

Mr. H. B. Knight has been appointed publisher of the American Anti-Slavery Standard Union, in place of J. B. Bates, resigned; and also the authorized agent of the Era for New York, and may be found at a bookstore near the corner of Broadway and Nassau streets.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1853.

PROSPECTUS OF THE EIGHTH VOLUME OF THE NATIONAL ERA.

G. BAILEY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR. JOHN G. WHITTIER, ASSISTANT EDITOR AND MANAGER. WASHINGTON, D. C.

The National Era is a weekly newspaper, devoted to Literature and Politics.

In Literature, it aims to unite the Beautiful with the True, and to make both immediately subservient to the practical purposes of every day.

Politics, it advocates the Rights of Man, and the Equality of Rights, and opposes what ever violates or tends to violate them, whether they be Involuntary Personal Servitude, Civil Despotism, Spiritual Absolutism, Class Legislation, the Selfishness of Capital, the Tyranny of Corruption, the Oppression of a Majority, or the Exactions of a Party.

It holds no fellowship with the Whig and Democratic organizations, believing that the main issues on which they have been arrayed against each other are obsolete or settled, and that the only course which would promote the Interest of Slavery, to impair the love of Liberty natural to the American mind, and to subjugate the American People to its rule.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are as applicable to the present as to the past.

the "Legal Tenure of Slavery," without controlling them. Our readers know our opinion well, and we have no confidence in the good sense that we are not afraid to submit to them, without comment views not in accordance with our own.

OUR REVENUE LIST is so overgrown that we are compelled to cut it down. We cannot afford, of course, to exchange with a short prospectus, which was intended for the use of our voluntary agents; and we have even calling attention to it, and then claim an exchange. As we have never requested them to do anything of the sort, they will please excuse us for not complying with the request.

The Prospectus for general use has been standing in my desk for three weeks. By publishing this, so that it will attract attention, or by giving such an abstract and notice of it as shall bring the Era fairly before their readers, they will entitle themselves to an exchange. We do not ask that, for we are desirous to keep our exchanges within moderate limits. If they choose to do so, we will recognize their claim to the Era for one year. Some publishers prefer to pay a difference of one dollar on the exchange.

We intend nothing offensive to any of our contemporaries, nor would we intimate that the Era, which has been so long in the world, but their own experience will show them the necessity of fixing some limitation upon their editorial courtesies.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS. According to custom, we send a number of the Era to every member of Congress, and to every member of the State Legislatures. We do not send it to every member of the State Legislatures, but to every member of the House of Representatives, and to every member of the Senate.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND CUBAN AFFAIRS. The Union publishes a private letter from an intelligent gentleman residing in Cuba, respecting the movements in that island, on the part of the British and Spanish Governments, concerning Slavery. It is written in reply to the editor of the Union, or some other one, who had written to the Government, as may be inferred from its opening paragraph: "I have only time briefly to sketch my views on British interference, as you requested me, hoping that you may find them of some use."

for this alone, would seem out of character for the Administration of a Republic founded upon the doctrine of Human Rights. The requisite amount of indignation against Great Britain could not be manufactured in this way, nor could the public mind be enlisted against the humane policy of abolition. What was to be done? The English Government must be represented as hostile to our progress, as plotting to arrest our territorial expansion, and as resorting, for this purpose, to the diabolical scheme of importing ten-year apprentices into Cuba, so as to prevent, by its Africanization, the Americanization of that American West India Island. What American would permit this arrogant and selfish Power thus to plot against our growth and destiny? What philanthropist would be shocked at a scheme so inhuman, so reckless of the interests of the children of Africa, and of the rights of the white race? The Philanthropy and Patriots of the American People might thus be aroused against Great Britain, and enlisted in the support of whatever expedients the Administration might find necessary to check foreign interference in favor of our Africanization of Cuba. If this condition for annexation, and to favor the progress of this policy. This would seem to be the philosophy of the course pursued by the Union, and the Administration of which it is the organ, in relation to the beneficial scheme of the Africanization of Cuba. Will you verify the somewhat spiteful remark of the London Times, in reference to Americans, that they wanted and undoubted abridgment wholly deserts them when they come to estimate and judge of their own country? That against which the Washington Union would really array them, is not the Africanization but the Emancipation of Cuba.

When referred to "Adantic emigrants," were they imported, or are they to be imported? From time to time we have seen notices in the newspapers, of plans for bringing Chinese laborers into Cuba. Still, in this letter, which the Union relies upon as a proof of the truth of the statement, that the Administration of Cuba, we can find nothing bearing directly upon it. As allusion is made to the new system of apprenticeship, but no explanation is given of the nature of this system, or as to why it should be introduced into Cuba, we are left to conjecture whether for things suggested as—its chief authority offered by this letter, in support of the existence of "a secret convention" between England, France, and Spain, "for the freedom of Cuban negroes, and other concurrent interests." It is well known that Great Britain, after the emancipation of the slaves in her West India Islands, undertook to supply the resulting deficiency of labor by the importation of Coolies from the East Indies, and natives from Africa, who were to be held to service under a contract for a certain number of years, or until they should be able to support themselves. It is well known that Spain assigned such a policy as certain to Africanize the British West Indies, or as an unjustifiable interference in the affairs of this hemisphere. Nor has it questioned hitherto the right of Great Britain to treat treaties with her own subjects, or to stipulate for the importation of slaves from Africa or the East Indies—does her conduct furnish a case for the interference of the American Government? Has she not a right to do what England has done, without being questioned by us? We may denounce the policy, as unfavorable to the rights of the colored people, and as unbecomingly at variance with the views of the United States, or because the scheme of importing free laborers into the colony, by contract, may be fraught with suffering to the colored people, but we cannot, on a national point of view, as was alleged by the Abolitionists of Great Britain in relation to the same policy, when adopted by that country. But the question recurs—What right has this Government here to interfere by force with the policy of another Government, and to attempt to enforce its system of emancipation and apprenticeship?

It is obvious that the Union is taking a good deal at random; and we fear that the Administration, in its excessive anxiety to please the Slave Power, may place the country in a position on these affairs, at once disgraceful and untenable.

THE ERA AND ITS COOPERATORS. We fully appreciate the importance of the State papers devoted to the cause of Freedom, and would do nothing to injure their interests. They are essential to State organization, and to the maintenance of a free press. We are friends. Again and again we insisted upon the duty of giving them a vigorous support, and at no time have we magnified the Era at their expense. That the establishment and extended circulation of our paper have not been impeded, but rather subserved their interests, is proof of the fact that the Union's commendation in relation to them, has been an unprecedented multiplication of kindred papers. In view of these facts, we had hoped that the Era might be sufficed to pursue its course, and that the Union would have no objection to its being enlarged and improved. The obstacles in its way have always been serious enough. In a neighboring District it can, of course, expect an adequate patronage. If excluded from State support, what has it to rely upon? Then, there are the Weekly Tribunes, the Free Press, and the Evening Post, Democratic and Anti-Slavery, established at \$1 a year, while the Era is \$2 a year, or \$1.50 to clubs. Competition of this kind it is hard to contend against, especially in communities Democratic or Whig in their party spirit. We have, therefore, recommended to our friends, that they should support the Era to the best of their ability, and that they should not be misled by the "local Anti-Slavery press." How could it have withstood this underhanded process?

It is not surprising that all this we are pained to observe every year, when we are reminded of our own list of efforts in several quarters, during this operation. That scarcely any of our editorial brethren should notice our prospects, or give us a kindly greeting, although always prompt to commend to their readers such papers as the Tribune and Post, on the one hand, and the Era on the other, is not a matter of complaint, when we do not make a subject of new volumes, but when open appeals are made to our subscribers, as we have lately seen, not to renew their subscriptions, but to reserve them for the State papers, we think that is unkind. We are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

SURELY, it is not the time to tell people that we are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

THE ERA AND ITS COOPERATORS. We fully appreciate the importance of the State papers devoted to the cause of Freedom, and would do nothing to injure their interests. They are essential to State organization, and to the maintenance of a free press. We are friends. Again and again we insisted upon the duty of giving them a vigorous support, and at no time have we magnified the Era at their expense. That the establishment and extended circulation of our paper have not been impeded, but rather subserved their interests, is proof of the fact that the Union's commendation in relation to them, has been an unprecedented multiplication of kindred papers. In view of these facts, we had hoped that the Era might be sufficed to pursue its course, and that the Union would have no objection to its being enlarged and improved. The obstacles in its way have always been serious enough. In a neighboring District it can, of course, expect an adequate patronage. If excluded from State support, what has it to rely upon? Then, there are the Weekly Tribunes, the Free Press, and the Evening Post, Democratic and Anti-Slavery, established at \$1 a year, while the Era is \$2 a year, or \$1.50 to clubs. Competition of this kind it is hard to contend against, especially in communities Democratic or Whig in their party spirit. We have, therefore, recommended to our friends, that they should support the Era to the best of their ability, and that they should not be misled by the "local Anti-Slavery press." How could it have withstood this underhanded process?

It is not surprising that all this we are pained to observe every year, when we are reminded of our own list of efforts in several quarters, during this operation. That scarcely any of our editorial brethren should notice our prospects, or give us a kindly greeting, although always prompt to commend to their readers such papers as the Tribune and Post, on the one hand, and the Era on the other, is not a matter of complaint, when we do not make a subject of new volumes, but when open appeals are made to our subscribers, as we have lately seen, not to renew their subscriptions, but to reserve them for the State papers, we think that is unkind. We are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

SURELY, it is not the time to tell people that we are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

THE ERA AND ITS COOPERATORS. We fully appreciate the importance of the State papers devoted to the cause of Freedom, and would do nothing to injure their interests. They are essential to State organization, and to the maintenance of a free press. We are friends. Again and again we insisted upon the duty of giving them a vigorous support, and at no time have we magnified the Era at their expense. That the establishment and extended circulation of our paper have not been impeded, but rather subserved their interests, is proof of the fact that the Union's commendation in relation to them, has been an unprecedented multiplication of kindred papers. In view of these facts, we had hoped that the Era might be sufficed to pursue its course, and that the Union would have no objection to its being enlarged and improved. The obstacles in its way have always been serious enough. In a neighboring District it can, of course, expect an adequate patronage. If excluded from State support, what has it to rely upon? Then, there are the Weekly Tribunes, the Free Press, and the Evening Post, Democratic and Anti-Slavery, established at \$1 a year, while the Era is \$2 a year, or \$1.50 to clubs. Competition of this kind it is hard to contend against, especially in communities Democratic or Whig in their party spirit. We have, therefore, recommended to our friends, that they should support the Era to the best of their ability, and that they should not be misled by the "local Anti-Slavery press." How could it have withstood this underhanded process?

It is not surprising that all this we are pained to observe every year, when we are reminded of our own list of efforts in several quarters, during this operation. That scarcely any of our editorial brethren should notice our prospects, or give us a kindly greeting, although always prompt to commend to their readers such papers as the Tribune and Post, on the one hand, and the Era on the other, is not a matter of complaint, when we do not make a subject of new volumes, but when open appeals are made to our subscribers, as we have lately seen, not to renew their subscriptions, but to reserve them for the State papers, we think that is unkind. We are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

SURELY, it is not the time to tell people that we are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

THE ERA AND ITS COOPERATORS. We fully appreciate the importance of the State papers devoted to the cause of Freedom, and would do nothing to injure their interests. They are essential to State organization, and to the maintenance of a free press. We are friends. Again and again we insisted upon the duty of giving them a vigorous support, and at no time have we magnified the Era at their expense. That the establishment and extended circulation of our paper have not been impeded, but rather subserved their interests, is proof of the fact that the Union's commendation in relation to them, has been an unprecedented multiplication of kindred papers. In view of these facts, we had hoped that the Era might be sufficed to pursue its course, and that the Union would have no objection to its being enlarged and improved. The obstacles in its way have always been serious enough. In a neighboring District it can, of course, expect an adequate patronage. If excluded from State support, what has it to rely upon? Then, there are the Weekly Tribunes, the Free Press, and the Evening Post, Democratic and Anti-Slavery, established at \$1 a year, while the Era is \$2 a year, or \$1.50 to clubs. Competition of this kind it is hard to contend against, especially in communities Democratic or Whig in their party spirit. We have, therefore, recommended to our friends, that they should support the Era to the best of their ability, and that they should not be misled by the "local Anti-Slavery press." How could it have withstood this underhanded process?

It is not surprising that all this we are pained to observe every year, when we are reminded of our own list of efforts in several quarters, during this operation. That scarcely any of our editorial brethren should notice our prospects, or give us a kindly greeting, although always prompt to commend to their readers such papers as the Tribune and Post, on the one hand, and the Era on the other, is not a matter of complaint, when we do not make a subject of new volumes, but when open appeals are made to our subscribers, as we have lately seen, not to renew their subscriptions, but to reserve them for the State papers, we think that is unkind. We are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

SURELY, it is not the time to tell people that we are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

THE ERA AND ITS COOPERATORS. We fully appreciate the importance of the State papers devoted to the cause of Freedom, and would do nothing to injure their interests. They are essential to State organization, and to the maintenance of a free press. We are friends. Again and again we insisted upon the duty of giving them a vigorous support, and at no time have we magnified the Era at their expense. That the establishment and extended circulation of our paper have not been impeded, but rather subserved their interests, is proof of the fact that the Union's commendation in relation to them, has been an unprecedented multiplication of kindred papers. In view of these facts, we had hoped that the Era might be sufficed to pursue its course, and that the Union would have no objection to its being enlarged and improved. The obstacles in its way have always been serious enough. In a neighboring District it can, of course, expect an adequate patronage. If excluded from State support, what has it to rely upon? Then, there are the Weekly Tribunes, the Free Press, and the Evening Post, Democratic and Anti-Slavery, established at \$1 a year, while the Era is \$2 a year, or \$1.50 to clubs. Competition of this kind it is hard to contend against, especially in communities Democratic or Whig in their party spirit. We have, therefore, recommended to our friends, that they should support the Era to the best of their ability, and that they should not be misled by the "local Anti-Slavery press." How could it have withstood this underhanded process?

It is not surprising that all this we are pained to observe every year, when we are reminded of our own list of efforts in several quarters, during this operation. That scarcely any of our editorial brethren should notice our prospects, or give us a kindly greeting, although always prompt to commend to their readers such papers as the Tribune and Post, on the one hand, and the Era on the other, is not a matter of complaint, when we do not make a subject of new volumes, but when open appeals are made to our subscribers, as we have lately seen, not to renew their subscriptions, but to reserve them for the State papers, we think that is unkind. We are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

SURELY, it is not the time to tell people that we are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

THE ERA AND ITS COOPERATORS. We fully appreciate the importance of the State papers devoted to the cause of Freedom, and would do nothing to injure their interests. They are essential to State organization, and to the maintenance of a free press. We are friends. Again and again we insisted upon the duty of giving them a vigorous support, and at no time have we magnified the Era at their expense. That the establishment and extended circulation of our paper have not been impeded, but rather subserved their interests, is proof of the fact that the Union's commendation in relation to them, has been an unprecedented multiplication of kindred papers. In view of these facts, we had hoped that the Era might be sufficed to pursue its course, and that the Union would have no objection to its being enlarged and improved. The obstacles in its way have always been serious enough. In a neighboring District it can, of course, expect an adequate patronage. If excluded from State support, what has it to rely upon? Then, there are the Weekly Tribunes, the Free Press, and the Evening Post, Democratic and Anti-Slavery, established at \$1 a year, while the Era is \$2 a year, or \$1.50 to clubs. Competition of this kind it is hard to contend against, especially in communities Democratic or Whig in their party spirit. We have, therefore, recommended to our friends, that they should support the Era to the best of their ability, and that they should not be misled by the "local Anti-Slavery press." How could it have withstood this underhanded process?

It is not surprising that all this we are pained to observe every year, when we are reminded of our own list of efforts in several quarters, during this operation. That scarcely any of our editorial brethren should notice our prospects, or give us a kindly greeting, although always prompt to commend to their readers such papers as the Tribune and Post, on the one hand, and the Era on the other, is not a matter of complaint, when we do not make a subject of new volumes, but when open appeals are made to our subscribers, as we have lately seen, not to renew their subscriptions, but to reserve them for the State papers, we think that is unkind. We are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

SURELY, it is not the time to tell people that we are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

THE ERA AND ITS COOPERATORS. We fully appreciate the importance of the State papers devoted to the cause of Freedom, and would do nothing to injure their interests. They are essential to State organization, and to the maintenance of a free press. We are friends. Again and again we insisted upon the duty of giving them a vigorous support, and at no time have we magnified the Era at their expense. That the establishment and extended circulation of our paper have not been impeded, but rather subserved their interests, is proof of the fact that the Union's commendation in relation to them, has been an unprecedented multiplication of kindred papers. In view of these facts, we had hoped that the Era might be sufficed to pursue its course, and that the Union would have no objection to its being enlarged and improved. The obstacles in its way have always been serious enough. In a neighboring District it can, of course, expect an adequate patronage. If excluded from State support, what has it to rely upon? Then, there are the Weekly Tribunes, the Free Press, and the Evening Post, Democratic and Anti-Slavery, established at \$1 a year, while the Era is \$2 a year, or \$1.50 to clubs. Competition of this kind it is hard to contend against, especially in communities Democratic or Whig in their party spirit. We have, therefore, recommended to our friends, that they should support the Era to the best of their ability, and that they should not be misled by the "local Anti-Slavery press." How could it have withstood this underhanded process?

It is not surprising that all this we are pained to observe every year, when we are reminded of our own list of efforts in several quarters, during this operation. That scarcely any of our editorial brethren should notice our prospects, or give us a kindly greeting, although always prompt to commend to their readers such papers as the Tribune and Post, on the one hand, and the Era on the other, is not a matter of complaint, when we do not make a subject of new volumes, but when open appeals are made to our subscribers, as we have lately seen, not to renew their subscriptions, but to reserve them for the State papers, we think that is unkind. We are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

SURELY, it is not the time to tell people that we are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

THE ERA AND ITS COOPERATORS. We fully appreciate the importance of the State papers devoted to the cause of Freedom, and would do nothing to injure their interests. They are essential to State organization, and to the maintenance of a free press. We are friends. Again and again we insisted upon the duty of giving them a vigorous support, and at no time have we magnified the Era at their expense. That the establishment and extended circulation of our paper have not been impeded, but rather subserved their interests, is proof of the fact that the Union's commendation in relation to them, has been an unprecedented multiplication of kindred papers. In view of these facts, we had hoped that the Era might be sufficed to pursue its course, and that the Union would have no objection to its being enlarged and improved. The obstacles in its way have always been serious enough. In a neighboring District it can, of course, expect an adequate patronage. If excluded from State support, what has it to rely upon? Then, there are the Weekly Tribunes, the Free Press, and the Evening Post, Democratic and Anti-Slavery, established at \$1 a year, while the Era is \$2 a year, or \$1.50 to clubs. Competition of this kind it is hard to contend against, especially in communities Democratic or Whig in their party spirit. We have, therefore, recommended to our friends, that they should support the Era to the best of their ability, and that they should not be misled by the "local Anti-Slavery press." How could it have withstood this underhanded process?

words. The desire to get their money's worth for the limited period, causes the matter to make but scant provision for the wants of the laborer, while his task is increased to the extent of possible human endurance; and if not performed, stripes and blows are administered *à libito*. If death ensues in consequence of this treatment, as it has done in several instances, the charge of malicious conduct against the dead, goes into the living murderer. Slavery, as it exists here, can not be mitigated and restricted by energetic British action at Madrid; but with Slavery, as it will under the operation of the proposed bill, which checks the abuse of the system. It is said this secret convention between England, France, and Spain, for the freedom of Cuban negroes, and other concurrent interests, is to be approved and in operation in the month of February next. Although the bill is not yet introduced, it is a striking native from Africa. One individual has obtained a license from Madrid, which has been approved by France and England, and brings 3000 "voluntary apprentices" from the coast of Africa. Smaller operators for, in all, 25,000 more, are at work, not waiting for the new Government. And this is but a drop to the ocean, in proportion to the anticipated action of the present Administration.

Reference is made to "Adantic emigrants," were they imported, or are they to be imported? From time to time we have seen notices in the newspapers, of plans for bringing Chinese laborers into Cuba. Still, in this letter, which the Union relies upon as a proof of the truth of the statement, that the Administration of Cuba, we can find nothing bearing directly upon it. As allusion is made to the new system of apprenticeship, but no explanation is given of the nature of this system, or as to why it should be introduced into Cuba, we are left to conjecture whether for things suggested as—its chief authority offered by this letter, in support of the existence of "a secret convention" between England, France, and Spain, "for the freedom of Cuban negroes, and other concurrent interests." It is well known that Great Britain, after the emancipation of the slaves in her West India Islands, undertook to supply the resulting deficiency of labor by the importation of Coolies from the East Indies, and natives from Africa, who were to be held to service under a contract for a certain number of years, or until they should be able to support themselves. It is well known that Spain assigned such a policy as certain to Africanize the British West Indies, or as an unjustifiable interference in the affairs of this hemisphere. Nor has it questioned hitherto the right of Great Britain to treat treaties with her own subjects, or to stipulate for the importation of slaves from Africa or the East Indies—does her conduct furnish a case for the interference of the American Government? Has she not a right to do what England has done, without being questioned by us? We may denounce the policy, as unfavorable to the rights of the colored people, and as unbecomingly at variance with the views of the United States, or because the scheme of importing free laborers into the colony, by contract, may be fraught with suffering to the colored people, but we cannot, on a national point of view, as was alleged by the Abolitionists of Great Britain in relation to the same policy, when adopted by that country. But the question recurs—What right has this Government here to interfere by force with the policy of another Government, and to attempt to enforce its system of emancipation and apprenticeship?

It is obvious that the Union is taking a good deal at random; and we fear that the Administration, in its excessive anxiety to please the Slave Power, may place the country in a position on these affairs, at once disgraceful and untenable.

THE ERA AND ITS COOPERATORS. We fully appreciate the importance of the State papers devoted to the cause of Freedom, and would do nothing to injure their interests. They are essential to State organization, and to the maintenance of a free press. We are friends. Again and again we insisted upon the duty of giving them a vigorous support, and at no time have we magnified the Era at their expense. That the establishment and extended circulation of our paper have not been impeded, but rather subserved their interests, is proof of the fact that the Union's commendation in relation to them, has been an unprecedented multiplication of kindred papers. In view of these facts, we had hoped that the Era might be sufficed to pursue its course, and that the Union would have no objection to its being enlarged and improved. The obstacles in its way have always been serious enough. In a neighboring District it can, of course, expect an adequate patronage. If excluded from State support, what has it to rely upon? Then, there are the Weekly Tribunes, the Free Press, and the Evening Post, Democratic and Anti-Slavery, established at \$1 a year, while the Era is \$2 a year, or \$1.50 to clubs. Competition of this kind it is hard to contend against, especially in communities Democratic or Whig in their party spirit. We have, therefore, recommended to our friends, that they should support the Era to the best of their ability, and that they should not be misled by the "local Anti-Slavery press." How could it have withstood this underhanded process?

It is not surprising that all this we are pained to observe every year, when we are reminded of our own list of efforts in several quarters, during this operation. That scarcely any of our editorial brethren should notice our prospects, or give us a kindly greeting, although always prompt to commend to their readers such papers as the Tribune and Post, on the one hand, and the Era on the other, is not a matter of complaint, when we do not make a subject of new volumes, but when open appeals are made to our subscribers, as we have lately seen, not to renew their subscriptions, but to reserve them for the State papers, we think that is unkind. We are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

SURELY, it is not the time to tell people that we are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

THE ERA AND ITS COOPERATORS. We fully appreciate the importance of the State papers devoted to the cause of Freedom, and would do nothing to injure their interests. They are essential to State organization, and to the maintenance of a free press. We are friends. Again and again we insisted upon the duty of giving them a vigorous support, and at no time have we magnified the Era at their expense. That the establishment and extended circulation of our paper have not been impeded, but rather subserved their interests, is proof of the fact that the Union's commendation in relation to them, has been an unprecedented multiplication of kindred papers. In view of these facts, we had hoped that the Era might be sufficed to pursue its course, and that the Union would have no objection to its being enlarged and improved. The obstacles in its way have always been serious enough. In a neighboring District it can, of course, expect an adequate patronage. If excluded from State support, what has it to rely upon? Then, there are the Weekly Tribunes, the Free Press, and the Evening Post, Democratic and Anti-Slavery, established at \$1 a year, while the Era is \$2 a year, or \$1.50 to clubs. Competition of this kind it is hard to contend against, especially in communities Democratic or Whig in their party spirit. We have, therefore, recommended to our friends, that they should support the Era to the best of their ability, and that they should not be misled by the "local Anti-Slavery press." How could it have withstood this underhanded process?

It is not surprising that all this we are pained to observe every year, when we are reminded of our own list of efforts in several quarters, during this operation. That scarcely any of our editorial brethren should notice our prospects, or give us a kindly greeting, although always prompt to commend to their readers such papers as the Tribune and Post, on the one hand, and the Era on the other, is not a matter of complaint, when we do not make a subject of new volumes, but when open appeals are made to our subscribers, as we have lately seen, not to renew their subscriptions, but to reserve them for the State papers, we think that is unkind. We are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

SURELY, it is not the time to tell people that we are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

THE ERA AND ITS COOPERATORS. We fully appreciate the importance of the State papers devoted to the cause of Freedom, and would do nothing to injure their interests. They are essential to State organization, and to the maintenance of a free press. We are friends. Again and again we insisted upon the duty of giving them a vigorous support, and at no time have we magnified the Era at their expense. That the establishment and extended circulation of our paper have not been impeded, but rather subserved their interests, is proof of the fact that the Union's commendation in relation to them, has been an unprecedented multiplication of kindred papers. In view of these facts, we had hoped that the Era might be sufficed to pursue its course, and that the Union would have no objection to its being enlarged and improved. The obstacles in its way have always been serious enough. In a neighboring District it can, of course, expect an adequate patronage. If excluded from State support, what has it to rely upon? Then, there are the Weekly Tribunes, the Free Press, and the Evening Post, Democratic and Anti-Slavery, established at \$1 a year, while the Era is \$2 a year, or \$1.50 to clubs. Competition of this kind it is hard to contend against, especially in communities Democratic or Whig in their party spirit. We have, therefore, recommended to our friends, that they should support the Era to the best of their ability, and that they should not be misled by the "local Anti-Slavery press." How could it have withstood this underhanded process?

It is not surprising that all this we are pained to observe every year, when we are reminded of our own list of efforts in several quarters, during this operation. That scarcely any of our editorial brethren should notice our prospects, or give us a kindly greeting, although always prompt to commend to their readers such papers as the Tribune and Post, on the one hand, and the Era on the other, is not a matter of complaint, when we do not make a subject of new volumes, but when open appeals are made to our subscribers, as we have lately seen, not to renew their subscriptions, but to reserve them for the State papers, we think that is unkind. We are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

SURELY, it is not the time to tell people that we are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

THE ERA AND ITS COOPERATORS. We fully appreciate the importance of the State papers devoted to the cause of Freedom, and would do nothing to injure their interests. They are essential to State organization, and to the maintenance of a free press. We are friends. Again and again we insisted upon the duty of giving them a vigorous support, and at no time have we magnified the Era at their expense. That the establishment and extended circulation of our paper have not been impeded, but rather subserved their interests, is proof of the fact that the Union's commendation in relation to them, has been an unprecedented multiplication of kindred papers. In view of these facts, we had hoped that the Era might be sufficed to pursue its course, and that the Union would have no objection to its being enlarged and improved. The obstacles in its way have always been serious enough. In a neighboring District it can, of course, expect an adequate patronage. If excluded from State support, what has it to rely upon? Then, there are the Weekly Tribunes, the Free Press, and the Evening Post, Democratic and Anti-Slavery, established at \$1 a year, while the Era is \$2 a year, or \$1.50 to clubs. Competition of this kind it is hard to contend against, especially in communities Democratic or Whig in their party spirit. We have, therefore, recommended to our friends, that they should support the Era to the best of their ability, and that they should not be misled by the "local Anti-Slavery press." How could it have withstood this underhanded process?

It is not surprising that all this we are pained to observe every year, when we are reminded of our own list of efforts in several quarters, during this operation. That scarcely any of our editorial brethren should notice our prospects, or give us a kindly greeting, although always prompt to commend to their readers such papers as the Tribune and Post, on the one hand, and the Era on the other, is not a matter of complaint, when we do not make a subject of new volumes, but when open appeals are made to our subscribers, as we have lately seen, not to renew their subscriptions, but to reserve them for the State papers, we think that is unkind. We are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

SURELY, it is not the time to tell people that we are not in the least disposed to magnify the Era and the Era in conflict! Why not let us alone, without trespassing upon the rights of our contemporaries, we are engaged in the work of renewing our subscriptions?

