

sir! Then came the expostulation of the man-monger, and the threat, accompanied with oaths, declaring that his master would "sell him South," if he did not go with him—then this keen retort, "Let him send me to h— if he can: I am sure I could not fall into worse hands than yours". Possibly, if we had not little children of our own, we might describe to you three little boys, (if we were going into this description in detail) about four, five and a half, and seven years old, brothers, and beautiful, notwithstanding their blackness, whom the man-monger wanted to hire out, declaring he would not sell them, (though several wanted to buy the three together,) as they would bring him more money to raise them; and when some one expostulated with him for separating such little fellows from their mother and from each other, and it only caused him to say "away with your blarney," I'll have \$1500 a piece for them in a few years," we wot attempt to describe the struggle it cost us to prevent telling him if he did not repent he would have a seat in the lowest hell "in a few years," and compound interest in the mean time.

We might speak of an aged and venerable woman, probably ninety, who said she could remember Washington distinctly—that her first husband held his horse—that they sold him (the husband not the horse) and carried him South, "away back yonder"—that they sold her second husband "a little farther on," and her third "many years ago," and they had sold all her thirteen children, so that she had not one to lean her dying head upon—that she had nothing but massa Jesus left.

We might speak of the living horror and burning agony with which we heard for the first (and we pray it may be the last) time the grating hellish sound (no, not *hellish*, for there is no such work in hell) of the auctioneer, crying (with the voice of a man, but with the heart of a fiend and the conscience of an ostrich,) "Only eight hundred dollars for this sound, healthy boy, seventeen years old, warranted sound, and a good disposition to boot—only eight hundred dollars, who says nine?"

We might refer to the encounter we had as we left this "den" with one of the "lions"—the impertinence with which he demanded to know what we were there for, and ordered us to give him up our notes; and our reply that we had further use for them ourself—his charge that we were a d—d abolitionist, having come there to take notes and report lies to the North—and our reply and *promise*, that if we reported anything we would report the *truth*, and his impudence among the rest (which promise we will fulfil at some future time, if we do not lose our notes)—his blustering assurance that we were "in a dangerous place"—and our reply that no doubt that poor, sobbing girl, who had just been sold to one man, and her brother to another, would agree with him that it was "a dangerous place"—our assuring him that if he expected to *frighten* or *sell* a full-blooded white man, he had waked the wrong customer—his inquiry for our name—our reply, giving real name, residence, present business, &c.—his "Ah, indeed"—"Happy to see you, sir"—"Why had you not got some Southern gentleman to introduce you"—our reply that we were not accustomed to follow the lead of Southern gentlemen—his begging us to pardon his impertinence—our reply that we would certainly do so,—these and a host of other incidents, we say, if we had time to develop, and you had space, and your readers had patience, might fill two or three columns of your paper; but as you and we are *hard up* for time and space, (don't know how it is with the patience of your readers,) we will close by saying that we were filled unutterably full of indignation by the scenes we wit-

nessed, and we thanked God that there are some men who will stand up in the present Congress and give their voices and their votes against the extension of this "sum of villainies."  
"DANIEL."

P. S. We ought to add as news (seeing sleighing can't go by telegraph) that we had eight to ten inches of snow on Saturday and Saturday night, making excellent sleighing, which might last a month if the thermometer keeps down to two degrees below zero, as it was this morning at sunrise. D.

From Correspondence of the Morning Star.

#### AFFAIRS IN WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 29, 1856.

Mr. Editor:—During the past two weeks the struggle for the Speakership has been unabated and unsuccessful. Week before last the plurality rule was moved several times by the Anti-Nebraska men, and as often voted down by the votes of the very same men who voted for it and were benefited by it in 1849. Here is a specimen of the language and disinterested patriotism of Howell Cobb, of Georgia, who was then elected Speaker by the plurality rule. He said:

"In reference to the plurality rule, if necessary, I would go into a discussion of it. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] says that while, at one time, I was the recipient of the benefit of that plurality rule, I have during this session uniformly voted against it. I will tell him that it never will receive the sanction of my vote when its creation is inevitably to place in the Speaker's chair the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Banks]."

Here also is what was said by Mr. Fuller, of Maine, then as now a member of the House:

"I voted for it on the ground that I believed the effect of the rule, if adopted, would be to elect the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cobb.] That was the reason I voted for it then; and I will not vote for it now, because I believe the effect of it would be to elect the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Banks]."

The country will judge *who* are keeping the House unorganized, and *why* they are doing so, from these and many similar declarations.

On Saturday week, a resolution was adopted entirely prohibiting debate, or personal explanation, so that for the past week there has been nominally no speech-making, but many members have evaded the rule by presenting their views in the form of resolutions, and moving the previous question, so as to cut off amendment and bring the House to a direct vote upon their proposition.

Mr. Dunn, of Indiana, one of the shrewdest, as well as one of the most stubborn members, introduced three resolutions at once, and demanded the previous question, and that the vote be taken on each resolution separately. The first declared that "the political complexion of the House is such that none but an Anti-Nebraska man should be elected Speaker." Disagreed to—102 to 103. The second declared that the Missouri compromise line ought to be restored, in terms or in substance. Agreed to—101 to 100. The third declared the agitation of the slavery question justifiable until the said compromise restricting slavery shall have been restored. Disagreed to—100 to 103. So it is exceedingly doubtful whether there is a working Anti-Nebraska majority in the House—that is, a majority who have nerve and backbone enough to meet the present emergency. The people have been deceived and betrayed to some extent at least. Next time let them scrutinize more closely, and elect men whose sympathies are not only right as to past action, but who will dare to take present responsibility. To