

Robert F. Wallcut, General Agent.

TERMS:—\$1.50 per annum, in advance.  
All remittances are to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper are to be directed, (POST PAID,) to the General Agent.  
Five copies will be sent to one address for TEN DOLLARS, if payment be made in advance.  
Advertisements making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cts.—one square for \$1.00.  
The Agents of the American, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Ohio Anti-Slavery Societies are authorized to receive subscriptions for the Liberator.

Financial Committee.—FRANCIS JACKSON, ELIAS GRAY, LEONARD, EDWARD QUINCY, SAMUEL PHILLIPS, WESLEY PHILLIPS. (This Committee is responsible only for the financial economy of the paper—not for any of its debts.)

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

VOL. XX. NO. 27.

# The Liberator.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

MARLBOROUGH, WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, May 29.  
SPEECH OF THEODORE PARKER.

MR. PRESIDENT:  
If we look hastily at the present aspect of American affairs, there is much to discourage a man who believes in the progress of his race. In this Republic, with the Declaration of Independence for its political creed, neither of the great political parties is hostile to the existence of slavery. That institution has the continual support of both the Whig and Democratic parties. There are now four eminent men in the Senate of the United States, all of them friends of slavery. Two of these are from the North—both natives of New England; but they surpass their Southern rivals in the zeal with which they defend that institution, and in the concessions which they demand of the friends of justice at the North. These four men are all competitors for the Presidency. Not one of them is the friend of freedom; he that is apparently least its foe, is Mr. Benton, the Senator from Missouri. Mr. Clay, of Kentucky, is less effectually the advocate of slavery than Mr. Webster, of Massachusetts. Mr. Webster himself has said, "there is no North," and to prove it experimentally, stands there as one mighty instance of his own rule.

In the Senate of the United States, only Seward and Chase and Hale can be relied on as hostile to slavery. In the House, there are Root and Giddings, and Wilcox and Mann, and a few others. "But what are these among so many?"  
See how it strikes a stranger. Here is an extract from the letter of a distinguished and learned man, sent out here by the King of Sweden to examine our public schools:—"I have just returned from Washington, where I have been witnessing the singular spectacle of this free and enlightened nation being buried in sorrow, on account of the death of that great advocate of slavery, Mr. Calhoun. Mr. Webster's speech seems to have made a very strong impression upon the people of the South, as I have heard it repeated almost as a lesson of the catechism by every person I have met within the slave territory. It seems now to be an established belief, that slavery is not a *malum necessarium*, still less, an evil difficult to get rid of, but desirable soon to get rid of. No, far from that; it seems to be considered as quite a natural, most happy, and essentially Christian institution."

Not satisfied with keeping an institution which the more Christian religion of the Mohammedan Bey of Tunis has rejected as a sin against God, we seek to extend it, to perpetuate it, even on soil which the half-civilized Mexicans made clear from its pollutions. The great organs of the party-politics of the land are in favor of the extension; the great political men of the land seek to extend it; the leading men in the large mercantile towns of the North—in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia—are also in favor of extending slavery. All this is plain.

But, sir, as I come up here to this Convention year after year, I find some signs of encouragement. Even in the present state of things, the star of Hope appears, and we may safely and reasonably say, "Now is our salvation nearer than when we first believed" in anti-slavery. Let us look a little at the condition of America at this moment, to see what there is to help or what to hinder us.

First, I will speak of the present crisis in our affairs; then of the political parties amongst us; then of the manner in which this crisis is met; next of the *idea of freedom*; and last, of its friends. I will speak with all coolness, and try to speak short. By the middle of anniversary week, men get a little heated; I am sure I shall be cool, and think I may also be dull.

There must be Unity of Action in a nation, as well as in an army; there cannot be harmony and welfare. As a man cannot serve two masters, antagonistic and diametrically opposed to one another, as God and Mammon, no more can a nation serve two opposite principles at the same time.

Now, there are two opposite and conflicting principles recognized in the political action of America; at this moment, they contend for the mastery, each striving to destroy the other.

There is what I call the AMERICAN IDEA. I so name it, because it seems to me to lie at the basis of all our truly original, distinctive and American institutions. It is itself a complex idea, composed of three subordinate and more simple ideas, namely:—the idea that all men are created equal; that all men are created equal; and that Government is to be established and sustained for the enjoyment and development of all those Unalienable Rights. This idea demands, as the proximate organization thereof, a Government of all the people, for all the people; of course, a Government after the principles of eternal justice, the unchanging law of God; for shortness sake, I will call it the IDEA OF FREEDOM. That is one idea; and the other is, that One man has a right to hold another man in thralldom, not for the slave's good, but for the master's convenience; not on account of any wrong the slave has done or intended, but solely for the benefit of the master. This idea is not peculiarly American. For shortness sake, I will call this the IDEA OF SLAVERY. It demands for its proximate organization, a Government of all the people by a part of the people—the masters; for and by a part of the people—the slaves; a Government contrary to the principles of eternal justice, contrary to the unchanging law of God. These two ideas are hostile, irreconcilably hostile, and can never be compromised and made to coalesce in the life of this nation, than the worship of the real God and the worship of the imaginary Devil can be combined and made to coalesce in the life of a single man.

An attempt has been made to reconcile and unite the two. The slavery clauses of the Constitution of the U. S. is one monument of this attempt; the

results of this attempt—you see what they are, not order, but confusion.

We cannot have any settled and lasting harmony until one or the other of these ideas is cast out of the councils of the nation; or there must be war between them before there can be peace. Hitherto, the nation has not been clearly aware of the existence of these two adverse principles; or, if aware of their existence, has thought little of their irreconcilable diversity. At the present time, this fact is brought home to our consciousness with great clearness. On the one hand, the friends of Freedom set forth the idea of Freedom, clearly and distinctly, demanding liberty for each man. This has been done as never before. Even in the Senate of the United States it has been done, and repeatedly during the present session of Congress. On the other hand, the enemies of Freedom set forth the idea of Slavery as this has not been done in other countries for a long time. Slavery has not been so lauded in any legislative body for many a year, as in the American Senate in 1850. Some of the discussions remind one of the spirit which prevailed in the Roman Senate A. D. 62; when about 400 slaves were crucified, because their master, Pedanius Secundus, a man of consular dignity, was found murdered in his bed. I mean to say, the same disregard of the welfare of the slaves, the same willingness to sacrifice them—if not their lives, which are not now in peril, at least their welfare, to the convenience of their masters. Any body can read the story in Tacitus, (Annals, Lib. XIV., cap. 42, et seq.) and it is worth reading, and instructive, too, at these times.

Here are some of the statements relative to slavery made in the 31st Congress of the United States. Hearken to the testimony of the Hon. Mr. Badger, of North Carolina:—"It is clear that this institution [slavery] not only was not disapproved of, but was expressly recognized, approved, and its continuance sanctioned by the Divine Lawgiver of the Jews."  
"Whether an evil or not, it is not a sin; it is not a violation of the Divine law."  
"What treatment did it receive from the Founder of the Gospel dispensation? It was approved, first negatively, because, in the whole New Testament, there is not to be found one single word, either spoken by the Savior, or by any of the Evangelists or Apostles, in which that institution is either directly or indirectly condemned. And also affirmatively,—"thine endeavors to quote by quoting the passages from St. Paul usually quoted for that purpose. "Nothing would be easier than for St. Paul to have said:—"Slaves, be obedient to your heathen masters; but I say to you, feeling masters, emancipate your slaves; the law of Christ is against that relation, and you are bound, therefore, to set them at liberty." No such word is spoken." Thus far goes the Hon. Senator Badger, of North Carolina.

Mr. Brown, of Mississippi, goes further yet. He knows what some men think of slavery, and tells them, "Very well, think so; but keep your thoughts to yourselves." He is not content with bidding the "freest and most enlightened nation in the world" to be silent on this matter; he is not content, with Mr. Badger, to declare that if an evil it is not a sin, and to find it upheld in the Old Testament and allowed in the New Testament; he tells us that he regards slavery as a great moral, social, political and religious blessing—a blessing to the slave, and a blessing to the master.

Thus the issue is fairly made between the two principles. The contradiction is plain. The battle between the two is open, and in sight of the world. But this is not the first time there has been a quarrel between the Idea of Slavery and the Idea of Freedom in America. The quarrel has lasted, with an occasional truce, for more than sixty years. In six battles, Slavery has been victorious over Freedom.

1. In the adoption of the Constitution supporting Slavery.
2. In the acquisition of Louisiana as slave territory.
3. In the acquisition of Florida as slave territory.
4. In making the Missouri Compromise.
5. In the annexation of Texas as a slave State.
6. In the Mexican war—a war man and wicked, even amongst wars.

Since the Revolution, there have been three instances of great national importance, in which Freedom has overcome Slavery; there have been three victories:

1. In prohibiting Slavery from the Northwest Territory, before the adoption of the Constitution.
2. In prohibiting the slave trade in 1808. I mean, in prohibiting the African slave trade; the American slave trade is still carried on in the capital of the United States.
3. The prohibition of Slavery in Oregon may be regarded as a third victory, though not apparently of so much consequence as the others.

Now comes another battle, and it remains to be decided whether the Idea of Slavery or the Idea of Freedom is to prevail in the territory we have conquered and stolen from Mexico. The present strife is to settle that question. Now, as before, it is a battle between Freedom and Slavery; one on which the material and spiritual welfare of millions of men depends; but now the difference between Freedom and Slavery is more clearly seen than in 1787; the consequences of each are better understood, and the sin of slavery is felt and acknowledged by a class of persons who had few representatives sixty years ago. It is a much greater triumph for slavery to prevail now, and carry its institutions into New Mexico in 1850, than it was to pass the pro-slavery provisions of the Constitution in 1787. It will be a greater sin now to extend slavery, than it was to establish it in 1620.

Ever since the adoption of the Constitution, protected by that shield, mastering the energies of the nation, and fighting with that weapon, slavery has been continually aggressive. The slave-driver has coveted new soil; he has claimed it; he has had his claim allowed. Louisiana, Florida, Texas, California and New Mexico are the results of Southern aggression. Now the slave-driver reaches out his hand towards Cuba, trying to clutch that emerald gem set in the tropic sea. How easy it was to surrender to Great Britain portions of the Oregon territory in a high northern lat-

itude! Had it been south of 36, 30, it would not have been so easy to settle the Oregon question by a compromise. So when we make a compromise there, the reciprocity must be all on one side.

Let us next look at the position of the political parties with respect to the present crisis. There are now four political parties in the land.

1. There is the Government party, represented by the President, and portions of his Cabinet, if not the whole of it. This party does not attempt to meet the question which comes up, but to dodge and avoid it. Shall Freedom or Slavery prevail in the new territory? is the question. The Government has no opinion; it will leave the matter to be settled by the people of the territory. This party wishes California to come into the Union without slavery, for it is her own desire so to come; and does not wish a territorial Government to be formed by Congress in New Mexico, but to leave the people there to form a State, excluding or establishing slavery as they see fit. The motto of this party is, *non intercessionem*. King James I. once proposed a question to the Judges of England. They declined to answer it, and the King said, "If you give no counsel, then why be ye counsellors?" The people of the United States might ask the Government, "If you give us no leading, then why be ye leaders?" This party is not hostile to slavery; not opposed to its extension.

2. Then there is the Whig party. This party has one distinctive idea; the idea of a Tariff for Protection—whether for the protection of American Labor, or merely American Capital, I will not stop now to inquire. The Whig party is no more opposed to slavery, or its extension, than the Governmental party itself.

However, there are two divisions of the Whigs, the Whig party South, and the Whig party North. The two agree in their ideas of protection, and their pro-slavery character. But the Whig party South advocates Slavery and Protection—the Whig party North, Protection and Slavery.

In the North, there are many Whigs who are opposed to slavery, especially to the extension of slavery; there are also many other persons, not of the Whig party, opposed to the extension of slavery; therefore, in the late electioneering campaign, to secure the votes of these persons, it was necessary for the Whig party North to make profession of anti-slavery. This was done accordingly, in a general form, and in special attempts was made to show that the Whig party was opposed to the extension of slavery.

Hear what Senator Chase says on this point. I read from his speech in the Senate, on March 26, 1850:—"On the Whig side it was urged, that the assiduity of the Philadelphia Convention was, if not positively favorable to the Proviso, at least pledged to leave the matter to Congress free from Executive influence, and ready to approve if when enacted by that body."

Gen. Cass had written the celebrated "Nicholson Letter," in which he declared that Congress had no constitutional power to enact the Proviso. But so anxious were the Democrats of the North to assume an anti-slavery aspect, (continues Mr. Chase,) that notwithstanding this letter, many of his friends in the Free Soil party persisted in asserting that he would not, if elected, veto the Proviso; many also insisted that he regarded slavery as excluded from the territories by the Mexican laws still in force; while others maintained that he regarded slavery as an institution of positive law, and Congress as constitutionally incompetent to enact such law, and that therefore it was impossible for slavery to get into the territories, whether Mexican law was in force or not.

This, says Mr. Chase, was the Whig argument:—"Prohibition is essential to the certain exclusion of slavery from the territories. If the Democratic candidate shall be elected, prohibition is impossible; for the veto will be used; if the Whig candidate shall be elected, prohibition is certain, provided you elect a Congress who will carry out your will. Vote, therefore, for the Whigs."

Such was the general argument of the Whig party. Let us see what it was in Massachusetts in special. Here I have documentary evidence. This is the statement of the Whig Convention at Worcester, published shortly before the election:—"We understand the Whig party to be committed in favor of the principles contained in the ordinance of 1787; the prohibition of slavery in the territories by new laws, and of its abolition wherever it can be constitutionally effected."

They professed to aim at the same thing which the Free Soil party aimed at, only the work must be done by the old Whig organization. Free Soil cloth must be manufactured, but it must be woven in the old Whig mill, with the old Whig machinery, and by the old Whig weavers. See what the Convention says of the Democratic party:—"We understand the Democratic party to be pledged to decline any legislation from the subject of slavery, with a view either to its prohibition or restriction in places where it does not exist; or to its abolition in any of the territories of the United States."

There is no ambiguity in that language. Men can talk very plain when they will. Still there were some that doubted; so the great and famous men of the party came out to convince the doubters that the Whigs were the men to save the country from the disgrace of slavery.

Here let me introduce the testimony of Mr. Choate. This which follows is from his speech at Salem. He tells us the great work is, the passage of a law to declare California and New Mexico shall remain forever free. That is... an object of great and transcendent importance;... we should go up to the very limits of the Constitution itself... to defeat the always detested, and forever-to-be-detested object of the dark ambition of that candidate of the Baltimore Convention, who has consented to pledge himself in advance, that he will veto the future law of freedom. Is there a Whig upon this floor who doubts that the strength of the Whig party next March will extend freedom to California and New Mexico, if by the Constitution they are entitled to freedom at all? Is there a member of Congress that would not vote for freedom? (Sensitively simplicitas! Ora pro nobis!) Is there a single Whig constituency, in any free State in this country, that would return any man that would not vote for freedom? Do you believe that Daniel Webster himself could be returned, if there was the least doubt upon this question? That is plain speech. But, to pass from the spe-

cial to the particular, hear Mr. Webster himself. What follows is from his famous speech at Marshfield, Sept. 1, 1848.

"Gen. Cass (he says) will have the Senate; and with the patronage of the government, with the interest that he, as a Northern man, can bring to bear, co-operating with every interest that the South can bring to bear, we cry safety before we are out of the woods, if we feel that there is no danger as to these new territories." In my judgment, the interests of the country and the feelings of a vast majority of the people require that a President of these United States shall be elected, who will neither use his official influence to promote, nor who feels any disposition in his heart to promote, the further extension of slavery in this country, and the further influence of it in the public councils.

Speaking of the Free Soil party and the Buffalo Platform, he says—"I hold myself to be as good a Free Soil man as any of the Buffalo Convention." Of the Platform he says—"I can stand upon it pretty well. I beg to know who is to inspire into my breast a more resolute and fixed determination to resist, unyieldingly, the encroachments and advances of the Slave Power in this country, than has inspired it, ever since the day that I first opened my mouth in the councils of the country."

If such language as this would not deceive the very Elect, what was most to the point, it was quite enough to deceive the Electors. But now this language is forgotten; forgotten in general by the Whig party North; forgotten in special by those who seemed to be the exponents of the Whig party in Massachusetts; forgotten at any rate by the 987 men who signed the letter to Mr. Webster; and in particular it is forgotten by Mr. Webster himself, who now says that it would disgrace his own understanding to vote for the extension of the Wilmot Proviso over the new territory!

There were some men in New England who did not believe the statements of the Whig party North in 1840, because they knew the men that uttered the sentiments of the Whig party South. The leaders put their thumbs in the eyes of the people, and then said, "Do you see any dough in our faces?" "No," said the people, "we see a speck." "Then vote our ticket, and never say we are not hostile to slavery so long as you live!"

At the South, the Whig party used language somewhat different. Here is a sample from the New Orleans Bee:—"Gen. Taylor is from birth, association, and conviction, identified with the South and her institutions; being one of the most extensive slaveholders in Louisiana—and supported by the slaveholding interest, as opposed to the Wilmot Proviso, AND IN FAVOR OF SECURING THE PRIVILEGE TO THE OWNERS OF SLAVES TO REMOVE WITH THEM TO NEWLY ACQUIRED TERRITORY."

3. Then there is the Democratic party. The distinctive idea of the Democrats is represented by the word Anti-Protection, or Revenue Tariff. This party, as such, is still less opposed to slavery than the Whigs; however, there are connected with it, at the North, many men who oppose the extension of slavery. This party is divided into two divisions:—the Democratic Party South, and the Democratic Party North. They agree in their idea of Anti-Protection and Slavery, differing only in the emphasis which they give to the two words. The Democrats of the South say Slavery and Anti-Protection; the Democrats North, Anti-Protection and Slavery. Thus you see, that while there is a specific difference between Democrats and Whigs, there is also a generic agreement in the matter of slavery. According to the doctrine of elective affinities, both drop what they have a feeble affinity for, and hold on with what their stronger affinity demands. The Whigs and Democrats of the South are united in their attachment to Slavery, not only mechanically, but by a net of chemical union.

Mr. Cass's Nicholson letter is well known. He says Congress has no constitutional right to resist slavery in the territories. Here is the difference between him and Gen. Taylor. Gen. T. does not interfere at all in the matter. If Congress puts slavery in, he says, very well! If Congress puts slavery out, he says the same, very well! But if Congress puts slavery out, Gen. Cass would say—No. You shall not put it out. One has the policy of King Log, the other that of King Serpent. So far as that goes, Log is the better King.

So much for the Democratic Party.

4. The Free Soil Party opposes slavery so far as it is possible to do, and yet comply with the Constitution of the United States. Its idea is declared by its words, *No more slave territory*. It does not profess to be an anti-slavery party in general, only an anti-slavery party subject to the Constitution. In the present crisis in the Congress of the United States, it seems to me the men who represent this idea, though not always professing allegiance to the party, have yet done the nation good and substantial service. I refer more particularly to Messrs. Chase, Seward and Hale in the Senate, to Messrs. Root, Giddings and Mann in the House. Those gentlemen seem to keep the Constitution—in what sense and with what limitations, I know not. It is for them to settle that matter with their own consciences. I do know this, that these men have spoken very noble words against slavery; heroic words in behalf of freedom. It is not to be supposed that the Free Soil party, as such, has attained the same convictions as to the sin of slavery, which the Anti-Slavery party has long arrived at. Still they may be as faithful to their convictions as any of the men about this platform. If they have less light to walk by, they have less to be accountable for. For my own part, spite of their short comings, and of some things which to me seem wrong in the late elections in New England, I cannot help thinking they have done good as individuals, and as a party; it seems to me they have done good both ways. I will honor all manly opposition to slavery, whether it comes up to my mark, or does not come near it. I will call every man to be true to his conscience, and his reason, not to mine.

In speaking of the parties, I ought not to omit to say a word or two respecting some of the most prominent men, and their position in reference to this slavery question. It is a little curious, that of all the candidates for the Presidency, Mr. Benton, of Missouri, should be the least inclined to support the pretensions of the Slave Power. But so it is. Of Mr. Cass, nothing more need be said at present; his position is defined and well known. But a word must be said of Mr. Clay. He comes forward, as usual, with a "Compromise." Here it is, in the famous "Omnibus Bill." In one point, it is not so good as the Government scheme. Gen. Taylor, as the organ of the party, recommends the admission of California, as an independent measure. He does not huddle and lump it together with any other matters; and in this respect, his scheme is more favorable to freedom than the other; for Mr. Clay couples the admission of California with other things. But in two points, Mr. Clay's bill has the superiority over the General's scheme.

1. It limits the Western and Northern boundaries of Texas, and so reduces the territory of that State, where Slavery is now established by law. Yet, as I understand it, he takes off from New Mexico about 70,000 square miles,—enough to make eight or ten States like Massachusetts,—and delivers it over to Texas to be slave soil; as Mr. Webster says, out of the power of Congress to redeem from that scourge.
2. It does not maintain that Congress has no power to exclude Slavery in admitting a new State; whereas, if I understand the President, (in his Message—Exec. Doc. II. of H. N. 17, p. 3), he considers such an act "an invasion of his rights!"

Let us pass by Mr. Clay, and come to the other aspirant for the Presidency.

At the Philadelphia Convention, Mr. Webster, at the most, could only get one-half the votes of New England; several of these not given in earnest, but only as a compliment to the great man from the North. Now, finding his Presidential war not likely to be bought by New England, he takes them to a wider market; with what success we shall one day see.

Something has already been said in the newspapers and elsewhere about Mr. Webster's speech. No speech ever delivered in America has excited such deep and righteous indignation. I know there are influential men in Boston, and in all large towns, who must always have somebody to sustain and applaud. They some time since applauded Mr. Webster, for reasons very well known, and now continue their applause of him. His life speech pleases them; its worst parts please them most. All that is as was to be expected; men like what they must like. But in the country, among the sober men of Massachusetts and New England, who prize right above the political expediency of to-day, I think Mr. Webster's speech is read with indignation. I believe no one political act in America, since the treachery of Benedict Arnold, has excited so much moral indignation as the conduct of Daniel Webster. But I pass by his speech, to speak of other things connected with that famous man. One of the most influential pro-slavery newspapers of Boston calls the gentlemen who signed the letter to him the "Retainers" of Mr. Webster. The word is well chosen, and quite descriptive. This word is used in a common, a familiar, and a legal sense. In the common sense, it means one who has complete possession of the thing retained; in the feudal sense, it means a dependent or vassal, who is bound to support his liege lord; in the legal sense, it means the person who hires an attorney to do his business, and the sum given to secure his services, or prevent him from acting for the opposite party, is called a retainer fee. I take it the word "Retainers" is used in the legal sense; certainly it is not in the feudal sense, for these gentlemen do not owe allegiance to Mr. Webster. Nor is it in its common sense, for events have shown that they have not a "complete possession" of Mr. Webster.

Now, a word about this letter to him. Mr. Webster's Retainers—987 in number—tell him—"You have pointed out to a whole people the path of duty, have convinced the understanding and touched the conscience of a nation!" "We desire, therefore, to express to you our entire concurrence in the sentiments of your speech, and our heartfelt thanks for the inestimable aid it has afforded towards the preservation and perpetuation of the Union."

They express their entire concurrence in the sentiments of his speech. In the speech, as published in the edition revised and corrected by himself, Mr. Webster declares his intention to support the famous fugitive slave bill, and the amendments thereto, with all its provisions, to the fullest extent." When the Retainers express their entire concurrence in the sentiments of the speech, they express their entire concurrence in that intention. There is no ambiguity in the language; they make a universal affirmation—(affirmatio de omni.) Now Mr. Webster comes out, (by two agents,) and recants this declaration. Let me do him no injustice. He shall be heard by his next friend, who wishes to amend the record—a correspondent of the Boston Courier of May 6th:—"The speech now reads thus:—"My friend at the head of the Judiciary Committee has a bill on the subject, now before the Senate, with some amendments to it, which I propose to support, with all its provisions, to the fullest extent." Changing the position of the word which, and the sentence would read thus:—"My friend at the head of the Judiciary Committee has a bill on the subject, now before the Senate, which, with some amendments to it, I propose to support, with all its provisions, to the fullest extent."

"Call you that backing your friends? Really, it is too bad, after his Retainers have expressed their entire concurrence in the sentiments of the speech, to back out, to deny that he entertained one of the sentiments already approved of and concurred in! Can it be possible, we ask, that Mr. Webster can recant to this device to defend himself, leaving his Retainers in the lurch? It does not look like him to do such a thing. But the correspondent of the Courier goes on as follows:—"We are authorized to state, first—That Mr. Webster did not revise this portion of his speech with any view to examine its exact accuracy of phrase; and second—That Mr. Webster, at the time of the delivery of the speech, had in his desk three amendatory sections, . . . and one of which provides expressly for the rights of trial by jury."

But who is the person "authorized to state" such a thing? Professor Stuart informs the public that it comes from the hand of a man who might claim a near place to Mr. Webster in respect to talent, integrity and patriotism.

Still, this recantation is so unlike Mr. Webster, that one would almost doubt the testimony of so great an unknown as is the writer in the Courier. But Mr. Stuart removes all doubt, and says—"I merely add that Mr. Webster himself has personally assured me that his speech was in accordance with the correction here made, and that he has now in his desk the amendments to which the corrector refers." So the Retainers must bear the honor, or the shame, whichever it may be, of volunteering the advocacy of that remarkable bill.

When Paul was persecuted for righteousness' sake, how easily might "the offence of the cross" have been made to cease by a mere transposition! Had he pursued that plan, he need not have been let down from the wall in a basket; he might have had a dinner given him by forty Scribes, at the first hotel in Jerusalem, and a doctor of the law to defend him in a pamphlet.

But, alas! in Mr. Webster's case, admitting the transposition is real, the transmutation is not thereby effected; the transfer of the which does not alter the character of the sentence to the requisite degree. The Bill which he volunteers to advocate contains provisions to this effect: that the owner of a fugitive slave may seize his fugitive, and on the warrant of any judge, commissioner, clerk, marshal, postmaster or collector, "residing or being" within the State where the seizure is made, the fugitive, without any trial by jury, shall be delivered up to his master, and carried out of the State. Now, this is the Bill which Mr. Webster proposes "to support, with all its provisions, to the fullest extent." Let him transfer his which, it does not transmute his statement so that he can consistently introduce a section which "provides expressly for the right of trial by jury." This attempt to evade the plain meaning of a plain statement is too small a thing for a great man.

I make no doubt that Mr. Webster had in his desk, at the time alleged, a bill designed to secure the trial by jury to fugitive slaves, prepared as it is set forth. But how do you think it came there, and for what purpose? Last February, Mr. Webster was intending to make a very different speech; and then, I make no doubt, it was that this bill was prepared, with the design of introducing it! But I see no reason for supposing that when he made his celebrated speech, he intended to introduce it as an amendment to Mr. Mason's or Butler's Bill. It is said that he will present it to the Senate. Let us wait and see.

But since the speech at Washington, Mr. Webster has said things at Boston almost as bad. Here they are—extracts from his speech at the Revere House. I quote from the report in the Daily Advertiser. "Neither you nor I shall see the legislation of the country proceed in the old harmonious way, until the discussions in Congress and out of Congress upon the subject, to which you have alluded, [the subject of Slavery], shall be, in some way, suppressed. Take that truth home with you—and take it as truth." A very pretty truth that is to take home with us, that "discussion" must be "suppressed!"

Again, he says:—"Sir, the question is, whether Massachusetts will stand to the truth against temptation [that is the question] whether she will be just against temptation! whether she will defend herself against her own prejudices! She has conquered every thing else in her time; she has conquered this ocean, which washes her shores; she has conquered her own sterile climate; she has fought her way to the universal respect of the world; she has conquered every one's prejudices but her own. The question now is, whether she will conquer her own prejudices!"

The trumpet gives no uncertain sound; but before we prepare ourselves for battle, let us see who is the foe. What are the "prejudices" Massachusetts is to conquer? The prejudice in favor of the American Idea; the prejudice in favor of what our fathers called "self-evident truths"; that all men are endowed with certain unalienable rights; that all men are created equal; and that to secure these rights governments are instituted amongst men. These are the prejudices Massachusetts is called on to conquer. There are some men who will do this "with alacrity"; but will Massachusetts conquer her prejudices in favor of the "unalienable rights of man"? I think, Mr. President, she will first have to forget two hundred years of history. She must efface Lexington and Bunker Hill from her memory, and tear the old rock of Plymouth out from her bosom. These are prejudices which Massachusetts will not conquer, till the ocean ceases to wash her shore, and granite to harden her hills. Massachusetts has conquered a good many things, as Mr. Webster tells us. I think there are several other things we shall try our hand upon before we conquer our prejudice in favor of the unalienable rights of man.

There is one pleasant thing about this position of Mr. Webster. He is alarmed at the fire which has been kindled in his rear. He finds considerable differences of opinion prevail . . . on the subject of that speech, and is "grateful to receive . . . opinions so decidedly concurring with" his own,—so he tells the citizens of Newburyport. He feels obliged to do something to escape the obloquy which naturally comes upon him. So he revises his speech; now supplying an omission, now altering a little; authorizes another great man to transpire his relative position and anchor it fast to a Senatorial desk designed to secure a jury trial for fugitive slaves, derides his opponents, and compares them with the citizens of ancient times. Here is his letter to the citizens of Newburyport—a very remarkable document. It contains some surprising legal doctrines, which I leave others to pass upon. But in it he explains the fugitive-slave law of 1793, which does not "provide for the trial of any question whatever by jury, in the State in which the arrest is made." At that time, nobody regarded any of the provisions of that bill as "repugnant to religion, liberty, the Constitution, or humanity;"

Since the delivery of the above, Mr. Webster has introduced his Bill, providing a trial by jury for fugitive slaves. If I understand it, Mr. W. does not object to a substitute for the Judiciary Bill on the subject, does not introduce it as an amendment to that or to any thing else. Nay, he does not formally introduce it—only lays it before the Senate, with the desire that it may be printed! The effect is to be desired to produce it is very easy to see. The Retainers can now say—See! Mr. Webster himself wishes to provide a trial by jury for fugitives! Some of the provisions of the Bill are remarkable, but they need not be dwelt on here.

Stuart removes all doubt, and says—"I merely add that Mr. Webster himself has personally assured me that his speech was in accordance with the correction here made, and that he has now in his desk the amendments to which the corrector refers." So the Retainers must bear the honor, or the shame, whichever it may be, of volunteering the advocacy of that remarkable bill.

When Paul was persecuted for righteousness' sake, how easily might "the offence of the cross" have been made to cease by a mere transposition! Had he pursued that plan, he need not have been let down from the wall in a basket; he might have had a dinner given him by forty Scribes, at the first hotel in Jerusalem, and a doctor of the law to defend him in a pamphlet.

But, alas! in Mr. Webster's case, admitting the transposition is real, the transmutation is not thereby effected; the transfer of the which does not alter the character of the sentence to the requisite degree. The Bill which he volunteers to advocate contains provisions to this effect: that the owner of a fugitive slave may seize his fugitive, and on the warrant of any judge, commissioner, clerk, marshal, postmaster or collector, "residing or being" within the State where the seizure is made, the fugitive, without any trial by jury, shall be delivered up to his master, and carried out of the State. Now, this is the Bill which Mr. Webster proposes "to support, with all its provisions, to the fullest extent." Let him transfer his which, it does not transmute his statement so that he can consistently introduce a section which "provides expressly for the right of trial by jury." This attempt to evade the plain meaning of a plain statement is too small a thing for a great man.

I make no doubt that Mr. Webster had in his desk, at the time alleged, a bill designed to secure the trial by jury to fugitive slaves, prepared as it is set forth. But how do you think it came there, and for what purpose? Last February, Mr. Webster was intending to make a very different speech; and then, I make no doubt, it was that this bill was prepared, with the design of introducing it! But I see no reason for supposing that when he made his celebrated speech, he intended to introduce it as an amendment to Mr. Mason's or Butler's Bill. It is said that he will present it to the Senate. Let us wait and see.

But since the speech at Washington, Mr. Webster has said things at Boston almost as bad. Here they are—extracts from his speech at the Revere House. I quote from the report in the Daily Advertiser. "Neither you nor I shall see the legislation of the country proceed in the old harmonious way, until the discussions in Congress and out of Congress upon the subject, to which you have alluded, [the subject of Slavery], shall be, in some way, suppressed. Take that truth home with you—and take it as truth." A very pretty truth that is to take home with us, that "discussion" must be "suppressed!"

Again, he says:—"Sir, the question is, whether Massachusetts will stand to the truth against temptation [that is the question] whether she will be just against temptation! whether she will defend herself against her own prejudices! She has conquered every thing else in her time; she has conquered this ocean, which washes her shores; she has conquered her own sterile climate; she has fought her way to the universal respect of the world; she has conquered every one's prejudices but her own. The question now is, whether she will conquer her own prejudices!"

The trumpet gives no uncertain sound; but before we prepare ourselves for battle, let us see who is the foe. What are the "prejudices" Massachusetts is to conquer? The prejudice in favor of the American Idea; the prejudice in favor of what our fathers called "self-evident truths"; that all men are endowed with certain unalienable rights; that all men are created equal; and that to secure these rights governments are instituted amongst men. These are the prejudices Massachusetts is called on to conquer. There are some men who will do this "with alacrity"; but will Massachusetts conquer her prejudices in favor of the "unalienable rights of man"? I think, Mr. President, she will first have to forget two hundred years of history. She must efface Lexington and Bunker Hill from her memory, and tear the old rock of Plymouth out from her bosom. These are prejudices which Massachusetts will not conquer, till the ocean ceases to wash her shore, and granite to harden her hills. Massachusetts has conquered a good many things, as Mr. Webster tells us. I think there are several other things we shall try our hand upon before we conquer our prejudice in favor of the unalienable rights of man.

There is one pleasant thing about this position of Mr. Webster. He is alarmed at the fire which has been kindled in his rear. He finds considerable differences of opinion prevail . . . on the subject of that speech, and is "grateful to receive . . . opinions so decidedly concurring with" his own,—so he tells the citizens of Newburyport. He feels obliged to do something to escape the obloquy which naturally comes upon him. So he revises his speech; now supplying an omission, now altering a little; authorizes another great man to transpire his relative position and anchor it fast to a Senatorial desk designed to secure a jury trial for fugitive slaves, derides his opponents, and compares them with the citizens of ancient times. Here is his letter to the citizens of Newburyport—a very remarkable document. It contains some surprising legal doctrines, which I leave others to pass upon. But in it he explains the fugitive-slave law of 1793, which does not "provide for the trial of any question whatever by jury, in the State in which the arrest is made." At that time, nobody regarded any of the provisions of that bill as "repugnant to religion, liberty, the Constitution, or humanity;"

Since the delivery of the above, Mr. Webster has introduced his Bill, providing a trial by jury for fugitive slaves. If I understand it, Mr. W. does not object to a substitute for the Judiciary Bill on the subject, does not introduce it as an amendment to that or to any thing else. Nay, he does not formally introduce it—only lays it before the Senate, with the desire that it may be printed! The effect is to be desired to produce it is very easy to see. The Retainers can now say—See! Mr. Webster himself wishes to provide a trial by jury for fugitives! Some of the provisions of the Bill are remarkable, but they need not be dwelt on here.

THE U. S. CONSTITUTION: A COVENANT WITH DEATH, AND AN AGREEMENT WITH HELL.

"Yes! it cannot be denied—the slaveholding lords of the South prescribed, as a condition of their assent to the Constitution, three special provisions to secure the perpetuity of their dominion over their slaves. The first was the immunity, for twenty years, of preserving the African slave trade; the second was the stipulation to surrender fugitive slaves—an engagement positively prohibited by the laws of God, delivered from Sinai; and, thirdly, the exaction, fatal to the principles of popular representation, of a representation for slaves—for articles of merchandise, under the name of persons. . . To call government thus constituted a democracy, is to insult the understanding of mankind. It is doubly tainted with the infection of riches and slavery. Its reciprocal operation upon the government of the nation is to establish an artificial majority in the slave representation over that of the free people, in the American Congress, and thereby to make the PRESERVATION, PROPAGATION AND PERPETUATION OF SLAVERY THE VITAL AND ANIMATING SPIRIT OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.—JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

and he has 'no more objections to the provisions of this law than was seen to them' by the framers of the law itself. If he sees therein nothing 'repugnant to religion, liberty, the Constitution, or humanity,' then why transport that relative pronoun, and have an amendment 'which provides expressly for the right of trial by jury?'

'In order to ally excitement, he answers, "and remove objections." There are many difficulties, however, attending any provision (of a jury trial), and a main one, and perhaps the only insuperable one, has been created by the framers of the law, by making it a penal offence in their officers to render any aid in apprehending or securing such fugitives, and absolutely refusing the use of their jails for keeping them in custody till a jury could be empanelled, witnesses summoned, and a regular trial be had.'

Think of that! It is Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio and New York which prohibit the fugitive from getting a trial for his freedom before a jury of twelve good men and true! But, Mr. Webster goes on:—'It is not too much to say, that to these States laws is to be attributed the actual and practical denial of trial by jury in these cases.' Generally, the cause is thought to prevent the effect, but here is a case in which, according to Mr. Webster, the effect has got the start of the cause by more than fifty years. The fugitive slave law of Congress, which allowed the master to capture the runaway, was passed in 1793; but the State laws he refers to, to which 'is to be attributed the actual and practical denial of trial by jury in these cases,' were not passed till after 1840. 'To what base uses may we come at last!' Mr. Webster would never have made such a defence of his pro-slavery conduct, had he not been afraid of the fire in his rear, and thought his Retainers not able to put it out. He seems to think this fire is set in the name of religion; so, to help us 'conquer our prejudices,' he cautions us against the use of religion, and quotes from the private letter of 'one of the most distinguished men in England,' dated as late as the 29th of January—'Religion is an excellent thing in every matter except in politics: there it seems to make man mad.' In this respect, it seems religion is inferior to money, for the Proverbs tell us that money 'answereth all things'; religion, it seems, 'answereth all things' except politics. Poor Mr. Webster! If religion is not good in politics, I suppose irreligion is good there; and really, it is often enough introduced there. So, if religion 'seems to make man mad' in politics, I suppose irreligion makes them sober in politics. But Mr. Webster, fresh from his transposition of his own relative, explains this—his friend ascribes the evil not to 'true and genuine religion,' but to 'that fantastic notion of religion.' So, making this transposition, it would read thus:—'That fantastic notion of religion' is an excellent thing in any matter except politics. 'Alas! Mr. Webster does not expound his friend's letter, nor his own language, so well as he used to expound the Constitution. But says, "The religion of the New Testament is as sure a guide to duty in politics, as in any other concern of life." So, in the name of 'Conscience and the Constitution,' Prof. Stuart comes forward to defend Mr. Webster by the religion of the New Testament; that religion which is founded on the teachings of Jesus and his apostles. How are the mighty fallen!

Mr. Webster makes a 'great speech,' lending his mighty influence to the support and extension of Slavery, with all its attendant consequences, which paralyze the hand of industry, enfeeble the thinking mind, and brutify the conscience which should discern between right and wrong; 987 of his Retainers in Boston think him for reminding them of their duty. But still the fire in his rear is so hot that he must come to Boston, talk about having *discussion suppressed*, and ask Massachusetts to *conquer her prejudices*. That is not enough. He must go up to Andover, and get a minister to defend him, in the name of 'Conscience and the Constitution,' supporting Slavery out of the Old Testament and New Testament. 'To what mean uses may we not descend!'

There is a 'short and easy method' with Prof. Stuart, and all other men who defend Slavery out of the Bible. If the Bible defends Slavery, it is not so much the better for Slavery, but so much the worse for the Bible. If Mr. Stuart and Mr. Webster do not see that, there are plenty of obscurer men that do. Of all the attacks ever made on the Bible by 'deists' and 'infidels,' none would do so much to bring it into disrepute as to show that it sanctioned American slavery.

It is rather a remarkable fact, that an Orthodox minister should be on Mr. Webster's paper, endorsing for the Christianity of Slavery. Let me say a word respecting the position of the Representative from Boston. I speak of his position, not of his personal character. Let him, and all men, have the benefit of the distinction between their personal character and official conduct. Mr. Winthrop is a consistent Whig—a representative of the Idea of the Whig party North, Protection and Slavery. When he first went into Congress, it was distinctly understood that he was not going to meddle with the matter of Slavery—the Tariff was the thing. All this was consistent. It is to be supposed that a Northern Whig will put the mills of the North before the black men of the South; and 'Property before Persons' might safely be written on the banner of the Whig party, North or South.

Mr. Winthrop asserts a little uneasy in his position. Some time ago he complained of a 'nest of vipers' in Boston, who had broken their own teeth in gnawing a file; meaning the 'vipers' in the *Free Soil Party*. I suppose, whose teeth, however, have a little edge still left on them. He finds it necessary to define his position, and show that he has kept up his communication with the base-line of operations from which he started. This circumstance is a little suspicious.

Unlike Mr. Webster, Mr. Winthrop seems to think religion is a good thing in politics, for in his speech of May 7th he says:—'I acknowledge my allegiance to the whole Constitution of the United States.' And whenever I perceive a plain conflict of jurisdiction and authority between the Constitution of my country and the laws of my God, my course is clear. I shall resign my office, whatever it may be, and renounce all connection with public service of any sort. That is fair and manly. He will not hold a position under the Constitution of the United States which is inconsistent with the Constitution of the Universe. But he says—'There are provisions in the Constitution of the United States, he means, not of the Universe, which involve us in painful obligations, and from which, some of us would rejoice to be relieved; and this [the restoration of fugitive slaves], is one of them. But there is none, none, in my judgment, which involves any conscientious or religious difficulty.' So he has no 'conscientious or religious' objection to return a fugitive slave. He thinks the Constitution of the United States 'avoids the idea that there can be property in man,' but recognizes 'that there may be property in the service or labor of man.' But when it is property in the service of man without value received by the servant, and a claim which continues to attach to a man and his children for ever, it looks very like the idea of property in man. At any rate, there is only a distinction in the words, no difference in the things. To claim the sum of the accidents, all and several of a thing, is practically to claim the thing.

Mr. Winthrop once voted for the Wilmot Proviso, in its application to the Oregon Territory. Some persons have honored him for it, and even contended that he also was a Free Soiler. He waxes off that caution by declaring, that he attached that Proviso to the Oregon bill for the purpose of defending the bill itself. 'This Proviso was one of the means upon which I mainly relied for the purpose.' There can be little doubt, he says, 'that this clause had its influence in arresting the bill in the other end of the Capitol,' where it was 'finally lost.' That is his apology for appearing to desire to prevent the extension of Slavery. It is worth while to remember this.

Unlike Mr. Webster, he thinks Slavery may go into New Mexico. 'We may hesitate to admit that Nature has every where [in the new territory] settled the question against Slavery.' Still he would not now pass the Proviso to exclude Slavery. It would unite the South as one man, and if it did not actually render the Union asunder, would create an alienation and irritation in that quarter of the country, which would render the Union hardly worth preserving.

'There is not ample reason for an abatement of the Northern tone, for a forbearance of Northern urgency upon this subject, without the impatience of temperance and treachery.'

Here I am reminded of a remarkable sentence in Mr. Webster's speech at Marshfield, in relation to the Northern men who helped annex Texas. Here it is:—

'For my part, I think that dough-faces is an epithet not sufficiently reproachful. Now, I think such persons are dough-faces, dough-heads, and dough-souls, that they are all dough; that the coarsest pater may mould them to pleasure to vessels of honor or dishonor, but most readily to vessels of dishonor.'

The Representative from Boston, in the year 1840, has small objection to the extension of slave soil. Hearken to his words:—

'I can never put the question of extending slave soil on the same footing with one of directly increasing Slavery and multiplying slaves. If a positive issue could ever again be made up for our decision, whether human beings, few or many, of whatever race, complexion or condition, should be freshly subjected to a system of hereditary bondage, and be changed from free men into slaves, I can conceive that no bonds of union, no ties of interest, no cords of sympathy, no considerations of past glory, present welfare, or future grandeur, should be suffered to interfere, for an instant, with our resolute and unceasing resistance to a measure so iniquitous and abominable. There would be a clear, unquestionable moral element in such an issue, which would admit of no compromise, no concession, no forbearance whatever. . . . A million of swords would leap from their scabbards to assert it, and the Union itself would be shattered like a Prince Rupert's glass in the shock.'

'But, sir, the question whether the institution of Slavery, as it already exists, shall be permitted to extend itself over a hundred or a hundred thousand more square miles than it now occupies, is a different question. . . . It is not, in my judgment, such an issue that conscientious and religious men may not be free to acquiesce in, or to support, as they may be arrived at by the constituted authorities of the country. . . . It is not with a view of coping up Slavery, within limits too narrow for its natural growth. . . . It is not for the sake of gridding it round with lines of fire, and setting it like that of the scorpion, shall be turned upon itself. . . . That I have ever advocated the principles of the Ordinance of 1787.'

Mr. Mann, I think, is still called a Whig, but no member of the Free Soil party has more readily or more ably stood up against the extension of slavery. His noble words stand in marvellous contrast to the discourse of the Representative from Boston. Mr. Mann represents the country, and not the 'metropolis.' His speech last February, and his recent letter to his constituents, are too well known, and too justly prized, to require any commendation here. But I cannot fail to make a remark on a passage in the letter. He says, if we allow Mr. Clay's compromise to be accepted, 'we are not for the horrible consequences which it would involve, a roar of laughter, like a *Jeu de foie*, would run down the course of the ages.' He afterwards says—'Should the South succeed in their present attempt upon the territories, they will impatiently await the retirement of Gen. Taylor from the Executive chair to add the "State of Cuba" to this noble triumph.' One is a little inclined to start such a laugh himself at the idea of the South waiting for that event before they undertake that plan!

Mr. Mann says—'If no moral or religious obligation existed against holding slaves, would not many of those opulent and respectable gentlemen who signed the letter of thanks to Mr. Webster, and hundreds of others, indeed, instead of applying to intelligence offices for domestics, go at once to the auction room, and buy a man or a woman with as little hesitancy or compunction as they now send to Brighton for beavers?' This remark has drawn on him some censures not at all merited. There are men enough in Boston, who have no objection to slavery. I know such men, who would have been glad if slavery had been continued here. Are Boston merchants unwilling to take mortgages on plantations and negroes? Do Northern men not acquire negroes by marrying swarthy women at the South, and keep the negroes as slaves? If the truth could be known, I think it would appear that Dr. Palfrey had lost more reputation in Boston than he gained, by emancipating the human beings which fell to his lot. But here is a story which I take from the Boston Republican. It is worth preserving as a monument of the morals of Boston in 1850, and may be worth preserving at the end of the century:—

'A year or two since, a bright-looking mulatto youth, about twenty years of age, and whose complexion was not much, if any, darker than that of the great 'Exponent of the Constitution,' entered the counting-room, or some private office, of a Kentuckian, who was making a visit here. A merchant on one of our principal wharves, who came in and spoke to him, remarked to the writer that he once owned this 'boy' and his mother, and sold them for several hundred dollars. Upon my expressing astonishment at him that he had sold his mother and his flesh, he remarked, that 'when you are among the Romans, you must do as the Romans do.' I know of others of my Northern acquaintances, (and good Whigs too,) who have owned slaves at the South, and who, if public opinion warranted it, would be as likely, I presume, to buy and sell them at the North.'

I have yet to learn that the controlling men of this city have any considerable aversion to domestic slavery.

Mr. Mann's zeal in behalf of freedom, and against the extension of slavery, has drawn upon him the indignation of Mr. Webster, who is grieved to see him so ignorant of American law. But Mr. Mann is able to do his own fighting.

So much for the political parties and their relation to the matters at issue at this moment. Still, there is some reason to hope that the attempt to extend slavery, made in the face of the world, and supported by such talent, will yet fail; that it will bring only shame on the men who aim to extend and perpetuate so foul a blight. The fact that Mr. Webster's Retainers must come to the rescue of their attorney; that themselves must write letters to defend himself, and must even obtain the services of a clergyman to help him—this shows the fear that is felt from the anti-slavery spirit of the North. Depend upon it, a politician is pretty far gone when he sends for the minister, and he thinks his credit falling when he gets a clergyman on his paper to endorse for the Christian character of American slavery.

Here I ought to speak of the party not political, who contend against slavery not only beyond the limits of the Constitution, but within those limits; who are opposed not only to the extension, but to the continuance of slavery; who declare that they will keep no compromises which conflict with the eternal laws of God,—of the Anti-Slavery party. Mr. President, if I were speaking to Whigs, to Democrats, or to Free Soil men, perhaps I might say what I think of this party, of their conduct, and their motives; but, Sir, I pass it by, with the single remark, that I think the future will find this party where they have always been found. I have before now attempted to point out the faults of this party, and before these men; that work I will not now attempt a second time, and this is not the audience before which I choose to chime its praises.

There are several forces which oppose the anti-slavery movement at this day. Here are some of the most important.

The Demagogues of the Parties are all or nearly all against it. By demagogue I mean the man who undertakes to lead the people for his own advantage, to the harm and loss of the people themselves. All of this class of men, or most of them, now support sla-

very—not, as I suppose, because they have any special friendship for it, but because they think it will serve their turn. Some noble men in politics are still friends of the slave.

The Demagogues of the Churches must come next. I am not inclined to attribute so much original power to the churches as some men do. I look on them as indications of public opinion, and not sources thereof—not the wind, but only the vane which shows which way it blows. Once the clergy were the masters of the people, and the authors of public opinion to a great degree; now they are chiefly the servants of the people, and follow public opinion, and seldom aspire to lead it, except in matters of their own craft, such as the technicalities of a sect, or the form of a ritual. They may lead public opinion in regard to the posture in prayer, to the form of baptism, and the like. In important matters which concern the welfare of the nation, the clergy have none or very little weight. Still, as representatives of public opinion, we really find most of the clergy, of all denominations, arrayed against the cause of Eternal Justice. I pass over this matter briefly, because it is hardly necessary for me to give any opinion on the subject. But I am glad to add, that in all denominations here in New England, and perhaps in all the North, there are noble men, who apply the principles of Justice to this question of the nation, and bear a manly testimony in the midst of bad examples. Some of the theological newspapers have shown a hostility to slavery and an attachment to the cause of liberty which few men expected; which were quite unknown in those quarters before. To do full justice to men in the sects who speak against this great and popular sin of the nation, we ought to remember that it is harder for a minister than for almost any other man to become a reformer. It is very plain that it is not thought to belong to the calling of a minister, especially in a large town, to oppose the actual and popular sins of his time. So when I see a minister yielding to the public opinion which favors unrighteousness, and passing by in silence and on the other side, causes which need and deserve his labors and his prayers, I remember what he is hired for, and paid for,—to represent the popular form of religion; if that be idolatry, to represent that. But when I see a minister oppose a real sin which is popular, I cannot but feel a great admiration for the man. We have lately seen some examples of this.

Yet on the other side, there are some very sad examples of the opposite. Here comes forward a man of high standing in the New England churches, a man who has done real service in promoting a liberal study of matters connected with religion, and defends slavery out of what he deems the 'infallible word of God,'—the Old Testament and New Testament. Well, if Christianity supports American slavery, so well the worse for Christianity, that is all. Perhaps I ought not to say, if Christianity supports slavery. We all know it does not, never did, and never can. But if Paul was an apologist for slavery, so much the better for Paul! I can easily understand the conduct of the leaders of the New York mob: considering the character of the men, their ignorance and general position, I can easily suppose they may have thought they were doing right in disturbing the meetings there. Considering the apathy of the public authorities, and the attempt, openly made by some men,—unluckily of influence in that city,—to excite others to violence, I have a good deal of charity for Rynders and his gang. But it is not so easy to excuse the conspicuous ecclesiastical defenders of slavery. They cannot plead their ignorance. Let them alone, to make the best defence they can.

The Toryism of America is also against us. I call that man a Tory, who prefers the accidents of man to the substance of manhood. I mean one who prefers the possessions and property of mankind to man himself, to Reason and to Justice. Of this Toryism we have much in America, much in New England, much in Boston. In this town, I cannot but think the prevailing influence is still a Tory influence. It is this which is the support of the demagogues of the State and the Church.

Toryism exists in all lands. In some, there is a good deal of excuse to be made for it. I can understand the Toryism of the Duke of Medina Sidonia, and of such men. If a man has been born to great wealth and power, derived from ancestors for many centuries held in admiration and in awe; if he has been bred to account himself a superior being, and to be treated accordingly, I can easily understand the Toryism of such a man, and find some excuse for it. I can understand the Toryism of other nations. The Toryism of the 'London Quarterly,' of 'Blackwood,' is easily accounted for, and forgiven. It is, besides, sometimes adorned with wit, and often set off by much learning. It is respectable Toryism. But the Toryism of men who only know they had a grandfather by inference, not by positive testimony; who inherited nothing but their bare limbs; who began their career as tradesmen or mechanics,—mechanics in divinity or law as well as in trade,—and got their bread by any of the useful and honorable callings of life—that such men, getting rich, or lifting their heads out of the obscurity they were once in, should become Tories, in a land too where institutions are founded on the idea of Freedom and Equity and Natural Justice—that is another thing. The Toryism of American journals, with little scholarship, with no wit, and wisdom in homopathic doses, the Toryism of a man who started from nothing the architect of his own fortune, the Toryism of a Republican, of a Yankee,—the Toryism of a Snob—it is Toryism reduced to its lowest denotation, made vulgar and contemptible; it is the little end of the tail of Toryism. Let us loathe the unclean thing in the depth of our soul, but let us pity the poor Tory; for he also, in common with the negro slave, is 'a man and a brother.'

Then the Spirit of Trade is often against us. Mr. Mann, in his letter, speaks of the opposition made to Wilberforce by the 'Guinea merchants' of Liverpool, in his attempts to put an end to the slave trade. The Corporation of Liverpool spent over £10,000 in defence of a traffic 'the worst the sun ever shone upon.' This would seem to be a reflection upon some of the merchants of Boston. It seems, from a statement in the Atlas, that Mr. Mann did not intend his remarks to apply to Boston, but to New York and Philadelphia, where mass meetings of merchants had been held, to sustain Mr. Clay's compromise resolutions. Although Mr. Mann did not apply his remarks to Boston, I fear they will apply here as well as to our sister cities. I have yet to learn that the letter of Mr. Webster's Retainers was any less well adapted to continue and extend Slavery, than the resolutions passed at New York and Philadelphia. I wish the institutions of Mr. Mann did not apply here.

One of the signs of the letter to Mr. Webster intentionally betrayed, I think, the open secret of the Retainers when he said—'I don't care a damn how many slave States they annex!' This is a secret, because not avowed; open, because generally known, or at least believed, to be the sentiment of a strong party in Massachusetts. I am glad to have it also expressed, and reiterated, and we do not fight in the dark.

It has long been suspected that some inhabitants of Boston were engaged in the slave trade. Not long since, the brig *Lucy Anne*, of Boston, was captured on the coast of Africa, with 547 slaves on board. This vessel was built at Thomaston in 1830; repaired at Boston in 1848, and now sails from this port. She was commanded by one 'Captain Otis,' and is owned by one 'Salem Charles.' This, I suppose, is a fictitious name, for certainly it would not be respectable in Boston to extend Slavery in this way. Even Mr. Winthrop is opposed to that, and thinks 'a million

swords would leap from their scabbards to oppose it.' But it may be that there are men in Boston who do not think it any worse to steal men who were born free, and have grown up free in Africa, and make slaves of them, than to steal such as are born free in America, before they are grown up. If we have the Old Testament decidedly sustaining Slavery, and the New Testament never forbidding it; if, as we are often told, neither Jesus nor his early followers ever said a word against Slavery; if scarcely a Christian minister in Boston ever preached against this national sin; if the Representatives from Boston have religious scruples against returning a fugitive slave, or extending Slavery over a 'hundred or a hundred thousand square miles of new territory; if the great Senator from Massachusetts refused to vote for the Wilmot Proviso, or re-affirm an ordinance of Nature, and re-nected the will of God; if he calls on us to return fugitive slaves 'with alacrity,' and demands of Massachusetts that she shall conquer her prejudices; if 987 men in this vicinity, of lawful age, are thankful to him for enlightening them as to their duty, and a Professor of Theology comes forward to sanction American Slavery in the name of religion—why, I think Mr. 'Salem Charles,' with his 'Captain Otis,' may not be the worst man in the world, after all! Let us pity him also, as a man and a brother.

Such is the crisis in our affairs; such the special issue in the great general question between Freedom and Slavery; such the position of parties and of great men in relation to this question; such the foes to Freedom in America. On our side, there are great and powerful allies. The American Idea is, with us,—the spirit of the majority of men in the North, when they are not blinded and muzzled by the demagogues of State and Church; the RELIGION of the land, also, is 'in our side; the irreligion, the idolatry, the infidelity thereof—all that is opposed to us. Religion is love of God and love of man: surely, all of that, under any form, Catholic or Quaker, is in favor of the unalienable rights of man. We know that we are right; we are sure to prevail. But in times present and future, as in times past, we need heroism, self-denial, a continual watchfulness, and an industry which never tires. Let us not be deceived about the real question at issue. It is not merely whether we shall return fugitive slaves without trial by jury. We will not return them with trial by jury; neither 'with alacrity,' nor with the 'solemnity of judicial proceedings!' It is not merely whether Slavery shall be extended or not. By and by there will be a political party with a wider basis than the Free Soil party, who will declare that the nation itself must put an end to slavery in the nation; and if the Constitution of the United States will not allow it, there is another Constitution that will. Then the title, defender and expounder of the Constitution of the United States, will give way to this—'defender and expounder of the Constitution of the Universe,' and we shall re-affirm the ordinance of Nature and re-nect the will of God. You may not live to see it, Mr. President, nor I live to see it; but it is written on the iron leaf that it must come—come, too, before long. Let the speech of Mr. Webster, and the defence thereof by Mr. Stuart, the letter of the Retainers and the letters of the Retained, will be a curiosity; the conduct of the Whigs and the Democrats an amusement, and the peculiar institution a proverb amongst all the nations of the earth. In the turmoil of party politics, and of personal controversy, let us not forget continually to move the previous question, whether Freedom or Slavery is to prevail in America. There is no attribute of God which is not on our side; because, in this matter, we are on the side of God.

Mr. President: I began by congratulating you on the favorable signs of the times. One of the most favorable is the determination of the South to use the powers of government to extend Slavery. At this day, we exhibit a fact worse than Christendom has elsewhere to disclose; the fact that one-sixth part of our population are mere property—not men, but things. England has a proletarian population the lowest in Europe; we have 8,000,000 of proletarians lower than the 'pauper laborers' of England, which the Whig Protectionists hold up to us in terror. The South wishes to increase the number of slaves, to spread this blot, this blight and baneful scourge of civilization over new territory. Hat-headed men of the South declare that, unless it is done, they will divide the Union; famous men of the North 'ave in,' and verify their own statements about 'dough-faces' and 'dough-souls.' All this is preaching anti-slavery to the thinking men of the North; to the sober men of all parties, who prefer conscience to cotton. The present session of Congress has done much to overturn Slavery. 'Whom the gods destroy, they first make mad.'

From the New York Tribune.

THE LATE ANTI-SLAVERY RIOTS IN NEW YORK.

New York, 6th mo. 4th, 1850.

To THE MAYOR: I have received thy favor of the 15th inst., and do it incumbent on me to submit the following rejoinder.

In thy account of the conversation which took place at our interview of the 6th ult., thou sayest that thou informed me that the Chief of Police was instructed not only 'to suffer no violence to be committed,' but also 'to suffer none to be threatened to be committed,' and thou express surprise that the latter clause was omitted in my statement. I have no recollection of hearing it. If I had, I am sure I should have mentioned it, and I should have returned to the meeting. But the point is not important, and I refer to it only to assure thee that nothing could be further from my intention than to misrepresent in the smallest particular.

Thou art aware, I presume, and if thou art not, there is abundant evidence that violence was threatened repeatedly and continually in all our Anti-Slavery meetings, from the first at the Tabernacle to the fourth and last at the Hall of the Society last evening. By repeated threats, and accompanied with threatening gestures, that he would not allow W. L. Garrison to assault the President, 'clenching his fist,' says the *Herald*, a witness friendly to the riot, and 'shaking it at Garrison.' Doing this, he leaped from the gallery upon the platform, and was followed and surrounded by fifty to a hundred confederates, when a highly respectable citizen requested Capt. Raymond, a policeman, that he should arrest Rynders as a rioter. Raymond refused, declaring that he (Rynders) was doing nothing more than he had a perfect right to do. Rynders overheard the request and the policeman's reply. He cursed the citizen, and made violent demonstrations of attack upon his leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynders threatened them with violence, if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, 'he would knock him off the stage.' In all this, and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, 'knock him down, turn him out, and repulse him even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side, but between them. The Hutchinson Family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, when Rynd

From the Dover Morning Star. THE FUGITIVE SLAVE QUESTION TEST.

Shall the fugitive slave be arrested by Northern men and forced back into bondage? This is the question now seriously before the country. It is a question of the human feeling, and especially of the humanity of him, who half dead with...

Ready to faint, yet bearing on. The ark of Freedom and of God. This question—a question settled by our fathers at the blinding cannon's mouth—settled by the pen of the Jeffersonian pen, by the pen of the Federalist, by the pen of the Abolitionist, or even by the pen of the Pious, but up in Freedom of Christendom. Not the driver Christendom, full-orbed Christendom of the United States of America, the land of refuge from the oppression—the land upon whose shores the unconquered heroes of the May Flower rejoiced to set their feet.

From the New York Independent. A PUZZLE FOR PHILEMON.

Rev. Dr. Eli Noyes, the distinguished Hebrew scholar of the Free-will Baptists, and now pastor of the Roger Williams Church of Providence, writes to the Morning Star an interesting account of a modern 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' begun in London, but which is not the joyful feelings of one who has escaped from a bondage worse than death. Perhaps some of the signers of the letters to Mr. Webster have been so long strangers to the feeling of spiritual parentage, that it would be idle to appeal to such sensibilities as Paul expressed to Philemon. But there are thousands of Christian pastors, to whom no casuistry could confute the candid conclusion of Mr. Noyes.

A FUGITIVE FROM SLAVERY.

'Yesterday we baptized, in the Roger Williams Church, a man, who recently escaped from one of our States, where he was held in slavery. Now, we suppose it was right enough for the church to receive him to fellowship upon a profession of his faith, and to baptize him, even slaveholders, we understand, do the same. But what are we to do with him now? Some of our great men, statesmen, divines, &c., have been calling us back to our constitutional duties, which they require us to send the fugitive back to his master. Now, we wish to be good, respectable and obedient citizens. We by no means wish to favor any fanaticism which would destroy our glorious Union. We are not deliberating, rationally and charitably in this affair, and we do not see how we can send our brother back into slavery; we do tell him to do so, he won't go, and we will, as Paul did by his convert, Onesimus, he would only doubt our friendship, and we are confident no member of his land. Well, considering that the man has been sold four times, and has had a pretty decent quantity of flogging, we cannot blame him the least for not believing that even his profession of Christianity would shield him from the awful lash, for Philemon of late has become fearfully impartial towards all runaways, saint and sinner—brother according to the flesh, and brethren according to the Spirit. Upon the whole, we conclude that we shall not send our brother back into slavery till God gives us another Bible, from which the consent of Christians shall not deliver him to his master, and which he has escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which shall choose, in one of thy gates, where it liketh him, and thou shalt not oppress him.' Deut. 23: 15, 16. Now, we shall not send him back till God effaces the law from his finger upon our hearts. Neither shall we be about any safe among us, as he would be in Canada. Though many of us are great peace men, yet we think it would be a very difficult affair indeed for any gang of man-stealers to kidnap and carry off our brother.

THE GERMANS WHO PERISHED IN THE GRIFFIN ON LAKE ERIE.

The German steamer, the Griffon, of New York, which sailed on the 20th inst. for Buffalo, and which was wrecked on the 23rd inst. in the Grand Duchy of Baden, has been the subject of a Committee to investigate the proper and decent treatment of these bodies were lying, and determined to purchase it to send it to a monument erected over them. It is now on its way to New York, and will be on board the Griffon, which took five, 250 dead passengers, 45 of whom were of 23 of crew; making a total of 336, of whom only 25 were rescued.

From the Promise.—Judge Daily, of New York, declares that a woman cannot be held to bail for a breach of promise to marry.

The new cemetery at Utica, New York, was dedicated on Thursday last week. It is a beautiful and spacious one, and will accommodate 10,000 of the Oriskany and Onondaga tribes. The sacred stone of the Oriskany was placed in the centre of the cemetery.

The Southern Press, a daily, is out in Washington. Messrs. Elwood Fisher and Edwin DeLoon are the editors, and Messrs. Sage and Heath the printers. They have commenced with a full subscription list, and are permanently established.

In Farth county, N. C. two of the Wealthy—on connection have been indicted and arrested for circulating abolition publications.

Of Worcester.—The population of Worcester, according to the present census, is 15,864—Increase since 1840, 839; since 1847, 2567.

The Liberator.

BOSTON, JULY 5, 1850.

THE FIRST OF AUGUST. ANNIVERSARY OF EMANCIPATION IN THE WEST INDIA ISLANDS.

The Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society having voted that they would celebrate the approaching Anniversary of West India Emancipation by a public meeting in the city of WORCESTER, the Committee of Arrangements would give notice, that the use of the beautiful and spacious CITY HALL of Worcester has been granted for that occasion; and on behalf of the Society, and for the sake of the three million slaves of this country, whose emancipation is still delayed and scornfully refused, they would invite all the true sons and daughters of Massachusetts alone, but of New England, to assemble on that day in WORCESTER, and renew the demand for that Emancipation in the name of Justice, of Humanity, and of God.

Let early, extensive, and general preparation be made for a meeting which shall surpass all that have gone before. It should be remembered that Worcester is peculiarly easy of access, by rail-road, not only from other parts of the State, but from Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Vermont; and it is hoped and earnestly desired that a numerous delegation will be present from each of those States.

Further particulars hereafter. For the Committee, SAMUEL MAY, Jr.

WORCESTER COUNTY A. S. SOCIETY.

A quarterly meeting of the Worcester (South Division) Anti-Slavery Society was held on Saturday and Sunday last, June 29 and 30, at Millville and Blackstone—in the spacious Town Hall, Sunday forenoon and afternoon, at the latter place. There was a large and most gratifying attendance, many persons coming from the neighboring towns, and all giving evidence of a strong desire to hear what might be said on the occasion. The President occupied the chair; and, after the appointment of a financial committee, (a liberal sum being subsequently contributed to defray expenses and carry on the good cause), the following resolutions were presented for discussion by Wm. Lloyd Garrison:—

Resolved, That where oppression is cherished by any people, their religious obligations are offered in vain; inasmuch as an abomination unto God; and new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies for worship, his soul hateth; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting;—and though they spread forth their hands, he will hide his eyes from them—and though they make many prayers, he will not hear.

Resolved, That the first thing God requires and will accept of such a people is to wash, and make themselves clean; to put away the evil of their doings from before his eyes; to cease to do evil; to learn to do well; to seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, and plead for the widow.

Resolved, That the American people are self-convinced criminals of the deepest dye, in holding in the galling chains of slavery three millions of their number; and not until they as formally reject Christianity as an imposture, as they now confess it to be the only true religious faith—not until they as earnestly denounce their Declaration of Independence as a perniculous instrument, as they now declare it to be a just and comprehensive exposition of the rights of man—they are to be addressed, on this subject, in any other language than that of condemnation, warning and rebuke.

Resolved, That among the productions of the press, calculated to make the Bible a detested book, as sanctioning all conceivable immorality, no one is more shameful than the recent work of Professor Stuart of Andover, entitled 'Conscience and the Constitution,' in which he declares that slavery is recognized and sanctioned as a permanent institution among the Jews in the fourth commandment of the Decalogue; that men may make merchandise of their species, and yet be exemplary disciples of Christ—that while almost every prevailing sin of the day is expressly and strongly denounced by the Saviour, he does not once touch on the abuses of slavery—not even in his Sermon on the Mount he has brought this matter into view—that such passages as these, 'Hide the out-cast, bewray not him that wandereth,' 'Thou shalt not deliver unto his master, the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee,' 'Undo the heavy burdens, let the oppressed go free, break every yoke, have no application to those who are held in slavery by this 'Christian nation,' for in case of their flight from chains and stripes, they are to be caught by us and returned to their masters!!!

Resolved, That when, in one breath, Professor Stuart says that 'universal and immediate emancipation would be little short of insanity—that the blacks themselves would be the first and most miserable victims—that stealing, robbery, rapine, and other evils, would inevitably follow in the train of their liberation'; and when, in the next breath, he indignantly denies 'that he is the advocate or apologist of slavery'; and solemnly declares—'I would not have upon my conscience the guilt of turning God's image, (redeemed by the blood of his Son, and made free by the Lord Jesus Christ himself) into goods and chattels—I would not bring on my soul that guilt for ten thousand worlds'; he flatly contradicts and confounds himself, shows his mind to be in a state of utter moral confusion, indicates an anxiety to propitiate both God and the devil, and proves his absolute unfitness to be a teacher even of the first principles of righteousness.

Resolved, That if it took '987 retainers' to bolster up Daniel Webster in his pro-slavery position at Washington, it would require more than nine hundred and eighty-seven millions to uphold Moses Stuart in his Bible defence of slavery at Andover.

Resolved, That the climax of gross hypocrisy and cool enmity is seen in a recent letter of Mr. Webster to Prof. Stuart, written since his betrayal of the cause of liberty universally, his recency to the rights and interests of his Northern constituents, his pandering to the worst desires of the Southern slave-breeder, in which he gravely asks—'Is it not time, my dear Sir, that the path of Christian duty, in relation to the obligations which men are under to support the Constitution and the fundamental principles of the Government under which they live, should be clearly pointed out?'—which means, in unambiguous language, 'Is it not time to show that the gospel of Christ is hostile to any agitation of the subject of slavery—contains no injunction whatever against the traffic in human flesh—admits of no protection being given to the fugitive slave, but requires his seizure and re-enslavement—and makes obedience to the Constitution, with all its compromises for the protection of slavery, a religious duty?'

Eloquent and stirring speeches were made by Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Charles C. Burleigh, and Stephen S. Foster, which evidently produced a deep impression. The resolutions were unanimously adopted. For the Committee, JOHN H. CHANEY, Sec.

SPEECH OF THEODORE PARKER. Those who heard this very able and comprehensive speech at the New England Convention will be highly gratified to see it in our columns to-day. Those who did not hear it will need no urgency to give it a thorough perusal. It shows, with a master's skill, the crisis in our national affairs—the special issue in the great struggle between Freedom and Slavery—the position of parties and of great men in relation to this struggle—and how favorable are all the signs of the times as to the result.

LETTER FROM JAMES HAUGHTON.

36 BUCKLE STREET, DUBLIN, June 12, 1850.

MY DEAR FRIEND:

I have been thinking for a good while past of writing to you, and I now take my pen to send you a few lines, were it only for the purpose of telling you that my heart is still with you in the noble work you have in hand. I read of your doings and of your struggles in the cause of humanity with unabated interest. That you should have so many, and so persevering enemies to encounter and overthrow—for overthrow they will all assuredly be in the long run—is cause of much regret, but not of surprise; for all who strive in any way to abate the wrong-doing which prevails in all communities of men, are sure to be met with interested opposition, violent just in proportion to the real effectiveness of their labors. It is not to be wondered at, that men who derive their gains from slavery or intemperance, or any other giant iniquity, should be enraged against those who assail their evil practices, and hold them up to the detestation of the world. The wonder to me is, that the wealthy and educated classes,—that those men who, from social position in society, are naturally expected to lead public opinion aright, should be so often found sympathizing with the doers of iniquity. The American people condemn slavery in the abstract, but few among you are to be found who are willing to visit the slaveholder with the censure he deserves. Channing characterizes slavery, as the greatest wrong which can be inflicted on a man; and yet even he attared but faint condemnation on the wrong-doer. The system he abhorred; the direct sustainer of the iniquity he could find excuses for in the fact, that he was surrounded from infancy by evil influences, which he seemed to think shared with his soul a portion of the crime of which he was the guilty agent. So it is with multitudes among you and among us; they exhibit an unaccountable tenderness towards acknowledged vices, if these vices be popular, and if they are sustained by general consent. With us, intemperance is a sin which widely desolates our land. All acknowledge the evil; few among the wealthy and the educated take any pains to abate the nuisance; almost all, by their example, sustain our drinking customs, and the teetotaler is looked upon as a sort of fanatic. He is not, it is true, subjected, as the abolitionist with you is, to much public odium and some personal danger, but he is met with the same heartless indifference to human misery and human degradation, which the abolitionist has to encounter in his fiercer warfare with interest and passion.

Indifference seems to me the great impediment in the way of reform; its deadening influences meet us at every step we take. We cannot get men to think about the social evils which surround them, and therefore they cannot be induced to take any active measures for their abatement. The conservative feeling in communities is strong; changes involve the necessity of action, action is troublesome, and in all cases, it comes in collision with the supposed interests of many, and thus opposition even to changes obviously advantageous is fierce and protracted. In their righteous movement, the abolitionists in your land have experienced a larger measure of the obloquy and ill-treatment incident to their measures. The late shameful proceedings in New York, in opposition to your annual meeting, are indeed disgraceful to that city; but I have seen meetings here similarly disturbed, when held for purposes opposed to popular feeling. Nowhere have men yet arrived at that degree of toleration wherein the advocacy of unpopular opinions is patiently listened to by large gatherings. Civilization offers a painful contrast to savage life in this respect. I have been led to doubt the value, or even propriety, of calling public meetings for discussion, so much heat and passion are generally elicited on such occasions. We had one in this city a few months ago on the subject of Free Trade. A few Protectionists attended, but they in vain attempted to get a hearing. No blackguardism such as disgraced your meetings in New York was exhibited; but such a decided determination was manifested not to hear the unpopular side of the question, that I felt satisfied it would have been better for each party to have called their own meeting, and to have allowed the public to judge of the merits of their different opinions as they would be given in the newspapers. Would not such a course as this, on the part of abolitionists and pro-slavery men, be preferable to inviting discussion, where discussion cannot be expected to proceed calmly or rationally?

I do not know whether you bear in recollection that, on the question of admitting slave-grown produce into these countries, you and J. and H. C. Wright and George Thompson and F. Douglass, used to have some interesting discussions. Frederick and I took the side of exclusion; you and the others that of free trade. My ideas on this matter have undergone much modification, as experience has proved that some of my apprehensions are not justified. It would seem that, on the opening of the trade, the results on which Frederick and I grounded our opposition actually followed;—that a large increase in the importation of negroes into Cuba and Brazil took place. This was a terrible evil, not to be sanctioned in any degree by men who felt strongly that such must be the case; but, in another respect, this freedom of trade, has given satisfactory proof to the world that free labor has nothing to fear in competition with slave labor, so that, in future, we may rest on the pleasing conclusion that the men-stealers of Brazil and Cuba will find it unprofitable work to continue their nefarious proceedings on the coast of Africa. (Some months since, the editor of the Economist, a London paper,) in order to quiet the apprehensions of our land-owners that free trade in corn would prove ruinous to their interests, proved to them that the fears of a similar nature, entertained by the West India planters, were groundless, inasmuch as the importations of sugar into Great Britain and Ireland, the produce of free labor, were steadily increasing, while those of slave labor produce were falling off largely. The following are his figures:—

1844, 4,102,468 cwts. 1847, 5,829,523 cwts. 1845, 4,914,618 1848, 5,054,286 1846, 4,473,769 1849, 5,229,789

Here, then, we have an increase of 25 per cent. since 1844, and of about 16 per cent. since 1846. The increase appears to be distributed pretty equally over all our colonies; all shared in the advantages of free over slave labor. Our consumption of foreign sugar for eleven months in each of the four following years, was—

1846, 516,987 cwts. 1847, 936,054 cwts. 1848, 1,196,848 1849, 427,124

The consumption of foreign sugar of 1846 was confined chiefly to the four months from August, when the act was passed, to December. The first entire year was 1847, under the operation of that act; so that already in 1849, while the consumption of colonial sugar has increased upwards of 600,000 cwt., the consumption of foreign sugar has declined already fully one-half, or more than 400,000 cwt.

Eleven months in each of the four years are taken, as that time only had passed over, in 1849, when the foregoing returns were taken. It is expected that this year will show even more favorable results. The knowledge that the admission of slave-grown sugars would permanently increase the slave trade, and I now feel that, however much we must deplore the added impulse given to it for a couple of years after we admitted free competition, yet that, in future, such unhappy consequences are not likely to follow. It would seem that the superior cheapness of free labor is now proved on a larger scale, so that henceforward your slaveholders, and slaveholders every where, will be known to act on a false principle, peculiarly as well as morally.

EXPENSES OF THE N. E. CONVENTION.

Since our last number, the following donations have been kindly made, and we trust we shall be enabled in our next number to announce that the whole amount required has been received. Who will take the remainder of the 'stock'?

Previously acknowledged, \$22 50 Isaac Stevens, Andover, 2 00 George T. Adams, Kingston, 1 00 Bourne Spooner, Plymouth, 2 00 Nathl B. Spooner, do, 1 00 David Hineley, Hyannisport, 1 00 John Holland, Abington, 1 00 Wm. Shaw, Boston, 1 00 Dr. J. B. Whitcomb, Brooklyn, Conn., 5 00 Lydia L. Bennett, Portland, Me., 5 00

It is our intention to be at the Anti-Slavery Convention, to be held at Pawtucket on the 14th inst. We hope to see a large number present.

I wrote my ideas on this subject to the editor of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter, and suggested that British abolitionists should no longer waste their energies in efforts to exclude foreign sugar, but direct their attention to the continued social improvement of the colored population in our own colonies. No notice has been taken in that paper of my letters, and as Mr. Buxton has been since ineffectually agitating the question, on the old ground, in Parliament, I conclude that the Committee in London are determined still to pursue their old course. It is gratifying to me to feel assured that slaveholding is a losing concern, as well as a villainous concern; and this knowledge, added to the moral and religious convictions of mankind on the subject, cannot fail to urge onwards the cause of universal emancipation from physical bondage. A longer period must elapse, before the light of truth shall have freed mankind from the mental bondage which envelops the world.

Since writing the foregoing, I have read in the Times (of London) an account of the outrage committed on F. Douglass, in New York. If I can get a copy of the paper, I will send it to you, as a token of the editor are excellent in their way. How shocking this prejudice against color is! It is a direct attack on the supremacy of the Deity, who has seen fit to tinge the complexion of inhabitants of various countries with different hues. I suppose this outrage arose, in some measure, out of the excited state of feeling in New York, consequent upon the infamous proceedings at your annual meeting. There are no particulars of the assault given. I hope our friend was not personally injured. It is difficult to speak with any degree of calmness of such wicked doings. I hope to hear that there is sufficient manly feeling in the people of New York to make them indignant at such conduct. If such be not the case, that entire community will be degraded before the civilized world. The act will not be merely the insane proceeding of an individual man, but it will affix a deep stain on all the inhabitants of that place. This weak attempt to lower Mr. Douglass and his colored countrymen in the estimation of the worthy and the good, will but bring added sympathy with them in their unmerited afflictions, and cover their contemptible oppressors with deserved infamy. Surely, there cannot be many persons in New York who will countenance such an attack on an unoffending man. The fellow who perpetrated the deed must have been drunk at the time.

I find that Father Mathew is still disgracing himself and his country by his fulsome adulation of the men-stealers who have been buying his praises, which, though given for small payment, are still too dearly purchased. How this once honored individual has sunk himself by his want of adherence to principle! His fame and his usefulness are for ever destroyed.

The mad expedition of a portion of your people against Cuba has caused a deal of comment here. It is said to be already abortive; but I can hardly believe that the shrewd Yankees would have entered into such an engagement without such an understanding with partisans in Cuba as would afford them some prospect of success. It seems to be a wild and altogether unjustifiable scheme; yet I am not a little amused at the vehemence of abuse lavished on the 'pirates' by Lord Brougham and others, in and out of Parliament, who have sought to praise and admiration of Sir James Brooke for his cowardly and altogether unjustifiable slaughter at Borneo. I do not think such Englishmen are entitled to cast a stone at Americans, because of their buccaneering and plundering propensities.

I have not any space left for gossip or chat about friends here, or at your side the water, so must content myself with a general statement that we are all well, and with the hope that the many whom I love and esteem at your side the Atlantic are all also in the enjoyment of health and happiness. I hope you have shaken off all your ailments, and that, in the midst of a happy family, you experience that best of earthly joys—domestic felicity.

Farewell, dear friend! Believe me to be yours affectionately, JAMES HAUGHTON.

IRISH EMIGRANT SOCIETY.

Among the various useful and benevolent associations, for which this city has justly obtained so much celebrity, perhaps no one is of more direct importance to its welfare—and, consequently, no one more deserving the generous contribution of its citizens—than the Irish Emigrant Society. The number of emigrants from Ireland, arriving at this port, is constantly augmenting; if compelled to remain here, where labor is redundant, in their extreme destitution and helplessness, for lack of means to reach the teeming West, where industrial employment is sure to be found, and boundless scope for enterprise is afforded for all, the consequences are easily to be predicted, viz. a vast increase of human wretchedness, pauperism and crime; taxation yet more burdensome, growing insecurity of all the interests of society, and a total inability to find a remedy for an evil, which, if promptly attended to, can now be readily cured. It is the beneficent and praiseworthy object of the Emigrant Society to exercise a watchful supervision over all impoverished emigrants on landing here, give them temporary shelter and assistance by the most careful and judicious management, and with the least possible delay to facilitate their passage to the Western States, where the resources of the country are abundant, and where alone the object of the emigrant in coming here—that of bettering his condition—can be safely calculated on. All classes in this crowded city are deeply interested in a movement of this nature; and it is believed our wealthy citizens in particular, the fame of whose charitable deeds has gone through the world, will give to their warm approbation and generous support.

The government of the Society consists of the following gentlemen:—

- Patrick Donahoe, President. D. W. O'Brien, Vice-President. Michael Gallagher, 2d Vice-President. J. O'H. Cantillon, 3d Vice-President. Arthur McAvoy, Treasurer, (who gives bonds for the faithful discharge of his duty.) John Tighe, Corresponding Secretary. Philip S. Taggart, Recording Secretary. Board of Directors, W. F. A. Kelly, W. S. Baxter, Maria Griffin, Thomas Hughes, W. Hickey, Hugh Green, J. T. Power, B. A. Hastings, A. Christie, P. Holly, N. J. Bean.

Mr. John Wilson, the veteran friend of the emigrant, and the uncompromising advocate of Teetotalism, will wait upon our fellow-citizens to solicit donations for this praiseworthy object.

It is our intention to be at the Anti-Slavery Convention, to be held at Pawtucket on the 14th inst. We hope to see a large number present.

CONFESSION OF PROF. WEBSTER.

At the meeting of the Council on Tuesday morning, the case of Prof. Webster was referred to a Committee.

Before this Committee, at 12 o'clock, appeared the Rev. Dr. Putnam, the spiritual adviser of the condemned, with a petition for a commutation of punishment, together with a confession that he killed Dr. Parkman. The Reverend gentleman (says the Traveller) professed the statement by a few remarks relative to the manner in which the Confession was made to him. He stated that he had no previous acquaintance with Professor Webster, before being called to act in the capacity of his spiritual adviser. In the first few weeks of his visits, he sought no acknowledgments of the prisoner. At length, on the 23d of May, he visited him in his cell, and demanded of him, for his own well-being, that he should tell the truth in regard to the matter; and he acceded to the request, by making a statement which was now submitted for the consideration of the Council.

It was in substance as follows:— On Tuesday, Nov. 20th, Professor Webster sent a note to Dr. Parkman. It was handed to Littlefield, and was unsealed. It was to ask Dr. Parkman to call on me, as he had become quite importunate about his debt. I wished to gain time. I did not expect to be able to pay him on Friday. I expected to state to him my inability, and to apologise for what had occurred, and make some promises for the future.

I heard on Thursday that he was in pursuit of me, and feared that he had not got my letter. I therefore called at his house, and asked for an interview. Dr. Parkman agreed to meet me at the College at half past one o'clock. At the time appointed, he came to the College. He came in at the lecture-room door, and followed me into the laboratory. He asked, with great energy, Have you got the money? I said, No, Doctor, and began to apologise. He would not hear me, and began to load me with opprobrious epithets, notwithstanding all I could say. Afterwards, he drew the notes and an old letter from his pocket, and, referring to the letter, said, In this letter I recommended you for your present situation, and now I have you turned out.

Dr. Parkman continued gesticulating in the most violent manner, and finally thrust his fists in my face. This caused my passions to rise, and in a moment of uncontrollable anger I seized whatever implement was near, which happened to be a stick of wood, and struck him a blow on the side of the head. There was no second blow. He fell upon the pavement of the room, insensible.

Blood flowed from his mouth, but there were no signs of life. I stood over his body ten minutes, and then found that he was dead. My first impulse was to run and bolt the doors, to consider what was to be done.

The Professor then states that he first burnt the clothes and papers, with the exception of those found upon him. The watch he afterwards threw over Cambridge bridge.

He then took the body to the sink, and dismembered it. He used for that purpose the knife found in the tea-chest. The Turkish knife was not used for that purpose. The head and some other parts of the body were placed in the furnace that day, and fuel heaped upon them. The stick with which the fatal blow was inflicted he then picked up, and found it to be a piece of grape vine some two inches in diameter, and two feet long. It was brought in from Cambridge some time previously, for the purpose of trying experiments relative to dyeing wood.

Upon the notes, he made the marks found upon them with a metallic pen, and put them in his pocket. He says that he never saw the sledge hammer spoken of by Littlefield. That night he left the College at 6 o'clock, after having disposed of the body in various places.

On Saturday he visited the College, but made no change in the position of the remains. He first saw an account of the disappearance of Dr. Parkman on Saturday evening, and then reflected as to what should be his course.

He concluded on Sunday to come into Boston, and make the statements which he did, relative to the visit of Dr. Parkman to his rooms.

On Sunday he visited his rooms. After the visit of the officers, he put part of the body in the privy and part in the tea-chest.

The tin-box was designed to receive the thorax; the fish hooks to be used in grappling up the remains. But he did not use them.

He was not aware that he put the knife in the tea chest. The brush pen found in his room was used in making diagrams. The bunch of keys found in his room, were found by him in the street.

The nitric acid found on the stairs, was dropped there by accident.

When the officers came to arrest him, he was in doubt as to their object, whether it was, as alleged, to again search the College, which was equally dreadful with fears of the facts having already been discovered.

When they reached the jail, his fears of being detected were confirmed, and before leaving the carriage he took a large dose of strychnia, sufficient to have caused death, had it not been for the excited state of his mind. To this he attributed his after strange appearance.

He states that he wrote but one of the anonymous letters, that from East Cambridge.

The letter from jail, he again asserts, contained only a caution against a bottle of nitric acid.

After he had made the statement, Dr. Putnam advised him to state, as for a man at the point of death, whether, previously to the occurrence, the thought had not occurred to him that Dr. Parkman's death would benefit him. He replied in an impressive manner—No, as I live I never dreamt of any such thing. My passions have been my besetting sin. I never had thought of injuring Dr. Parkman.

THE ONE HUNDRED CONVENTIONS.

Held pursuant to a resolution adopted at the recent New-England Anti-Slavery Convention.

Will continue with meetings at the following named places:— GLOUCESTER, (Essex County), Sunday, July 7.

This Convention will be held in the Town Hall, Gloucester Harbor, commencing at 10 o'clock. A. M. Wendell Phillips, Parker Pillsbury, and Samuel May, Jr. will be present.

SOUTHBORO, (Worcester County.) Saturday Evening and Sunday, July 6 and 7.

To be held in the Town Hall, and will be attended by Stephen S. Foster and Charles C. Burleigh.

BERLIN, (Worcester County.) Saturday Evening and Sunday, July 13 and 14.

PAWTUCKET, (R. I.) Saturday Evening and Sunday, July 13, and 14. [Particulars next week, and in handbills.]

MILFORD, (Worcester County.) Saturday Evening and Sunday, July 20 and 21.

ANDOVER, (Essex County.) Saturday Evening and Sunday, July 27 and 28.

W. M. FERNALD will speak at East Abington, next Sunday, at the Lyceum Hall, forenoon and afternoon, on some subjects pertaining to progressive humanity.

ANTI-SLAVERY LECTURES.

LORINO MOODY will lecture on Slavery in Stoneham, Sunday, July 7. Medford, Monday, " 8. West Cambridge, Tuesday, " 9. Bedford, Wednesday, " 10. Concord, Thursday, " 11. West Acton, Friday, " 12. Loomisston, Sat. and Sun., 13 and 14. Fitchburg, Monday, July 15.

LECTURES AT NORTHAMPTON.

Wm. LLOYD GARRISON will lecture at the Town Hall, at Northampton, on Sunday, 21st inst., forenoon, afternoon and evening, on Peace, Anti-Slavery, and the Popular Tests of Piety.

The Pathfinder Railway Guide for the New England States, containing a large amount of information respecting railway, steamboat and stage routes, throughout New England, and also a complete railway map—127 pages—all for 5 cents! The July number just issued by Snow & Wilder, 25 Washington Street.

Quite a number of communications are on file for as early an insertion as convenient. Correspondents will please exercise patience, especially as they perceive into what close quarters we ourselves are driven, editorially. We are desirous of completing the publication of the speeches made at the late New England A. S. Convention, as soon as practicable, and therefore other matter must give way for a season.

DRS. CLARK & PORTER'S Cholera and Diarrhoea Cordial.

This is a prompt and certain cure for Diarrhoea and the various summer complaints of the bowels. It is a remedy which the former proprietor has used in his practice for the last ten years with remarkable success. If taken in season, it will prevent the Dysentery and Cholera. The first symptom of the Cholera is a slight Diarrhoea, which, if allowed to go unchecked, oftentimes terminates fatally. If this Cordial is taken on the first appearance of this symptom, it will be sure to check the difficulty at once, and prevent, perhaps, a fatal result. It is a vegetable compound, pleasant to take, and perfectly innocent in its operation on the system. Hundreds of Dr. Clark's patients have offered their testimony in favor of this cordial, who have experienced its beneficial effects on their own persons. It is no imposition on the public, but a medicine which will do all that is claimed for it. It is put up in extra pint bottles, at the exceeding low price of 50 cents each, which makes it come within the means of those in moderate circumstances. Prepared and sold by CLARK, PORTER & CO., 382 Washington street, Boston. Sold also by Redding & Co., 8 State street; Brown & Price, Salem; Sylvania Dodge, Danvers; David Mead & Co., Lynn. July 6.

BOOKS.

BELA MARSH, No. 25 CORNHILL, HAS FOR SALE,

ANTHROPOLOGY; or the Science of Man; in its bearing on War and Slavery, and on Arguments from the Bible, Marriage, God, Death, Retribution, Atoneement and Government, in support of these and other social wrongs, in a Series of Letters to a Friend in England. By Henry C. Wright. Price 25 cts. Henry C. Wright's Auto-Biography—\$1 00. Christ and the Pharisees upon the Sabbath; with a Consideration of the Clergy and the Church, by a Student of Divinity. Sometime a Student of Law—20 cts. Narrative of the Life of William W. Brown, a Fugitive Slave, written by himself—25 cts. Bibb's Narrative of American Slavery—37 cts. Despotism in America, by R. Hilditch—25 cts. Moody's History of the Mexican War—20 cts. The Church as it is; or the Fortiori Proof of Slavery. By Parker Pillsbury—16 cts. Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass—25 cts. Nature's Divine Revelations, &c. By Andrew Jackson Davis—\$2 00. Also, The Philosophy of Spiritual Providences. A Vision. By the same author—15 cts. The Great Harmonies, being a Philosophical Revelation of the Natural, Spiritual, and Celestial Universes. Volume 1st. The Physician. By Andrew Jackson Davis. 3 nos.

JULY DIVIDEND OF THE UNION MUTUAL Life Insurance Company.

The success of this Company is unprecedented. It has,



Selections.

From the National Era. A SABBATH SCENE.

Scarce had the solemn Sabbath bell Ceased quivering in the steeples, Scarce had the parson to his desk Walked stately through his people—

ASSAULT ON FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

Various reports of a ruffianly assault on Frederick Douglass in New York are afloat. His friends everywhere will read with deep interest his own statement of the affair. Here it is from his North Star of the 30th ult. What vulgar, brutal wretches the pro-slavery classes keep in train to do their infernal work! Read:

My readers will have observed, in the North Star of last week, an account of a most cowardly assault made upon me on the Battery in New York. Like most other statements which emanate from the American press, this one (though partly true) is false in several particulars. It is not true that I walked down Broadway with two white females on my arm, in the case alluded to, although I insist upon the right to do so.

It is not true that the ladies in company with me placed themselves under the care of the gentleman (ruffian?) who assaulted me, or any one else. It is not true that I sneered or spoke to the leading assailants. The facts briefly are these. Myself and friends were going to Philadelphia, supposing that the John Pettibone, a steamer from New York at twelve o'clock, was due down in quarter before twelve, but found on my arrival that we had been mistaken; the time of starting being half-past one o'clock. The interval, therefore, we passed in the Battery. When about to leave for the steamer, five or six men surrounded us, assailing us with all sorts of coarse and filthy language, and two of them finally struck the ladies on the head, while another attacked me. I warded off the blows with my umbrella and the cowardly wretches left without doing any personal harm. Thinking that we should not be disturbed by them again, we walked slowly towards the steamer. One of the mob, observing that I was off my guard, ran up behind me, and before I could put myself in a position to ward off the assassin's blow, I was struck in the face. These are the whole facts in the case. I never was more calm or self-possessed than when under this beastly assault. I felt no indignation towards the poor miserable wretches who committed the outrage. They were but executing upon me the baseness of the pro-slavery church and clergy of the land; doing the dirty work of the men who despise them, and who have no more respect for them in reality than they have for me.—F. D.

LETTER FROM GERRIT SMITH.

Peterboro, June 1, 1850. FREDERICK DOUGLASS: MY OUTRAGED AND AFFLICTED BROTHER—I have just read, in the last North Star, the article in which you informed your readers of the insult and violence, and threats of assassination, which you encountered in your recent visit to New York. This article stirred the breast of my sympathy and love. I sympathized with you and loved you before, but much more now.

SONNET.

I love to feel the workings of the tie That binds me to my brother: sacred peace, And joy, and hope, and reverent peace To fill my heart, when the fraternal eye Looks to each human soul beneath the sky.

It read and can understand its import. The effect will be one of unbounded indignation, disgust and astonishment.

Mr. Douglass, a negro gentleman, some time since complained of the treatment he had experienced from citizens of the United States, because of his color. This proceeding on his part is thus described by an American writer in the New York Globe:

Frederick Douglass, the impudent negro who has lately taken to himself the privilege of abusing our country in his Paris and Constantinople journals, that chastisement he so richly merited at the hands of our republicans, who would not condescend to notice his blasphemy and negroisms, had the audacity yesterday morning to walk down Broadway, the principal promenade of our city, with two white women resting on his arms.

It however appears that, spite of the dreadful and blasphemous conduct, he is not to be punished. The mildness and wonderful self-control of the whole American population produced the marvellous effect above described. The citizens, though deeply moved, took no notice of the blasphemy and negroisms. But there are limits to human patience. Bad as may be the making a just complaint by a negro against a white man, black atrocity can go further, and against white imagination can hardly, in American phrase, realize the atrocity. What is this abominable offence? Walking with two white women down Broadway. The patience of the citizenry, though most superhuman forbearance, at length gave way, and the mode of proceeding consequent upon this venial sinning of white virtue is eminently characteristic; and is, indeed, a touching evidence of the delicacy and refinement of the high-minded white man, even in the very fury and paroxysm of his passion.

Several citizens who noticed this disgraceful scene, (viz., of the quiet, offending negro walking with two white women, who willingly walked with him,) followed the impudent scamp to the Battery. The negro was supposed to commit the additional offence of laughing; thereupon a white gentleman stepped up to the white ladies, and politely requested them to retire, and leave their ebony companion, and place themselves under the protection of a (white) gentleman standing near by. The women obeyed, and the impudent and insulted (white) gentleman to use the person really insulted was the negro; go severe, it appears, that he will not readily forget it. "Maddened justice," exclaims the white editor, "forgets the dictates of law in a case of this kind; and, personally, we see no reason why it should not."

AMERICAN VIOLATION OF THE RIGHTS OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

Every day something is occurring to remind us that we are a commercial nation. That our love of money exceeds our love of men is too often forced upon our attention, and that in too prominent a manner to admit of denial. We are not yet well out of an act of donning for our debts on a large scale, which has threatened to embroil us with some of the most powerful European nations. We are now appealing to our own sense of justice and equity, and to the actual rights and liberties of the subject—and we take it very coolly. We have sent out a fleet to collect the debts due to a British speculator, and a Portuguese consul and Jew, who hangs himself on the peg of our nationality, by virtue of an abode in Gibraltar; and we have carried the whole thing with a high hand towards Greece, protesting that if these two individuals are not paid, we will carry off property by force, and pay them ourselves. On the heels of this laughable and overbearing demonstration comes a complaint that the United States of America have seized a British subject on board a British vessel, in the harbor of Charleston, and incarcerated him for a fortnight, for no other offence than that he has a black skin and woolly hair. All men, women and children, with black skins and woolly hair, the Americans declare to be, according to some new revelation, to be the property of the United States, and to be free for the entire use of the white man. Nay, they have no business to have black skins, woolly hair, and liberty, and that whoever presumes to give liberty to one of that race, without asking leave of the United States, commits a crime which warrants the Americans in setting aside all the laws of nations in order to punish them. By the treaty of 1815, all persons being English subjects and citizens are allowed to travel to the United States, freely to trade there, and freely to quit them. Stock is the treaty, and vice versa as regards American citizens and England. England observes the treaty to the letter. Americans of all sorts—white, black, blue or yellow, or of any other imaginable color—whether their hair be woolly or straight—may walk from John O'Groat's to the Land's End, and nobody attempts to interfere with them. But America does not, on her side, keep the treaty. The moment a black man appears in the United States, whether he be a free man, or a slave, or a fugitive from Louisiana, before he can set a foot on the land, or before any body knows whether he will ever set a foot on it, the Americans board a British vessel; seize the man, be he sailor, steward or captain, and carrying him on shore, there imprison him so long as the vessel which brought him stays in the port. The captain of the vessel is, moreover, made chargeable for the keep of the prisoner, and responsible for his being again taken out of the country.

LET IN LIGHT.

What if cherished creeds may fade? Faith will never leave us; God preserves what God has made—Nor can truth deceive us.

Mary Anne has been seized on board that vessel in the port of Charleston, and committed to prison for a fortnight, that is during the stay of the vessel there. His chivalrous lordship, who sent of a fleet to the Dardanelles, to resist the attack on the rights of Hungarians, and who sent another to seize the vessels, and blockade the port of Athens for satisfaction to the pockets of an English speculator and a Portuguese Jew, in this case coolly replies that it is not the law of nations, but the law of the State, in 1847, that is the subject, the measure he has taken, is the law of Louisiana and Carolina, and that, as the federal government knew that it could neither persuade nor compel those States to repeal the law, all that they could do was to put an end to the treaty of 1815, if the English government insisted on protecting the rights of its subjects. Now, are we to believe that if Russia had threatened to put an end to the treaty of 1815, if Lord Palmerston did not recall his fleet from the Dardanelles, that he would ever do so?—that if Russia or France had threatened the same thing, if we did not retire from the Piræus and from the claims of Mr. Finlayson and Don Pacifico, that he would have done it?

Or are we to suppose that Lord Palmerston is willing to put himself and England into the attitude of a cowardly bully and braggadocio? That he will even make a weak and manly demand of justice, and call the British nation in the persons of its subjects, and says we are not disposed to alter our practice? Does he mean to act the bullfinch, in the collection of petty debts, and to neglect the most sacred rights of nations and of British subjects? That, however, is precisely, at the present moment, the position in which Lord Palmerston stands, and in which he has placed this country. The hectoring and the weak for pecuniary demands, and the succumbing to the threats, these are the two positions and the two liberties of Englishmen are concerned, stand in strange and humiliating contrast.

We trust that the public will not allow this matter to rest. We trust that it will communicate to Lord Palmerston and the government, that after the affair of Greece, the honor of the country is concerned to see the rights of Englishmen asserted in America. We must do this, or bear the inevitable character of cowardly bullies. Our swagger will hereafter be estimated at the level of the ground. It is for the nation to decide, if it is for the nation to forget, that it places a higher value on the honor of the State and on the person of its citizens, than on any amount of money; that it cares not a farthing or a fig whether those citizens are black, white, green, or gray—it is enough that they are Englishmen, and we are bound by the honor of true men, by the faith of treaties, and by laws, to protect and defend them.

But, says Lord Palmerston, they threaten to put an end to the treaty of 1815. Is that such an awful affair? Does not any nation gallop through that treaty at its pleasure? Where is Posen, where Galicia, where Cracow? Is there not a white as well as a black side to this question? Will the Americans go to war to defend a breach of faith in the slave-driving population of the South? Will the South break with England for this? Where, then, would be its great cotton market, without which the whole South would be bankrupt at once? No! On the following morning, the annexed letter was read, which, after a short debate, was received, an acknowledgment of its reception entered on the journal, and the document itself placed on file.

PROTEST.

Against said action as a departure from the established constitutional basis of the Order, and as tending to disturb the otherwise peaceful growth of its principles. Respectfully presented by CHAS. W. SLACK, of Mass., WM. R. STACY, of N. H., DANIEL BAXTER, of N. H., EDWIN P. HILL, of N. H., JOSHUA NYE, Jr., of Maine, EDWARD STACEY, of Canada W.

THE REMEDY THAT CURES.

Dr. Ayer's Indian Blood Purifier. A VALUABLE REMEDY for Liver Complaint, Jaundice, Dyspepsia, &c. Also the Indian Search Warrant, and Tonic Compound, for Croup, Cramp, Cholera, Pleurisy, Rheumatism, Piles, Diarrhea, Summer Complaint, &c. &c. &c. These Medicines are recommended, and are extensively prepared for family use, and as they are carefully calculated to preserve health, and cure disease, no family should ever be without them. The proprietor of these valuable Medicines derived his knowledge and skill from the Indians for many years, who had been long in the habit of using them, and has had experience in an extensive and successful practice, by which he has had ample opportunity of acquiring a practical knowledge of the nature and effects of remedies best calculated to remove them.

Eliza Adams, John R. Fish, Thos. E. Sawyer, VERNON.—Yes—Thos. E. Powers, Arns D. Putnam, Thos. Chubbuck, Asst.—Ralph A. Severance. MASSACHUSETTS.—Yes—Samuel Ellis, Wm. A. White, Charles W. Slack, Wm. R. Stacy, Wm. A. White, Asst.—Stevens Baker, Daniel Clark, D. N. Merritt, CONN.—Yes—Jas. K. Clark, Edward B. Cooke, Eliza M. Gorham, Friend W. Smith, Andrew L. Stone. N. B. BRUNSWICK.—Yes—Asa Cox, Alex. Campbell, Samuel L. Tilley, Asst.—James Johnson, NOVA SCOTIA.—Yes—Wm. Burrill. CANADA WEST.—Yes—Edward Stacey.

Every other delegate present voted in the affirmative. Upon the announcement of the vote, Bro. White, of Mass., rose and said, that as the proposed object of the Order of the Sons of Temperance was to promote the cause of all mankind; and as, by the adoption of the report just before them, an attempt was made to exclude a large portion of said mankind from its blessings, and as all opportunities of discussion on the subject had been virtually denied him, he did not deem he would be doing justice to his own sentiments or serving his constituents by a longer continuance in the deliberations of the body; and he therefore respectfully resigned his seat in the National Division, and withdrew from the hall. By the acknowledgment of Mr. Linton himself, the applicator of the "previous question" gag, we learn positively that the plan to force the report through the Convention, was fully arranged, and was actually decided upon previous to its delivery. So much for the dignity of the transaction!

On the following day, after some unavailing opposition, the following document was read, and entered upon the journal of the session— Boston, June 14, 1850. To THE N. D. S. OF N. A.— Whereas, at the session of this body, on Thursday, the 13th day of the present month, a report from the Committee on Appeals (No. 1) concluding with the words, "the admission of negroes into Subordinate or Grand Divisions be declared improper and illegal," was unanimously adopted without explanation or debate; and whereas, it is provided by the 2d Section of Article 5th of the Constitution of Subordinates, that the only disqualification for membership into this Order is by reason of immorality of character, or incapacity of earning a livelihood, or want of the means of support; and whereas, there are already in membership with this Order colored Brethren of high moral character and general excellence, upon whom is placed by the adoption of the foregoing report an undeserved stigma; and whereas, by the action herein alluded to, a departure has been made from the constitutional qualifications for membership, thus giving opportunity for future disturbance to the harmony of the Order by calling in question the suitability of candidates; and whereas, power has been exercised by this action which properly should be invested in Subordinates,—we therefore

PROTEST. Against said action as a departure from the established constitutional basis of the Order, and as tending to disturb the otherwise peaceful growth of its principles. Respectfully presented by CHAS. W. SLACK, of Mass., WM. R. STACY, of N. H., DANIEL BAXTER, of N. H., EDWIN P. HILL, of N. H., JOSHUA NYE, Jr., of Maine, EDWARD STACEY, of Canada W.

THE REMEDY THAT CURES.

Dr. Ayer's Indian Blood Purifier. A VALUABLE REMEDY for Liver Complaint, Jaundice, Dyspepsia, &c. Also the Indian Search Warrant, and Tonic Compound, for Croup, Cramp, Cholera, Pleurisy, Rheumatism, Piles, Diarrhea, Summer Complaint, &c. &c. &c. These Medicines are recommended, and are extensively prepared for family use, and as they are carefully calculated to preserve health, and cure disease, no family should ever be without them. The proprietor of these valuable Medicines derived his knowledge and skill from the Indians for many years, who had been long in the habit of using them, and has had experience in an extensive and successful practice, by which he has had ample opportunity of acquiring a practical knowledge of the nature and effects of remedies best calculated to remove them.

THE REMEDY THAT CURES.

Dr. Ayer's Indian Blood Purifier. A VALUABLE REMEDY for Liver Complaint, Jaundice, Dyspepsia, &c. Also the Indian Search Warrant, and Tonic Compound, for Croup, Cramp, Cholera, Pleurisy, Rheumatism, Piles, Diarrhea, Summer Complaint, &c. &c. &c. These Medicines are recommended, and are extensively prepared for family use, and as they are carefully calculated to preserve health, and cure disease, no family should ever be without them. The proprietor of these valuable Medicines derived his knowledge and skill from the Indians for many years, who had been long in the habit of using them, and has had experience in an extensive and successful practice, by which he has had ample opportunity of acquiring a practical knowledge of the nature and effects of remedies best calculated to remove them.

are essential of the Order—the pledge and the character of the candidate. Does any one suppose that the National Division has the right to abolish or even modify the pledge? Neither can they change the basis of membership, which was wisely founded on character.

We should be cautious in allowing the head of any organization to grasp any power which does not clearly belong to it, as the tendency of all such bodies is towards centralization, eventually depriving subordinate societies of all power. I have not room to say anything, if you, my Brethren, will not submit to this assumption of power on the part of the National Division. I believe you are fully competent to decide who shall, and who shall not, exercise your prerogatives, and that you will resist calmly, but firmly, any attempt to interfere in this matter.

As I, with my associates, was not allowed to express these sentiments on the floor of the National Division, owing to the gag, I thought I might most strongly express my disapprobation of an unconstitutional act, and my protest against the invasion of the right of free speech, by withdrawing from the Division and reporting the facts for your consideration. Yours in L. P. and F., W. A. WHITE.

Great Cough Remedy! Dr. J. C. AYER'S CHERRY PECTORAL. For the Cure of COUGHS, COLDS, HOARSENESS, BRONCHITIS, WHOOPING-COUGH, CROUP, ASTHMA AND CONSUMPTION.

Dr. Ayer's Cherry Pectoral. For the Cure of COUGHS, COLDS, HOARSENESS, BRONCHITIS, WHOOPING-COUGH, CROUP, ASTHMA AND CONSUMPTION. I offer to the community this justly celebrated remedy for diseases of the throat and lungs, it is not our wish to trifle with the lives and health of the afflicted, but frankly to lay before them the opinions of distinguished men, and some of the evidence of its success, from which they can judge for themselves. We sincerely pledge ourselves to make no wild assertions or false statements of its efficacy, nor will we hold out any hope of suffering humanity which facts will not warrant.

Dr. Ayer's Cherry Pectoral. For the Cure of COUGHS, COLDS, HOARSENESS, BRONCHITIS, WHOOPING-COUGH, CROUP, ASTHMA AND CONSUMPTION. I offer to the community this justly celebrated remedy for diseases of the throat and lungs, it is not our wish to trifle with the lives and health of the afflicted, but frankly to lay before them the opinions of distinguished men, and some of the evidence of its success, from which they can judge for themselves. We sincerely pledge ourselves to make no wild assertions or false statements of its efficacy, nor will we hold out any hope of suffering humanity which facts will not warrant.