

Herald of Freedom.

BY G. W. BROWN & CO.

LAWRENCE, KANSAS, SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1856.

NUMBER 15--VOLUME II.

Selected Poetry.

From the New York Tribune.

The Song of the Camp.

A CHIEFMAN INCIDENT.

"Give us a song!" the soldiers cried,
The outer trenches guarding;
When the heated guns of the camps allied
Grew weary of bombardment.

The dark Redan, in silent scorn,
Lay, grim and threatening, under;
And the tawny mound of the Malakoff
No longer belched its thunder.

There was a pause. A guardman said:
"We storm the fort to-morrow;
Sing while we may, another day
Will bring enough of sorrow."

They lay along the battery's side,
Below the smoking cannon—
Brave hearts, from Severn and from Clyde,
And from the banks of Shannon.

They sang of love, and not of fame;
Forgot was Britain's glory;
Each heart recalled a different name,
But all sang "Annie Laurie."

Voice after voice caught up the song,
Until its tender passion
Rose like an anthem, rich and strong—
Their battle-voice confession.

Dear girl, her name he dared not speak,
Yet, as the song grew louder,
Somewhat upon the soldier's cheek
Washed of the stains of powder.

Beyond the darkening ocean burned
The bloody sunset's embers,
While the Crimean valleys learned
How English love remembers.

And once again a fire of hell
Rained on the Russian quarters
With scream of shot, and burst of shell,
And howling of the mortars.

And Irish Nora's eyes are dim
For a singer, dumb and gory;
And English Mary mourns for him
Who sang of "Annie Laurie."

Ah, soldiers! to your honor rest
Your truth and valour bearing;
The bravest are the tenderest—
The loving are the daring.

BAYARD TAYLOR.

Original Correspondence.

For the Herald of Freedom.

Letter from Mrs. Nichols.

TOWNSHEND, VT., April 14, '56.

DEAR HERALD:—"Truth is stranger than fiction," long since became, to my mind, as applicable to legal as to social life. You are a lawyer. You have heard of "legal fictions." What some of the most striking ones are, I have indicated, I think, in my last communication, but for the present I must speak of legal truths, facts stranger, because giving the lie direct to fastidious theory. Perhaps I cannot better illustrate and impress the legal wrongs which I have and intend to present to our Kansas Legislators for their manly rejection, than by detailing, in brief, simple incidents of suffering under laws, which have been, and still are, in force in many States of this Union.

And here let me say, I have been for thirty years a careful observer, and sometimes a passive sufferer, under the laws affecting the rights of married women. True, it is scarcely fourteen years since I first sought, through the press, to awaken public attention to this department of legal action, and if I have done anything towards securing better protection and greater freedom to my sex, I may be excused for indicating one source of the courage, which, at so early a day, was an indispensable qualification in advocating legal rights for married women. Married at about that time to my late husband, Geo. W. Nichols, publisher and editor of the Windham County Democrat, I was most happy in finding in him, not only a sympathizing friend, but one who scouted the idea of impropriety in a woman's advocating any truth, or attacking any wrong, which appeals to her womanly sympathies, or has to do with the moral, intellectual or political life, justice to him, justice to myself demands that I bear testimony to the noble manhood, which, having come to value its own rights of means of human happiness, rather than paltry gain, feels itself more honored in releasing than in absorbing the "inalienable" rights of woman. From my earliest childhood to this, my second marriage, I was most highly favored in frequent opportunities to sit under the drapery of the manly "truth" of "the honest poor" for many years my father, as town agent and postmaster, was the recipient of all petitions and complaints in that department of town life. I studied the poor laws, and peeped behind them into the causes of poverty. While I sat in the quiet corner, an indignant and silent listener to revelations from the quivering lips of the poor, and the heartless contrivances of men to evade the paupers' support, I saw my father's moistened eye, and heard my regretful replies to the oft-recurring tales of sorrow—"I can't help it; I am only the agent of the town to do its bidding"—and "the law allows it"—until I learned first to despise such laws, and second, to doubt the wisdom of the men who could make them. Noble men—men of influence and official position—when I appealed to them against these outrages of the golden rule and the Constitution, only pointed me, in reply, to the law, regretting, but deprecating the idea that laws so framed as to obviate what they termed "abuses," but which, to my mind, were the legitimate uses and fruits of the laws under which they were obtained. "It is the law," seemed with the majority to be the shaking off of all responsibility in the matter, and the conviction was forced upon my young

heart that the electors and representatives of the State did not regard themselves as the representatives and protectors of women and children, and had no right to claim to be trusted as such. How could I look over the legal provisions for these unrepresented classes, and feel otherwise? How could I watch the operation of laws depriving them of their rights to the means of life and liberty, and then follow them to the auction block of pauperism, or the premature grave, and not be indignantly alive to the agencies and causes involved?

I would shrink from myself as less than human, and an anomaly of womanhood, if I could have seen all this, and not resolve to do, that I might do. God, it seems to me, has made no distinction between man and woman in the necessity or the duty to labor for their bread. He has as effectually endowed woman as man with the ability to win it, and in thus endowing her for self-dependence, has declared it to be His will that woman, no less than man, should possess and enjoy independent means of life and self-culture. Neither by their laws and customs, have men loosed women from their obligation to labor for their own support. By what right, then, have they legislated themselves into possession and control of woman's inalienable rights, until helplessness and degradation have become so general, that they can unblushingly speak of the sex as "helpless and dependent?"—until they have lost sight of the eternal truth that she is God-endowed with self-dependence?

Her charter of right, of independent action and thought, is as good and broad as her brother's. You may see it in the birthright gifts of her nature; you may feel it, if you will, in the second and final charter of human freedom, "Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." Do my readers still contend that God did not create woman self-dependent? Let them take note of the laboring classes, and they will find that under equally favorable conditions, single women support themselves with as much ease as single men.

Do they still maintain that God designed married women to be dependant, and by their relations as mothers, involved them in helplessness? I can only reply, that if such be the fact, multitudes of women have outwitted their creator, and proved, in spite of men's theories and laws to realize them, that God has signally failed in his design, and is, no doubt, amazed to find his handiwork prove so much more efficient than he intended! For, look up and down the land, and lo! tens of thousands of these helpless women are not only supporting themselves, but helping children and invalid or drunken husbands, sometimes even paying taxes for the support of Government; and this, too, with less than one-third the remuneration which men receive for their labor. Should men, by their laws or customs, make women more helpless than God has made them? Is it good political economy to depress the energies of any class of citizens? Above all, is it not suicidal to every social interest, to rob the mothers of their God-given powers of self-support, extending, as these abilities do, to the support of their children?

The laws which sequester the earnings of the wives and mothers, are fruitful of pauperism above all other sources, not excepting intemperance. Good men have wept with the paupered wife and children of the drunkard, and ignorant charged upon his drunkenness the pauperism of his family. If they had looked one remove further, they could have seen that, in nine cases out of ten, it should be charged upon the law, which places the earnings of the wife and children, even to their wearing apparel, at the absolute disposal of the husband and the father.

Will men assert that law is powerless to protect the weak against the strong? The self-supporting against robbery, by the idle and vicious? Our Legislators claim to protect the poor man against the creditors, by laws exempting from attachment for debt, a homestead, necessary household furniture, the tools of his trade, a cow, a pig, school books, Bible, &c. In Vermont, some \$300 worth of personal property, and a homestead worth \$500, are thus exempted. But in not one State of the Union is there exemption to the wife, so much as her own clothing! The husband has a right to mortgage or sell every article of personal property exempted from attachment, even to her clothing, without the consent of his wife, and when he dies the exemption dies with him—proving, in fact, that exemption laws are for the benefit of the strong man, and not for "the weak and helpless members of the family," as claimed by those who made and uphold them. They are for the aid of the fathers—not for the mothers—and yet many a little brood of embryo citizens are dependent upon the mothers for all they enjoy of a home; and should not their helplessness and the possibilities of their future, appeal effectually against the legislation which makes paupers of the mothers, only to burden the State with the support of the children, and tyrants of the fathers, only to increase the demands for prisons and lunatic asylums?

But I will pen for your readers an incident, illustrating the economy and humanity of this unequal legislation, unequal protection of "natural, inherent, and alienable (?) rights." Mr. B— became involved in debt to the rum-seller, which he had no means to liquidate, but the household furniture, which was exempted from attachment. He mortgaged this, without reservation, and without the knowledge of his wife, and shortly after died. Immediately after his burial, the rum-seller claimed the furniture on his mortgage. The poor, half-distracted widow went to the lawyers, and found that the laws were on his side—"her husband had a legal right to dispose of it." She then pleaded with the creditor to spare her a single bed for her little ones. He was inexorable, and she, with her little ones, was turned penniless upon the world. Was the creditor a hard man and cruel? Mark, now, he could not have done this if the law had not given him the power. If men who profess to protect women, had protected this woman with such protection as they have gathered around themselves, the hard man and unfeeling creditor would have been kept from inflicting such grievous wrong. If this property had been exempted to both parents, it could not have been mortgaged without her consent, and would have remained to her, as the surviving parent, at the father's death. * * * One more incident to the point.

Mr. G— drank up all his earnings—sold the cow, pig and furniture, piece by piece, and last of all the family Bible. His wife, who had for years supported her seven little ones and paid the rent, at last found it impossible to do so with his increasing levies upon her earnings. She called upon the town, and its agents, "put out" her older children, while she went out to service, taking her babe with her. In a few weeks her husband died of delirium tremens. Now Mrs. G. gathered up her little ones, earned them shelter, food and clothing, and sent them to school. Years have passed—the mother is "gathered to her fathers," and those children are among the most respectable members of society.

Who made Mrs. G— helpless and dependent? God, or man's laws? "Women are not capable of legislation"—they "cannot understand politics." Tell us, gentlemen legislators, was Mrs. G— protected by her legal representatives? To which condition of her life was society most indebted—that in which she was "legally dead?" or alive mother, controlling and applying her own earnings for the discharge of her holiest duties and highest responsibilities?

"Governments are instituted for the protection of the weak against the strong"—a beautiful legal fiction, my brothers. Oh! make it true political Gospel. Respectfully, C. I. H. NICHOLS.

Letter from Rev. Pardee Butler.

For the Herald of Freedom.

MR. EDITOR:—Dear Sir, The bar of public opinion seems to be the only tribunal to which the Free State men of Kansas can appeal for redress. I must therefore, a second time, ask your indulgence, while I make a statement of facts. One year ago, I came to Kansas, and bought a claim on Stranger Creek, Atchison Co. On the 16th of August, the Border Ruffians, of the town of Atchison, sent me down the Missouri River, on a raft. We parted under a mutual pledge. I, that if my life was spared, I would return to Atchison, and they, that if I did come back, they would hang me. Faithful to my promise, in November last, I retraced my journey to Kansas with my family, visited Atchison in open day, announced myself on hand, and returned without molestation. Kansas being yet sparsely settled, and having few meeting houses, it was determined that Mrs. Butler should live on our claim, with her brother, and her brother's wife, while I should return to my home in Kentucky.

April 30th, I returned to Kansas, and crossed the Missouri at Atchison. I spoke to no one, save with two merchants with whom I have had business transactions, since my first arrival in the Territory. Having remained only a few minutes, I went to my buggy to resume my journey, when I was assailed by Kelly, co-editor of the Squatter Sovereign, and others. I was dragged into a grocery, and there surrounded by a company of South Carolinians, who are reported to have been sent out by a Southern Emigrant Aid Society. In this last mob, I noticed only two who were citizens of Atchison, or engaged in the former mob. It is not reported that these Emigrants from the Palmetto State seek out a claim, and labor to make for themselves a home. Neither do they enter into any legitimate business. They very expressly describe themselves as having "come out to see Kansas through." They yelled, "Kill him! kill him! hang the d— abolitionist!" One of their number

clutched up to me, and demanded, "Have you got a revolver?" I replied, "No." He handed me a pistol saying, "There, take that, and stand off ten steps, and d—n you, I will blow you through in an instant." I replied, "I have no use for your weapon." I afterwards heard them congratulating themselves in reference to this, that they had acted honorably with me. The fellow was furious; but his companions dissuaded him from shooting me, saying they were going to hang me.

If I can picture to myself the look of a Cuba blood hound, just ready with open jaws to seize a panting slave in a Florida swamp, then, I imagine, we have a correct daguerrotype likeness of the expression worn by these emigrant representatives of the manly sentiment, heightened courage, and magnanimous feeling of the South Carolina chivalry, when first they scented, in their own estimation, the blood of a live abolitionist; and yelled, "hang him! hang him! hang the d— abolitionist!" They pinioned my arms behind me, obtained a rope, but were interrupted by the entrance of a stranger—a gentleman from Missouri; since ascertained to be General Tut, a lawyer of Buchanan Co. He said, "My friends, hear me. I am an old man, and it is right you should hear me. I was born in Virginia, and I have lived many years in Missouri. I am a slave-holder, and desire Kansas to be made a Slave State, if it can be done by honorable means. But you will destroy the cause you are seeking to build up. You have taken this man, who was peacefully passing through your town, and along the public highway, and doing no person any harm. We profess to be law and order men, and should be the last to commit violence. If this man has violated any law, let him be punished according to law, but for the sake of Missouri—for the sake of Kansas—for the sake of the proslavery cause, do not act in this way." They dragged me into another grocery, and appointed a moderator. Kelly told his story. I rose to my feet, and calmly, and in respectful language, began to tell mine. I was repeatedly jerked to my seat, and so roughly handled that I was compelled to desist. My friend from Missouri earnestly besought them to set me at liberty. Kelly turned short on him, and said, "Do you belong in Kansas?" He replied, "No, but I expect to live in Atchison next fall, and in this matter the interests of Missouri and Kansas are identical." Mr. Lamb, a lawyer of Atchison, and Mr. Samuel Dickenson, a merchant of the same place, both slave-holders, also united with General Tut, in pleading that I should be set at liberty. While these gentlemen were thus speaking, I heard my keepers mutter, "D—n you, if you don't hush we will tar and feather you." But when Kelly began to see how matters stood, he came forward and said, "He did not take Butler to have him hung, only tarred and feathered." Yet, in the other grocery, he had said to the mob, "They should do as they pleased." He dared not take the responsibility of taking my life, but when these unfortunate men, whose one idea is on the subject of Slavery and Southern rights, has become insanity—when these irresponsible South Carolinians, sent out here to be bull-dogs and blood-hounds for Atchison and Stringfellow—when they could be used as tools to take my life, he was ready to do it! Our gunpowder moderator cut the matter short, by saying, "It is moved that Butler be tarred and feathered, and receive thirty-nine lashes." A majority said, "Aye," though a number of voices said, "No." The moderator said, "The affirmative has it. Butler has to be tarred and feathered, and whipped." I began to speculate how that sort of thing would work so far north as the latitude of Kansas. There was a good deal of whispering about the house. I saw dark threatening, and ominous looks in the crowd. The moderator again came forward, and in an altered voice, said, "It is moved that the last part of the sentence be rescinded." It was rescinded. I was given into the hands of my South Carolina overseers, to be tarred and feathered. They muttered and growled at this issue of the matter. "D—d," said one, "out in this way, we would have let him go."

They stripped me naked to the waist, covered my body with tar, and then for the want of feathers, applied outcast wool. Having appointed a committee of seven to accompany me to the next time I should come to Atchison, they tossed my clothing into my buggy, put me therein, accompanied me to the suburbs of the town, and sent me naked out upon the prairie. I adjusted my attire about me, as best I could, and hastened to rejoin my wife and two little ones, on the banks of the Stranger Creek. It was rather a sorrowful meeting after so long a parting, still we were very thankful that, under the blessing of a good Providence, it had fared no worse with us all.

The first mob that sent me down the river on a raft, were courteous gentlemen, (always excepting Robert S. Kelley) compared with this last one. When I was towed out into the middle of the stream, I do not remember to have heard one word spoken by the men on the shore. Their demeanor indicated that they felt themselves performing a painful duty, though perhaps they regarded it as a necessary one. This last mob, when they left me on the borders of the town, screamed and yelled, like a pack of New Zealand cannibals. The first mob did not attempt to abridge my right of speech in reply to all the hard and bitter things they said against me. They treated me patiently to the end. For this I felt to thank them—from my heart I did thank them. But these men, who have come to introduce into Kansas the order of things that now obtains in South Carolina, savagely gagged me in silence, by rapping my face, choking me, pulling my beard, jerking me violently to my seat, and calling out, "d—n you, hold your tongue." All this was done while my arms were pinioned behind me.

Many will ask now, as they have asked already, what is the true and proper cause of all these troubles which I have had in Atchison? I have told the world already. I can only repeat my own words, "The very head and front of my offending hath this extent," no more, I had spoken among my neighbors favorably to making Kansas a Free State, and said in the office of the Squatter Sovereign, I am a Free Soiler, and intend to vote for Kansas to be a Free State." It is true, that Kelley, by an after thought, has added two new counts to his bill of indictment against me. The first is, that I went about the town of Atchison last August, talking abolitionism, (I have not the honor of being an abolitionist,) and second, that I spoke, some how or other, improperly in the presence of slaves. All this is not only utterly false, but the charges are *ex post facto*, for not a word was said of all this the day they put me on the raft. The New York Tribune publishes me as a Methodist preacher, that was put on a raft for preaching abolitionism. I am a member of the denomination known as Disciples (Campbellites), and had never alluded to the subject in my preaching. I published a narrative of the whole affair in the Missouri Democrat, not one word of which has ever been denied to my knowledge. Except this, I said I had "heard that Kelley was born in Massachusetts." He says he was not born in Massachusetts—that he was born in Virginia. Robert S. Kelley, co-editor of the Squatter Sovereign, and Government Printer, shall be born just where he pleases. Still it will be regarded as mysterious and incredible, that a man should receive such treatment for uttering such words as I report myself to have uttered. The matter is plain enough when the facts are understood. I will explain. Prior to August 16, 1855, there was, properly speaking, no Free Soil party organized in Atchison County, perhaps not in the whole territory of Kansas. Free Soilers did not know their own strength, and all were disposed to be prudent—some were timid. Here in Atchison County we were determined that, if the Border Ruffians were resolved to push matters to a bloody issue, the responsibility of so doing should rest wholly with themselves. There are many free soilers in this county—brave men, who have no conscientious scruples to hinder them from arming themselves, and preparing to repel force with force. The Border Ruffians sought by a system of terrorism, so to intimidate Free State men, as to prevent them from organizing a Free State party, or even discussing the question of freedom or slavery in Kansas. They carried this to such an extent of outrageous violence, that it came to be currently reported, that it was as much as a man's life was worth, for a man to say in the town of Atchison, "I am a free soiler." We deprecated violence, and wished a peaceful discussion of the subject. It was therefore most fitting that a man whose profession forbade him to go armed, should put to the test of actual experiment, in the town of Atchison, whether an American citizen, of harmless life, could be permitted to publish expressions of opinion—able to make Kansas a Free State—such views being uttered without anything of angry, abusive, or insulting language. It was for this purpose the above words were spoken, and which have been the cause of all my troubles in Atchison.

If the Border Ruffians had permitted me to depart in peace, they would have proved themselves, simply, harmless bullies, afraid to execute their own threats. If they had taken my life, their act would have been without the shadow of an excuse to mitigate its atrocity. But whatever might have been the result, I had counted the cost and was prepared to abide the issue.

If there is any class of men that stand behind the curtain and pull the wires, we would respectfully represent to them, that it will do no good to urge these understrappers on to these deeds of violence and ruffianism. We are not a class of men to utter obnoxious complaints at any wrongs we may suffer, but we know our rights and intend to have them.

may do among the field hands of a South Carolina rice plantation, it won't do here at all. We, in Kansas, are not made of metal to be worked in such a fire.

Subscribing myself the friend and well wisher of all good and civil men, whether North or South, I am, very truly,
PARDEE BUTLER.
OCEANA P. O., Stranger Creek, Kansas, May 6th, 1856.

Political.

Meeting at Osawatimie.

At a large and enthusiastic meeting, held at Osawatimie, on the 10th April, 1856, in pursuance of a call, signed by twenty-three citizens, for the purpose of considering what measures should be adopted in view of the attempt to assess and collect taxes by the officers appointed by the "Border Ruffian Legislature," a committee of five men, appointed to draft resolutions expressing the sentiment of the citizens of Osawatimie, which committee having reported the following, were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, Several invasions from the border State have been made into this Territory, to subjugate it and make it subservient to slavery; and
Whereas, Said invasions were made for, and resulted in the prostration of our civil and political rights, and pollution of the ballot box; and
Whereas, Said invasions also forced upon us a set of pretended and tyrannical Legislators, who unlawfully assembled at the Shawnee Mission, on the Indian reservation, and then attempted to impose upon the settlers of Kansas Territory, cruel and tyrannical laws, and appointed officers, contrary to the fundamental principles of our Government, for the term of six years; and
Whereas, We are credibly informed that attempts have been made, and are still being made, to assess and collect taxes of us, by men appointed for this purpose, by the Territorial Legislature, so called, therefore,

Resolved, That we utterly repudiate the authority of that Legislature, as a body emanating, not from the people of Kansas, but elected and forced upon us by a foreign vote, and that the officers appointed by the same have, therefore, no legal right to act.

Resolved, That we pledge to one another mutual support and aid in a forcible resistance to any attempt to compel us into obedience to those enactments, let that attempt come from whatever source it may; and that, if men appointed by that Legislature, to the office of assessor or sheriff shall hereafter attempt to assess or collect taxes of us, they will do so at the peril of such consequences as shall be necessary to prevent the same.

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to inform such officers of the action of this meeting, by placing in their hands a copy of these resolutions.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, with the proceedings of this meeting, be furnished to the several papers of Kansas.

RICHARD MENDENHALL, Ch'm.
OSCAR V. DAYTON, Sec'y.

Mr. Douglas' Enabling Bill.

It would appear that the policy of the administration respecting Kansas now is, to press Douglas' Enabling bill—which "enables" the people of Kansas, when they shall number 93,420, to hold a convention, and form a State Constitution.

If the administration believed, what it has stated, that the population of Kansas in February last, one year and nine months after it was open to settlement, numbered only about 25,000 or 30,000 persons, we should be at a loss to know why it provides now for that very distant period, when its population will amount to more than ninety thousand. Mr. Douglas, in his report, gives no reason for this inconsistency.

The fact is, that the population of Kansas is now nearly sixty thousand; it is, of course, almost certain, that before next winter it will have reached the number which will enable it to elect a State member of the House. The "Enabling bill" is therefore prepared really for what the public know is the truth, rather than for what the government proclaimed.

The bill is thrown out with the aspect of fairness, a sort of tub to a whale, in the pretence of bringing the Kansas question to a solution by the popular vote. If pressed in the Senate, it will doubtless pass that body. We trust it will fail in the House, for there is no reason why it should command the vote of a single friend of Kansas.

It is true, that it pretends to leave the Constitution of the State to an election where all the people of the State shall vote. But it provides that this election shall be held by those very judges of election whom the invading legislature appointed, whose authority three-fourths of the people disown. It provides that the election shall be held under the laws passed by that legislature. These laws provide, that any person may vote who is an inhabitant of the territory, though he have entered it the moment before,—if at the moment he be willing to pay a territorial tax (one dollar in amount). It provides also that any voter may be challenged at the polls, and compelled to swear that he will support the "fugitive slave law and the Kansas-Nebraska bill."

(We quote here Judge Douglas' Report, in which this act is spoken of as a bill, by some of its warmest admirers.) It is evident that this oath to support two laws, known to be unpopular to a great majority of the people of the territory, was intended as a measure to keep them from the polls.

Now the country knows perfectly well what sort of votes these Missouri-made judges, or their predecessors, appointed by the same constituents, have received at previous elections. No one knows this better than Mr. Douglas. Some five thousand foreign votes, given at an election of very little comparative importance, are an intimation of what could be done in an election which was to determine the character of the State.

The people of Kansas say, and they have a right to say, that they will go before no such judges. They have chosen their own legislature, under the constitution which they have themselves made. Their future elections will be conducted by the laws of this legislature. And Mr. Douglas does great disonor to the good sense of this country if he supposes that it will be satisfied, by a law which provides that the critical election in Kansas shall be held before judges who will undoubtedly reject many of the votes of the friends of freedom; before whom most of the friends of freedom will refuse to appear; who are willing also to receive an indefinite number of votes, even if they exceed the whole population of the precinct where they are polled, and who, indeed, are best pleased if those votes come from Missouri.

We see no reason to doubt that the House will reject this bill.—Boston Mess.

A Southern Slaveholder Sending to N. Y. for a Sharp's Rifle.

The following is an extract from a letter of a citizen of the interior of Kentucky, dated Feb. 28th, and addressed to an active and efficient friend of the Free State men in Kansas, now in this city. It shows that Mr. Pierce's Kansas policy is by no means so universally popular in the Slave States as he and his advisers suppose.

"DEAR SIR:—My object in writing to you is to know how I can procure a Sharp's rifle, or any other equally as good. I intend to emigrate next month to Kansas, and will be on the side of Freedom.

Although I am a slaveholder, yet I am, in the broadest sense, Anti-slavery, and as a proof of my principles, intend to take my slave to Kansas and liberate him. It is a cruel, wicked and unjust law of our State that prevents slaveholders from liberating their slaves here. The Free State men in Kansas have been greatly outraged. There is a man now in this county who voted in Kansas, whilst on a trip to Missouri.

Mr. —, who was the controlling spirit of the Kansas Legislature, and who emigrated from this county to Missouri, gathered up his voters in Missouri, and went over to Kansas, and was elected by them to a seat in the Legislature.—Persons from Missouri have told me that they went over and voted. But you are well informed on this subject. Although my religion requires me to love law, yet when the law of God and the law of man come in contact, we must obey the law of God. Every man, guided by reason and an enlightened conscience is to determine when the law of man and of God come in conflict.

I have no patience with those who are continually glorifying our Revolutionary Fathers, for resisting the laws of England, "imposing upon the Colonies laws of taxation without representation," and yet insist that the people of Kansas must submit to unjust, Anti-Christian, and iniquitous laws passed by a Legislature representing the people of another State. Out upon such hypocrisy!

I would be glad to have one of Sharp's rifles sent to me here, and if I were certain this letter would reach you, I would enclose the money, and let you send it by express to Lexington. If you will send a rifle to some person in Cincinnati, I can pay for it there, or you can send it direct to me, and I will send the money by mail, or you can send it to Kansas with the rifle, and I can pay for it when I receive it from the agent.

If it is known when the rifles pass through Missouri, they may be taken possession of by the "Law and Order Party." Let me suggest that you do not make public through the newspapers any aid that you may be rendering to the Free State men in Kansas, for it will all be copied into the Southern papers, and for all the aid rendered by the North, the Slave Oligarchy will endeavor to render twice as much to their supporters.

I also want one or two pistols—where and how can you get them?

Please let me hear from you immediately."—N. Y. Evening Post.

In a South Carolina paper, called the Southern Enterprise, appears a letter from O. B. O'Neil, in which, speaking of South Carolina College and the young men who are educated there, he says:—"I graduated in the college forty-three years ago last December. I have been a Trustee for thirty-seven years. I know that I have watched over its interests with all the care of a deep and abiding love; and yet I know that of all the students graduating from 1805 to 1855, forty-nine years, one-fourth of the whole number have died drunkards, or are now drunkards."

may do among the field hands of a South Carolina rice plantation, it won't do here at all. We, in Kansas, are not made of metal to be worked in such a fire.

Subscribing myself the friend and well wisher of all good and civil men, whether North or South, I am, very truly,
PARDEE BUTLER.
OCEANA P. O., Stranger Creek, Kansas, May 6th, 1856.

At a large and enthusiastic meeting, held at Osawatimie, on the 10th April, 1856, in pursuance of a call, signed by twenty-three citizens, for the purpose of considering what measures should be adopted in view of the attempt to assess and collect taxes by the officers appointed by the "Border Ruffian Legislature," a committee of five men, appointed to draft resolutions expressing the sentiment of the citizens of Osawatimie, which committee having reported the following, were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, Several invasions from the border State have been made into this Territory, to subjugate it and make it subservient to slavery; and
Whereas, Said invasions were made for, and resulted in the prostration of our civil and political rights, and pollution of the ballot box; and
Whereas, Said invasions also forced upon us a set of pretended and tyrannical Legislators, who unlawfully assembled at the Shawnee Mission, on the Indian reservation, and then attempted to impose upon the settlers of Kansas Territory, cruel and tyrannical laws, and appointed officers, contrary to the fundamental principles of our Government, for the term of six years; and
Whereas, We are credibly informed that attempts have been made, and are still being made, to assess and collect taxes of us, by men appointed for this purpose, by the Territorial Legislature, so called, therefore,

Resolved, That we utterly repudiate the authority of that Legislature, as a body emanating, not from the people of Kansas, but elected and forced upon us by a foreign vote, and that the officers appointed by the same have, therefore, no legal right to act.

Resolved, That we pledge to one another mutual support and aid in a forcible resistance to any attempt to compel us into obedience to those enactments, let that attempt come from whatever source it may; and that, if men appointed by that Legislature, to the office of assessor or sheriff shall hereafter attempt to assess or collect taxes of us, they will do so at the peril of such consequences as shall be necessary to prevent the same.

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to inform such officers of the action of this meeting, by placing in their hands a copy of these resolutions.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, with the proceedings of this meeting, be furnished to the several papers of Kansas.

RICHARD MENDENHALL, Ch'm.
OSCAR V. DAYTON, Sec'y.

Mr. Douglas' Enabling Bill.

It would appear that the policy of the administration respecting Kansas now is, to press Douglas' Enabling bill—which "enables" the people of Kansas, when they shall number 93,420, to hold a convention, and form a State Constitution.

If the administration believed, what it has stated, that the population of Kansas in February last, one year and nine months after it was open to settlement, numbered only about 25,000 or 30,000 persons, we should be at a loss to know why it provides now for that very distant period, when its population will amount to more than ninety thousand. Mr. Douglas, in his report, gives no reason for this inconsistency.

The fact is, that the population of Kansas is now nearly sixty thousand; it is, of course, almost certain, that before next winter it will have reached the number which will enable it to elect a State member of the House. The "Enabling bill" is therefore prepared really for what the public know is the truth, rather than for what the government proclaimed.

The bill is thrown out with the aspect of fairness, a sort of tub to a whale, in the pretence of bringing the Kansas question to a solution by the popular vote. If pressed in the Senate, it will doubtless pass that body. We trust it will fail in the House, for there is no reason why it should command the vote of a single friend of Kansas.

It is true, that it pretends to leave the Constitution of the State to an election where all the people of the State shall vote. But it provides that this election shall be held by those very judges of election whom the invading legislature appointed, whose authority three-fourths of the people disown. It provides that the election shall be held under the laws passed by that legislature. These laws provide, that any person may vote who is an inhabitant of the territory, though he have entered it the moment before,—if at the moment he be willing to pay a territorial tax (one dollar in amount). It provides also that any voter may be challenged at the polls, and compelled to swear that he will support the "fugitive slave law and the Kansas-Nebraska bill."

In a South Carolina paper, called the Southern Enterprise, appears a letter from O. B. O'Neil, in which, speaking of South Carolina College and the young men who are educated there, he says:—"I graduated in the college forty-three years ago last December. I have been a Trustee for thirty-seven years. I know that I have watched over its interests with all the care of a deep and abiding love; and yet I know that of all the students graduating from 1805 to 1855, forty-nine years, one-fourth of the whole number have died drunkards, or are now drunkards."