at Carus's Saloon, on Friday evening. He is expected to lecture on Saturday evening, on "Money and Love," and on Monday evening on "Matrimony."

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—We learn that the Hon. Stephen A. Douglas has been appointed by the President of the Senate a delegate of this institution, in the place of the late Senator Charles.

The Hutchinson Family will give a Concert in Alexandria to-morrow evening.

The military of our city are on parade to-day, in honor of the Anniversary of the Birth of Washington. The men are warm and glowing, and the spectators, in the midst of making snow, are in a cheerful mood.

The price of gas in Cincinnati is now fixed at the uniform rate of \$2.50 per 1,000 feet, with no extra charges for meter rent.

SENATOR CHASE AND THE CONSTITUTION.

Senator Chase, in his speech, says of the Constitution: "That charter of government was not framed on Pro-Slavery principles, but upon Anti-Slavery principles. It nowhere recognizes any right of property in man. It nowhere confers upon the Government which it creates the power to establish or to continue Slavery." And, to fortify his position, he quotes the language of Mr. Justice McLean: "That cannot divest them of the leading and controlling quality of persons, by which they are designated in the Constitution. The character of property is given them by the local law. This law is respected, and all rights under it are protected by the Federal authorities. But the Constitution acts upon slaves as persons, and not as property."

If the honorable Senator offers the best arguments his side of the question affords, the decision will be an easy one, for he answers himself. He summons Mr. Madison as evidence. We quote the Senator: "Mr. Madison himself records, in his report of the debates of the Convention, his own declaration, that it was 'wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in men.'" Can anything be more conclusive than that he admitted, that this declaration that it was wrong in having admitted it? It is perfectly certain, if it had not been admitted, Mr. Madison could not have used the language quoted, and it is susceptible of no other interpretation.—Washington Sentinel.

The Sentinel places within quotation marks, the twelve closing lines, and attributes them to Senator Chase. We cannot suspect our neighbors of having done this intentionally, but there it is—language and sentiments attributed to Mr. Chase, which he never uttered and utterly repudiates. The only sentiment for which he is responsible is this: "Mr. Madison himself records, in his report of the debates of the Convention, his own declaration, that it was wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man."

The inference that follows—that it was clear from this that the idea had been admitted—is the reasoning of the Sentinel, not of Mr. Chase. Will that journal make the requisite explanation, and acquit Mr. Chase of the authorship of what originated solely in its own brain?

As to the inference of the Sentinel, its editors will pardon us for saying, that it could only have been made by one ignorant of the Madison Papers. By consulting them, it will be found, that a certain clause in relation to Slavery being under consideration, Mr. Madison and others objected to the phraseology, on the ground that it implied the idea of property in man—that it was then Mr. Madison said, it would be "wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man"—and that the phraseology was accordingly changed, so as to exclude this implication.

Mr. Madison's record of facts is better authority than the Sentinel's interpretation.

THE CERTAINTY OF WAR IN EUROPE.

In the British House of Lords, on the 6th instant, the Marquis of Clanricarde brought forward his motion, "to call the attention of the House to the state of the country with relation to the question of peace or war;" and he asked the Foreign Secretary whether any answer had been received from the Emperor of Russia? what was the present state of diplomatic relations with that Power? and what instructions, if any, had been sent to the British Minister at St. Petersburg? The Earl of Clarendon replied, that a proposal from the Emperor of Russia had been received at Vienna, and was known there on Friday, the 3d instant, stating the terms on which he would be prepared to negotiate for peace; but that the terms of the Emperor's proposal were quite unacceptable. He also stated, that on Saturday evening, the 6th, Baron Browne, Russian Minister at London, had called at the Foreign Office and made known that the answers given to the inquiries of his Government did not permit him to continue his official functions; and, consequently, diplomatic relations between Russia and Britain are broken off. The Earl of Ellenborough stated that he considered that Britain was at the commencement of one of the most formidable wars in which she had ever engaged. The Marquis of Clanricarde agreed with Lord Ellenborough, in believing that the war would be a momentous one. Earl Fitzwilliam entirely agreed that the present state of affairs could not continue long. He thought it had already continued altogether too long. Whether the country was fully aware of the tremendous character of the conflict in which it is about to engage, he would not stop to discuss; but he would say that there never was a war in which the people would more heartily support the Government. Lord Beaumont asked whether instructions had been sent for the withdrawal of the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg, and for stopping further negotiations? To which the Earl of Clarendon replied, that he had no reason to believe that fresh negotiations on the subject would be renewed. Instructions would be sent by France and England to Gen. Castelleja and Sir George Seymour, their Ministers at St. Petersburg, which place they on exactly the same footing as the Russian Ministers at Paris and London have adopted; and diplomatic intercourse between the two countries and Russia will be suspended.

The latest Paris news is to the effect that M. Kisseloff, the Russian Ambassador, left Paris on Monday evening, the 6th, for Germany; that, at a council held at the Tuileries, the Emperor strongly expressed the necessity, now that negotiations are broken off, to prepare with vigor for war. In most departments of the military service, preparations are ordered to continue night and day. Immense orders for ammunition, arms, and accoutrements, are being executed, and the assembling, organizing, and inspecting of troops, goes on ceaselessly. Gen. Pelissier is selecting 20,000 men for the organization of a Territorial Government for Nebraska. It was composed of the sterling business and working men of the city, who seemed to come up with a firm determination to condemn what they believed the consummation of a most iniquitous act.

One clause of a resolution, in which it was declared that "with the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, harmony and confidence was at an end forever," was hailed with a perfect torrent of cheers. It was some time before order could be restored. Mr. Hale's speech was well received, and his observations upon the new lights, who were endeavoring to teach new lessons in regard to the requirements of the Constitution, were witty and amusing.

The earnest manner which pervaded the meeting last evening, left the unavoidable impression on our mind, that New York is becoming thoroughly aroused. Indeed, there seems to be a feeling deeply seated, and so far as we can judge, honestly entertained, that this measure should not be consummated.

As we have before intimated, we fear that the virtual repeal of the Missouri Compromise would renew that agitation and ill feeling which we hoped had permanently subsided.

The Rappite community, residing at Economy, Pa., has remitted, \$250,000 in gold sovereigns to New York, for the purpose of raising a rebellion in that State. It is reported in a late issue of Pittsburgh, that for the last fifteen years the community had constantly on hand over half a million of dollars.

Spirit rappings have damaged the intellect of a young lady of Sadsbury township, Chester county. She is in a critical condition.

CONGRESS.

THIRTY-THIRD CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION.

Senate.—After Mr. Sumner had concluded his able and eloquent speech, yesterday, Mr. Toombs obtained the floor, and the Senate adjourned till to-morrow, when the latter named gentleman will address that body on the same subject.

House.—After Mr. Grow had concluded yesterday, Mr. Smith, of Virginia, briefly stated his objections to the bill, and utterly denied the power of the Government to give away the common property of the Union.

Mr. Gerrit Smith, of New York, advanced the bill, because, he said, in the view which he took of it, it was an admission that the Government did not own these lands, and that the landless did.

The hour of three o'clock having arrived, to which the debate had been limited by the House, Mr. Dawson, the member reporting the measure, made a brief reply to the objections which had been urged against the bill.

The provisions of the bill extending the consideration of the bill granting bounty lands to the officers and soldiers who have been engaged in the military service of the United States—the question being on the motion that it be laid on the table.

The motion was disagreed to—yeas 66, noes 72.

The bill was then referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. On motion of Mr. Wright, of Pennsylvania, the House adjourned to Thursday—Wednesday being the birthday of Washington.

(BY HOUSE'S PRINTING TELEGRAPH.)

TELEGRAPHIC CORRESPONDENCE.

FOR DAILY NATIONAL ERA.

Railroad Collisions. LANCASTER, Pa., Feb. 22.—A railroad collision occurred near this place, this morning, fatal in its results. Nine passengers were killed, and many wounded. Their names have not yet been ascertained.

SECOND DESPATCH. LANCASTER, Pa., Feb. 22.—Four of the passengers on an advance for the propagation of Slavery in that Territory, and I have every reason to believe that he is the minister of the Gospel referred to by Senator Douglas. Now, I happen to know something about this minister, and the mission over which he presides. I once sojourned at that mission about a month, and they had plenty of the kind of "help" which the honorable Senator speaks of, for they had about a dozen slaves there, to aid in "civilizing and Christianizing" the Indians, and some of those slaves belonged to the same worthy minister; and there was a bitter enemy among them towards the missionary first spoken of, because he treated the negroes under his care so kindly.

During the rule of a former superintendent of this mission, a poor slave was knocked down with a stone, and then tied to a tree and severely whipped, under the eye and by the direction of the superintendent. And what was this severity for? Simply because the slave did not instantly obey a hired overseer, and refused to be whipped by him.

This mission is under the control of the Methodist Church South, and for several years they carefully concealed from the Indians the great difficulty and separation in the Methodist Church on the subject of Slavery. But some of the Indians got wind of it, and asked their white brethren for an explanation and history of the difficulty. The missionaries endeavored, first by frowns and threats, to keep the Indians quiet on the subject; but this mode they threatened, the more the Indians wouldn't be still, and finally separated themselves from the Methodist Church South, and were joined to the Northern or true Methodist Church.

And those same missionaries are, in a great measure, responsible for the existence of Slavery in Nebraska, for there are two or three Indians that own slaves—the greater portion of them being utterly opposed to Slavery.

RICHARD MENDENHALL.

From the New York Evening Post.

RELIGIOUS FANATICISM—CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE AND JOURNAL.

If conservatism is what the Union wants, we will show it that even conservatism at the North is against the Nebraska bill. Of all the journals of the Methodist persuasion in the United States, there is none more decidedly conservative in its character than the Christian Advocate and Journal, published in this city. It is the principal organ of the Northern Methodist Church, and has a circulation of over 100,000 copies, and is conducted by a gentleman from Baltimore, who has always stood firm for the Compromise of 1850 and the Fugitive Slave Law—subjects on which his journal has been drawn into frequent controversies with the Northern Christian Advocate, and other religious newspapers of the Methodist denomination. In the very article on which we are about to remark, he says:

"The conservative character of this journal is generally known, and well established. We desire peace above all earthly blessings, and will make any sacrifices, but that of good conscience, to maintain it. Beyond this we may not go, even to preserve or secure peace; and we fear this is about to be required of us. It is with extreme reluctance we have adverted to a subject which is so intimately connected with politics; but we could not refrain, because it is quite as inseparably connected, in its nature and probable consequences, with the obligations of religion and good moral conduct. The Christian Advocate has been late, very late, in taking notice of the Nebraska bill, and the condemnation of that scheme, which, at the risk of encouraging what the Union calls religious fanaticism, we are about to quote from its columns, has been, no doubt, extorted from it by a conviction that the meditated wrong is too flagrant to be palliated by any possible excuse. The Advocate, after some discussion of the constitutional question, which it insists should be referred to the Supreme Court of the United States, proceeds to say:

"But there is a more important question to be decided—a question of religion and morality—the decision of which cannot fail to exert an important influence on public opinion and character in regard to the moral obligation to fulfill contracts. Is a legislative body, representing the nation, bound by moral obligations? Have compromises and compacts, entered into by national Legislatures, the binding force of moral obligations? By what name reasoning do such bodies release themselves from these obligations? They are acknowledged to be obligatory upon individuals, and all legal associations of individuals. How, then, do these individual citizens release themselves from the obligation of a compromise, or a compact, when represented by delegates of their own selection? In short, does not the obligation to fulfill all moral obligations rest as imperiously upon men sitting in a legislative, as an individual, capacity?"

But this, we suppose, is "religious fanaticism." It is fanaticism to insist so strongly upon the obligations of moral honesty. The Christian Advocate is also fanatical enough to say that the effect of the scheme of Douglas is to annul the covenant of 1850, "so far as it gave anything to the non-slaveholding States, while the South retains, and must necessarily retain, all she acquired by the bargain." We mention this former extract from the same journal, we do so, in anticipation of the effect of passing the Nebraska bill, so wholly contrary to those expressed by Mr. Douglas and his tender, the Washington Union, will probably be estimated by them as the very height of "religious fanaticism."

We are aware that leading politicians, even of the North, doubt the general Anti-Slavery feeling of the people of the non-slaveholding States. Hitherto, the expression of public feeling has been suppressed, in a great degree, lest it should encourage the violent measures of the ultraists; and, also, by the influence of political interests, which demanded the sacrifice. But when there is nothing to hope, there is nothing to fear. It was universally believed that the Missouri Compromise was safe in the hands of either of the great parties into which the people of this country is divided. When the people of the free States shall find themselves deceived and betrayed, there will come a disruption of the old party organizations, and new associations will be formed, having for a common object, protection against Slavery propagandism. A necessary consequence of violating the Missouri Compromise will be an effort, which cannot long be resisted, to repeal the Fugitive Slave Law, and to carry out the principles of the Wilmot Proviso. Party political combination will resist while there remains a hope of "the leaves and fishes"; but they will wheel into line as soon as it is found that a change of tactics offers a surer way to effect office. Let the Nebraska bill pass, and we predict that no one new living, will be elected to the Missouri Territory, south or north of the Compromise line, admitted into the Union; or an entire Territorial Government organized without a stringent provision for the exclusion of Slavery. We predict, too, that the Fugitive Slave Law will be ultimately repealed, after a struggle which will shake the confederacy of these United States from centre to circumference."

MAINE POLITICS.

PARKER'S HEAD, Me., Feb. 16, 1854.

To the Editor of the National Era.

As I write you after the result of our State election, giving your readers to understand the causes of the result, I now, by your permission, propose to present before them the practical results of the assembling of our Legislature.

When the Representatives assembled, it proved, as I before stated, that Pillsbury, the candidate of the professed Democracy, and nominated by the run power of the State, had but 56 or 57 representatives in his favor, out of 151. And as there were constitutional candidates pledged to the Temperance law, it became certain that Pillsbury would not be presented to the Senate. Accordingly, Crosby, (Whig) and Morrill, (Temperance Democrat) were sent to the Senate, from which that body was to elect a Governor. The Senate had been filled—there being 17 vacancies, leaving but 14 elected by the people—as follows: 3 Morrill, 5 Pillsbury, and 6 Whigs; making the Senate stand 13 Whigs, 12 Pillsbury, 4 Morrill, and 2 Free Democrats. The vote shows that 9 Pillsbury men and 7 Whigs voted for Crosby, while 6 Whigs, 4 Morrill, 3 Pillsbury, and 2 Free Democrats, voted for Morrill. It was believed, according to the organization of the Senate, that Morrill would be Governor, but there was terrible hostility on the part of the "Wild Cat" portion of the Pillsbury men, and, though enough of them had given their word that, if the choice came between Crosby and Morrill, they would vote for Morrill, to have elected Morrill, yet their weak virtues gave way under the outside pressure, and they voted for a Whig, and Mr. Crosby is Governor by one majority. The "Wild Cats" did not vote for Crosby because they loved him, but they hated Morrill. They expected, also, to elect Fessenden as Senator, and to present to Morrill party from having an executive office in the State. They have not, however, defeated Fessenden, and have increased the Morrill influence, for multitudes who voted at the polls for Pillsbury, when their eyes became opened to see what they had done, earnestly desired Morrill for Governor, and are now ready to act upon that side of the question.

The Temperance cause has been the controlling power that has produced the result as stated. And the run power may take the credit of bringing about this state of affairs, and it can have a rumpus just so long as it presses the repeal of the "Maine Law." Our people will never permit (and other States are unwise for doing it) run and its dealers to ride rough-shod over the people, even if they do christen their damning business and intentions by the term Democratic.

There are many thousands of true Democrats, who are interested in the welfare of their State; and when they see the result of the election, whether or not villainous shall be permitted to govern our State with "breathing-holes of hell" or not, without molestation, or fear of "fery indignation," will snap the ties of party, as Samson did the withes, and stand up as men, rather than be the lackeys of party. May such men increase.

The fact is, multitudes have taken to themselves the term Democrat, under which to carry on the crushing system of oppression, as many have stolen the "livestock of freedom" to feed their avarice. Many of the papers in the State set up a great howl, because Fessenden, elected United States Senator; but it arises not so much because he is nominally a Whig, as that he is tainted with the principles of humanity, or, in other words, is too democratic for the Democracy of this professed Democratic Administration. That is a strange fact, Doctor, yet it is a fact. Every intelligent man knows, though the pretension is that it makes an awful difference, there is no practical difference between the two parties, and it is not who gets the spoils. Mr. Fessenden owes his election to the fact that his feelings and sympathies are on the side of Freedom. Had it not been for a few ultra Pro-Slavery Whigs in the former Legislature, he would have been elected a year ago. Enough Democrats voted for him in the previous Legislature to have secured his election, had his own party supported him to a man. There is, and thank God for it, a strong Anti-Slavery feeling throughout the State, and it is not to be wondered at, that their repeated inconsistencies; and they are not fond of Pro-Slavery enemies, though they will sometimes take them for the "sake of the Union."

In connection with this, the Free Democracy, which numbers 2,400 strong, makes up a power that Pro-Slaveryism and Cottonocracy cannot succeed against. Messrs. Hamlin and Fessenden both hold their places as United States Senators by this power, and the united vote of the Free Democratic Representatives. Hamlin has generally been true in his acts to the power that placed him there, and we have no reason to distrust Mr. Fessenden. Maine is well represented in the Senate, as to her true interest and spirit, and will be better represented at the next election in the House. While the papers opposed to Fessenden may cry out "tri-colored," he possesses precisely the same spirit that elected Hamlin; and their stripes are near enough alike to make them indistinguishable. Let us all work together to strip men in this State will learn, after a while, that political success does not depend upon stultifying themselves upon the subject of Slavery, or praising the law for catching and kidnapping people in the free States, even if it be for the pretended "salvation of the Union."

MAINE.

A SHIPPER OF INFORMATION.—The Spectator mentions a curious remedy for cholera, which is a form of miasmata which exhibits itself in the uncontrollable appetite for alcoholic stimulants. The process may be easily described. We will suppose that the liquor which the patient is addicted to drinking is the commonest in the country—say gin. When he enters the hospital for treatment, he is supplied with his favorite drink, and with no other; if anything else is given to him, or any other food, it is flavored with gin. He is in the hospital, and the very atmosphere is so filled with his favorite perfume. His room is scented with

NEBRASKA—AN ERROR CORRECTED.

PLAINFIELD, Ind., 2d mo. 16, 1854.

To the Editor of the National Era.

In the remarks of Senator Douglas in the Senate, January 30, on the Address of certain members of Congress relative to the Nebraska Bill, there is a statement which I think that justice requires should be corrected. And I would here remark, that I spent about three years as a missionary in Nebraska, and know whereof I speak, and shall state nothing that was not well authenticated. The Senator states that he heard a minister of the Gospel telling a member of the Committee on Territories that a missionary and his wife, from Boston, went out to Nebraska, and, being destitute of "help," he went down to Missouri and bought a slave, for \$1,000, to help him. Now, in all the acquaintance which I formed in that Territory, I never heard of any such thing. But this I know, that a very worthy missionary from Massachusetts did buy a slave, not for \$1,000, but for a much less sum; and at the same time made a contract with him, that so soon as he should have worked enough to pay for his purchase money, he should go free; nay, he told him that he would leave it entirely to his choice; that he might leave at any time, if he chose; but the slave preferred to stay in his freedom, and so remained until the whole of his ransom was paid. His wife, a free woman, was living with the missionary, and they were treated much more like brethren than like slaves; and when the slave had got his freedom, the missionary assisted him in fitting out for California.

I understand that the superintendent of the Methodist mission in Nebraska has gone to Washington as an advocate for the propagation of Slavery in that Territory, and I have every reason to believe that he is the minister of the Gospel referred to by Senator Douglas. Now, I happen to know something about this minister, and the mission over which he presides. I once sojourned at that mission about a month, and they had plenty of the kind of "help" which the honorable Senator speaks of, for they had about a dozen slaves there, to aid in "civilizing and Christianizing" the Indians, and some of those slaves belonged to the same worthy minister; and there was a bitter enemy among them towards the missionary first spoken of, because he treated the negroes under his care so kindly.

During the rule of a former superintendent of this mission, a poor slave was knocked down with a stone, and then tied to a tree and severely whipped, under the eye and by the direction of the superintendent. And what was this severity for? Simply because the slave did not instantly obey a hired overseer, and refused to be whipped by him.

This mission is under the control of the Methodist Church South, and for several years they carefully concealed from the Indians the great difficulty and separation in the Methodist Church on the subject of Slavery. But some of the Indians got wind of it, and asked their white brethren for an explanation and history of the difficulty. The missionaries endeavored, first by frowns and threats, to keep the Indians quiet on the subject; but this mode they threatened, the more the Indians wouldn't be still, and finally separated themselves from the Methodist Church South, and were joined to the Northern or true Methodist Church.

And those same missionaries are, in a great measure, responsible for the existence of Slavery in Nebraska, for there are two or three Indians that own slaves—the greater portion of them being utterly opposed to Slavery.

RICHARD MENDENHALL.

From the New York Evening Post.

RELIGIOUS FANATICISM—CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE AND JOURNAL.

If conservatism is what the Union wants, we will show it that even conservatism at the North is against the Nebraska bill. Of all the journals of the Methodist persuasion in the United States, there is none more decidedly conservative in its character than the Christian Advocate and Journal, published in this city. It is the principal organ of the Northern Methodist Church, and has a circulation of over 100,000 copies, and is conducted by a gentleman from Baltimore, who has always stood firm for the Compromise of 1850 and the Fugitive Slave Law—subjects on which his journal has been drawn into frequent controversies with the Northern Christian Advocate, and other religious newspapers of the Methodist denomination. In the very article on which we are about to remark, he says:

"The conservative character of this journal is generally known, and well established. We desire peace above all earthly blessings, and will make any sacrifices, but that of good conscience, to maintain it. Beyond this we may not go, even to preserve or secure peace; and we fear this is about to be required of us. It is with extreme reluctance we have adverted to a subject which is so intimately connected with politics; but we could not refrain, because it is quite as inseparably connected, in its nature and probable consequences, with the obligations of religion and good moral conduct. The Christian Advocate has been late, very late, in taking notice of the Nebraska bill, and the condemnation of that scheme, which, at the risk of encouraging what the Union calls religious fanaticism, we are about to quote from its columns, has been, no doubt, extorted from it by a conviction that the meditated wrong is too flagrant to be palliated by any possible excuse. The Advocate, after some discussion of the constitutional question, which it insists should be referred to the Supreme Court of the United States, proceeds to say:

"But there is a more important question to be decided—a question of religion and morality—the decision of which cannot fail to exert an important influence on public opinion and character in regard to the moral obligation to fulfill contracts. Is a legislative body, representing the nation, bound by moral obligations? Have compromises and compacts, entered into by national Legislatures, the binding force of moral obligations? By what name reasoning do such bodies release themselves from these obligations? They are acknowledged to be obligatory upon individuals, and all legal associations of individuals. How, then, do these individual citizens release themselves from the obligation of a compromise, or a compact, when represented by delegates of their own selection? In short, does not the obligation to fulfill all moral obligations rest as imperiously upon men sitting in a legislative, as an individual, capacity?"

But this, we suppose, is "religious fanaticism." It is fanaticism to insist so strongly upon the obligations of moral honesty. The Christian Advocate is also fanatical enough to say that the effect of the scheme of Douglas is to annul the covenant of 1850, "so far as it gave anything to the non-slaveholding States, while the South retains, and must necessarily retain, all she acquired by the bargain." We mention this former extract from the same journal, we do so, in anticipation of the effect of passing the Nebraska bill, so wholly contrary to those expressed by Mr. Douglas and his tender, the Washington Union, will probably be estimated by them as the very height of "religious fanaticism."

We are aware that leading politicians, even of the North, doubt the general Anti-Slavery feeling of the people of the non-slaveholding States. Hitherto, the expression of public feeling has been suppressed, in a great degree, lest it should encourage the violent measures of the ultraists; and, also, by the influence of political interests, which demanded the sacrifice. But when there is nothing to hope, there is nothing to fear. It was universally believed that the Missouri Compromise was safe in the hands of either of the great parties into which the people of this country is divided. When the people of the free States shall find themselves deceived and betrayed, there will come a disruption of the old party organizations, and new associations will be formed, having for a common object, protection against Slavery propagandism. A necessary consequence of violating the Missouri Compromise will be an effort, which cannot long be resisted, to repeal the Fugitive Slave Law, and to carry out the principles of the Wilmot Proviso. Party political combination will resist while there remains a hope of "the leaves and fishes"; but they will wheel into line as soon as it is found that a change of tactics offers a surer way to effect office. Let the Nebraska bill pass, and we predict that no one new living, will be elected to the Missouri Territory, south or north of the Compromise line, admitted into the Union; or an entire Territorial Government organized without a stringent provision for the exclusion of Slavery. We predict, too, that the Fugitive Slave Law will be ultimately repealed, after a struggle which will shake the confederacy of these United States from centre to circumference."

MAINE POLITICS.

PARKER'S HEAD, Me., Feb. 16, 1854.</