

Selections.

SPEECH OF HON. MORROW B. LOWRY,

OF ERIS,

Delivered in the Senate of Pennsylvania, January

19, 1865.

COLORIED PEOPLE IN PASSENGER CARS.

Mr. LOWRY, on leave given, read in place a bill

entitled "An act relative to the exclusion of colored

people from the cars of passenger railroad companies

of the Commonwealth.

Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LOWRY moved to discharge the Committee

from the consideration of said bill,

and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of

the same.

The motion was agreed to, when the bill was read

as follows:

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and

House of Representatives, etc., That it shall not be

lawful for any passenger railway, or company within

this Commonwealth, to enforce any rule, regulation or

condition excluding any race of people from its

passenger cars on account of their color.

Mr. LOWRY said:

The object of Government is to execute impartial

justice between man and man. It is ordained to

protect the weak against the strong, to exact right

from the strong, and to assure the rights of each and all,

however lowly or however exalted, against all at-

tempts to violate them. That is no government,

worthy of the name, which leaves its poor and de-

pendent subjects to be preyed upon by the wealth-

ier and stronger classes, and refuses them protection

and redress. That is not worthy of the name of

law which is not based on a reverential regard for

human rights. In fact, all true law emanates from

the bosom of God, who is no respecter of persons.

Human laws are of no validity, except so far as they

conform with and reflect the divine law. The sole

business of government is to discover this one great

law, and to make it operative for its application

to the necessities of mankind.

It is because this country has disregarded that

law, practically denied the doctrine of human equal-

ity, as enunciated in its Declaration of Independ-

ence, and suffered the strong to oppress and crush

the weak, that the source of intestine war is up-

held against us. Unless all history is a lie, all re-

volution a myth, and the law of cause and effect a

mere delusion, this war is God's judgment upon the

land for its sin of oppression. The case is not to be

argued. Slavery is the cause of the war, and it

in defiance of every principle of justice. They in-

stitute a false standard of rights, founded in mere

prejudice, purely arbitrary, and wickedly despotic.

It is as ridiculous as it is brutal. What should we

say of a corporation that should discriminate against

every man whose head might be illuminated with

most in vain, two hundred and fifty brave black men

appeared on these grounds, and offered their services

to that evil hour. The loyalty of the blacks is earn-

est and universal. They are the only loyal class, as

a class, in the whole land. And yet, this is the class

that, of all others, we continue to ostracize, to dis-

criminate against, and to deny the courtesies of life

and the rights of humanity. Returning to their

homes after fighting our battles, we drive them from

our street cars, as though they were ministers of

death rather than of life! Behold the spectacle of

a people calling upon the black man to help save their

government, and then basely denying them civil and

social rights under the government which they have

helped to save.

Robert Small, who gallantly captured a vessel of

war from the hands of the enemy, and presented it

to the American navy as a token of his patriotic re-

gard for the government, is refused accommodation

on the railways of Philadelphia. The regulation,

being wholesale, crushes all alike. Euclid, the pro-

foundest mathematician of ancient or modern times,

were he alive and desirous of witnessing the attrac-

tions of the city of Brotherly Love, would not be

FREEDOM OF SOLDIERS' FAMILIES.

SPEECH OF CHARLES SUMNER
In the U. S. Senate, Jan. 6, 1865.

MR. PRESIDENT: There was a call only a few days ago for three hundred thousand more troops. This country needs them, and it is the duty of Congress to help supply them. To this end there must be no difficulty, impediment or embarrassment in the way. All these must be removed. But this is not all. There must be encouragement of every kind; and such is the character of the present proposition. There can be no delay. The country cannot wait the slow action of a Constitutional Amendment, as has been proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Doolittle). Congress must act to the extent of its power, and any abdication of its power on this question will be injurious to the public interests.

All must confess the humanity of the proposition to enfranchise the families of colored persons who have borne arms for their country. All must confess the hardships of continuing them in slavery. But the question is asked by many, and even by the Senator from Wisconsin, what power has Congress to set the families free?

Mr. Doolittle—I did not ask that question. Mr. Sumner—I understand. Mr. Doolittle—The Senator is entirely mistaken. He is putting a question himself, and then answering it. I have not put it at all. Mr. Sumner—The question has been put again and again, and the whole purport of the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin was in that sense. He argued that we were about to have a Constitutional Amendment which would supersede everything; that therefore this proposition was unnecessary, if not injurious. I so understood the argument of the Senator, and that it pointed directly to the question of the power of Congress on this occasion, because I know that if in his opinion the power of Congress on this occasion was beyond question, he would hesitate. I do not therefore do the Senator any injustice. I say, then, the question is asked, what power has Congress to set the families free? This is the single point on which I shall express an opinion.

My answer is, that Congress has precisely the same right to enfranchise the families that it has to enfranchise the colored soldier. The two powers are coincident, and from the same source. It has been already assumed that Congress may enfranchise the colored soldier. This has been done by solemn statute, without any reference to the conduct of his profligate owner. If we were asked the reason for such enfranchisement, it must be found, first, in its practical necessity, that we may secure the best services of the slaves; and secondly, in its intrinsic justice and humanity. In brief, government cannot be so imprudent and so foolish as to attempt to obtain the services of the slave at the hazard of life, without securing to him the boon of freedom. Now, if government were so bereft of common sense as to forego this temptation to enlighten and efficient service, could it be guilty of the unutterable meanness of denying the slave the national defence, and then returning him to bondage? Therefore the slave who fights is enfranchised.

But every argument, every consideration, which pleads for the enfranchisement of the slave pleads for the enfranchisement of the family. There is the same practical necessity for doing it, and the same unutterable shabbiness in not doing it. There is no principle of law better established than the rule that any acknowledged right carries with it all incidents essential to its exercise. Do not employ technical language; do not give the idea, which is founded in reason, and the nature of things. It would be vain to confer a right, or a power, if the means for its enjoyment were denied. From this simple statement the conclusion is irresistible.

In conferring upon Congress the power to create an Army, the Constitution conferred therewith all the powers essential to the exercise of the principal power. If Congress can authorize the enlistment of slaves, as it unquestionably can, it may at the same time authorize their enfranchisement, and by the same reason it may authorize the enfranchisement of their families; and all this from the necessity of the case, and to prevent an end to the nation. An English patriot, nearly two centuries ago, exclaimed in memorable words that he would give his life to serve his country, but he would not do a mean thing to save it. If there be any value in this declaration, it may well be invoked when it is deliberately signed that the National government can create an Army, and in this service can enfranchise the slave which it enlists, but that it is impotent to enfranchise his family. I know not how we can use his right arm, and ask him to shed his blood in our defence, and then hand over his wife and child to bondage. The cases are too near for argument. The human heart rejects the insufferable pretension.

But it is said that the slave has no family. Such is the argument of slavery. For all that he has, as well as all that he is, even wife and child, belong to another. Surely this unrighteous pretension will not be made the apology for a denial of rights. If the family of the slave be not designated by law, or by the forms of legal marriage, then it must be ascertained by the next best evidence possible; that is, by collocation and mutual recognition as man and wife. And any uncertainty in this evidence must be regarded as a natural incident to slavery. As men cannot take advantage of their own wrong, so slave-masters, on this occasion, cannot take advantage of slavery. Any other rule would practically unite with slavery in denying to the slave wife and child.

There is a well-known French maxim, that "it is only the first step with this occasion, ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte—and on this occasion, permit me to say, it is only the first stage of the argument which merits attention. Concede that the soldier may be enfranchised, and it follows that by the same constitutional power his family may be admitted to equal liberty. An argument in support of this logical and inhumanly discreditable alike to the head and the heart. There is no argument, whether of reason or of humanity, for the enfranchisement of the soldier which does not plead equally for that of his family. Nay, more; I know not how we can expect a blessing on our arms while we fail to perform this duty.

I cannot close what I have to say without adding that, in my opinion, Congress at this moment is complete master of the whole question of slavery everywhere in the United States, even without any Constitutional Amendment. It can sweep it all out of existence, precisely as it can remove any other obstruction to the national defence, and all this by virtue of a power as inherent and as complete as that to raise armies or to suspend the *habeas corpus*. Future generations will read, with amazement that a great people, when national life was assailed, hesitated to exercise a power so simple and beneficent; that this Congress boggled for months on the question whether the wife and children of the colored soldier should be admitted to freedom.

IMPORTANT LESSON. Hon. E. P. Weston, in his eulogy on Edward Everett, in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, uttered this important truth: And this lesson I read most clearly, from the closing pages of that life which is opened to us with new significance to-day; that whatever of scholarly attainments a man may reach, whatever of intellectual strength he may gather, and whatever of heroic he may have cultivated, he attains the highest power, away the great popular heart, and move it to generous purposes, only as his own heart is inspired with the best impulses of humanity and the highest patriotic devotion.

Admiral Porter's report upon recent events near Wilmington contains the noticeable feature that several Armstrong guns having the mark of the broad arrow (The King's Own) upon them, fell into our hands with Fort Caswell and other works. The British government is supposed to have secured the exclusive use of these guns, and the Admiral thinks this circumstance requires an explanation. An enormous quantity of stores and provisions, and clothing for sixty thousand troops, all English, was also abandoned by the enemy. Another circumstance mentioned is the finding of a despatch from Lee, informing the commanders of the works that unless they were held, he should be compelled to evacuate Richmond.

Gen. Butler, of New York, having made some cautious remarks in Congress against Gen. Butler, was brought to by a sharp letter from the general, which he promptly answered, and that blessed Cause to which you have nobly devoted your life. Much as I admired your course before, it has won from me new and increased admiration during the last ten years of trial and of glory. May God bless and cheer you in all your trials, as I know He will.

With sincerest regard, NATH. HALL.

The Liberator.

No Union with Slaveholders!

BOSTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1865.

I REPEAT THE DECLARATION MADE A YEAR AGO, THAT WHILE I REMAIN IN MY POSITION, I SHALL NOT ATTEMPT TO SIGN ANY DOCUMENT WHICH SHALL BE A VOUCHER OF THE UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS. I SHALL ILLUSTRATE BY MY CONDUCT, BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS, BY THE PEOPLE SHOULD, BY WHATEVER MEANS OR MEANS, MAKE IT AN EXECUTIVE DUTY TO REPEL SUCH SPEARS, AND NOT TO BE THE INSTRUMENT TO PERFORM IT.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

LAUS DEO! — HALLELUJAH!

It is with devout thanksgiving to God, and emotions of joy which no language can express, that we announce to our readers the passage through the U. S. House of Representatives, on Tuesday last, of the proposed amendment of the Constitution, in concurrence with the Senate, and by the requisite two-thirds vote, abolishing and prohibiting slavery in every part of the republic! It is the greatest and most important event in the history of congressional legislation. It is better than all the military and naval victories of the war. Adopted as unquestionably it will be by the requisite number of States, imagination may toil in vain to depict the future career of this country as pertaining to peace, unity, prosperity, and grandeur. Henceforth, in deed and in truth, America is to be "the land of the FREE"—"where breathes no caged lord nor caged slave."

"Perley," the Washington correspondent of the Boston Journal, gives the following sketch of the scene in the House of Representatives:— "The event of the day has been the final reference of the proposed amendment to the State Legislatures. The galleries of the hall of the House were literally packed with ladies and gentlemen, and on the floor were Senators, Judges, officers of the army and navy, and distinguished citizens from almost every State. The Democrats endeavored at one time to filibuster, and urged a postponement of the vote until to-morrow; but General Ashley, who has engineered the resolution, was inflexible, and at last the voting was commenced just before four o'clock. There was almost breathless suspense until James F. English of Connecticut voted "aye," when there was a cheer, and the applause was repeated after the affirmative vote of John C. Gibson of New York, who was a member of the Chicago Convention. At last the result was declared—One hundred and nineteen Ayes to fifty-six Nays, when for at least five minutes the hall rang with applause. Handkerchiefs were waved, congratulations were interchanged, and every loyal man and woman present appeared delighted."

Gov. Andrew has issued an order that whenever the telegraph shall announce that the President has signed the resolution for an amendment of the Constitution abolishing slavery, a salute of one hundred guns shall be fired on the Common. He also recommends that the church bells throughout the State be rung at the same hour.

THE ANNUAL MEETING.

We devoted a large portion of our inside form to a condensed report of the proceedings of the two days' meetings of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society at the Melodeon, in this city, last week. For reasons entirely satisfactory to us, we neither participated in the proceedings nor attended any of the meetings on the second day. Where the platform is free to all comers, it is not surprising that some persons take advantage of it to display their folly and give vent to their personal spleen, under the specious guise of being deeply concerned lest the rights of the colored people should be compromised! The discussions, as a whole, were earnest, able and eloquent. The speech of Mr. Phillips on Thursday evening, and of George Thompson on Friday evening, (neither of which we heard,) it is universally conceded were of a very high order. They will be printed in full hereafter, as well as some other speeches. As the resolutions submitted by Mr. Phillips were adopted by putting them to the assembly, and not confining the vote to members of the Society, the Society is not strictly committed to them; especially is this true of the last resolution, introduced by Mr. Foster at the last moment, and adopted by a confused and dissolving audience. In regard to the duty and importance of claiming equal rights and privileges for the colored population, there was, of course, no difference of opinion among the abolitionists.

PERSISTENT INJUSTICE. The Commonwealth, a short time since, announced to its readers, with an air of affected surprise and sorrow, that the Liberator had repudiated its motto, "No Union with Slaveholders." We showed the charge to be a false one, and expected the Commonwealth would candidly acknowledge it had done us an injustice. Instead of this, it repeated its untruthful assertion by representing that we had put the old motto "back again"—the inference being that we had done so in consequence of our exposure! Again denying the charge, expressing our astonishment at such dishonest conduct, and calling for fair treatment, we looked to see what the Commonwealth of Saturday would have to say on the subject; and we found, not any correction, but only the following dissembling and calumnious paragraph:— "The Liberator is mistaken. We have no unfringed lines, and indulge in no rivalry towards it. We sometimes fear we do not adequately appreciate the services of its editor in past years, which become all the more conspicuous from his present position and advocacy. In this crisis of the nation, we think constant to his old teachings would be of transcendent value to our race; and the adoption of a policy, as it seems to us, of excuse and palliation for their short-comings, he is risking the value of a life-long instruction. The Commonwealth comments freely—we believe not unjustly. While doing so, we disclaim all personal hostility; and we refuse to accept it when we find ourselves in the 'Refuge of Oppression' of the Liberator, and that our criticisms, not our encomiums, are remembered."

To the imputations and insinuations in this extract concerning our fidelity to the cause of the oppressed, we deem it quite unnecessary to make any reply. A testimony like the following, given by that "Israélite" Rev. Nathaniel Hall of Dorchester, outweighs an avalanche of such calumny:—

DORCHESTER, Jan. 27, 1865.
MY DEAR MR. GARRISON—I send you, as Editor of the Liberator, and as a most honored friend, the enclosed \$10; with heart-felt thanks for what you have done for me personally, and for that blessed Cause to which you have nobly devoted your life. Much as I admired your course before, it has won from me new and increased admiration during the last ten years of trial and of glory. May God bless and cheer you in all your trials, as I know He will.

With sincerest regard,
NATH. HALL.

"TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN." There are some persons whose peculiar idiosyncrasy, love of dispute and lack of breadth are such that we never allow ourselves to be drawn into a controversy with them. Our readers will understand, therefore, why we invariably take no notice of any imputation of our motives or acts, or of any allegations made against us on an anti-slavery platform or in our columns, by STEPHEN S. FOSTER. We have for years given him carte blanche to say whatever he pleases against us—deeming it as absurd and useless to attempt to hold him to any point, or to make any appeal to reason and fact on any controverted matter, as it would be to encounter a wind-mill or grasp a will-o'-wisp.

John Steel of Philadelphia lately died from the effects of a kick of a horse. He is said to have been the wealthiest man in Pennsylvania, and his receipts (from the oil business) were \$3000 a day.

MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The thirty-second annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society was held at the Melodeon, in Boston, on Thursday, Jan. 26, 1865.

The President of the Society, EDMUND QUINCY, called the meeting to order at quarter past 10 o'clock. The usual Committees were nominated and appointed, as follows:—

Committee on Business.—W. L. Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Henry C. Wright, Maria W. Chapman, Parker Pillsbury, Andrew T. Foss, Abby Kelley Foster, Stephen S. Foster, Wm. Wells Brown, Mrs. Caroline H. Hall.

Committee on Nominations.—Elbridge Sprague, Abington; James N. Buffum, Lynn; W. W. Ditcher, Milford; A. M. Chase, Canton; Elias Richards, Weymouth; Richard Plumer, Newburyport; Josiah Hayward, Salem; Moses Wright, Georgetown; Joseph A. Howland, Worcester.

Committee on Finance.—Ebenezer D. Draper, Hopdale; Lewis Ford, Boston; Samuel Dyer, Abington. The President stated that the last two Committees were not full, and might be added to hereafter. Samuel May, Jr. and Charles K. Whipple were chosen Assistant Secretaries.

The Treasurer's Report, duly audited, was presented to the Society, and read by the President. It showed the expenditures of the Society, during the year past, to be exactly equal to its receipts.

Report accepted, to be published with the proceedings of the meeting. The Committee on Business not having had time to confer together, Wendell Phillips read for information of the Society a series of resolutions; and proceeded to address the Society in support of them.

The speech was heard with the closest attention by the audience, and received warm applause at the close. [A fuller report will appear hereafter.] Three children, lately slaves in New Orleans, present in the meeting, came forward by request of the meeting, on the proposition of Mr. May, and sang a song—"I was born a little slave." Mr. May stated that these children, set free by the arms of the United States, had been gathered with thousands of others into schools under the administration of Gen. Banks, in Louisiana.

GEORGE THOMPSON then addressed the Society in an eloquent and impressive manner. [This speech also will be fully reported hereafter.] It having been known that FREDERICK DOUGLASS was present in the audience, by Mr. Thompson's reference to the fact, very many in the meeting next called loudly for Mr. Douglass, some also for Mr. Remond. The latter gentleman declined speaking at present, preferring to give way for Mr. Douglass, who then came forward and addressed the Society. [This eloquent and interesting speech will be written out for publication.]

Adjourned to half-past 2 o'clock, P. M.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

Met according to adjournment; the President in the chair. The first speaker introduced was JOHN PARKER, recently in the rebel service. He had been an American slave, and had recently, only three years ago, made his escape. He is of unmixt African blood. He gave forcible expression to his hearty detestation of slavery, and of those amphibious creatures, Northern men with Southern principles. The negro, he thought, was in an unfortunate position, disliked and oppressed by both parties. His race wanted justice and liberty, and they would be thankful to any one, Northern or Southern, who would grant them these. He gave some details of his personal and family history, and replied to some of the current apologies for slavery. He rejoiced in the reformation of Gen. Butler from partisan democracy to practical abolitionism. He made impressive reference to the injustice yet practised against the colored people in the city of Philadelphia, and rejoiced in the patient and unrelenting disposition of that race, in spite of the gross cruelties which they had suffered. He had been compelled to assist in building the fortifications of Richmond, but he thought the greatest strength of the rebellion lay in the divisions of opinion among Northern men in regard to slavery.

The ex-slave children, under the charge of Rev. DEXTER S. KISS, then came upon the platform, and after a brief sketch of their history from him, they sang the song, "Slavery's chain is bound to break;" after which, "Charley" spoke a little speech which had been written for him, in relation to his past history, and in eulogy of Gen. Banks, and the elder girl recited some verses.

MR. GARRISON made a partial report in behalf of the Business Committee. They had agreed to report Mr. Phillips's resolutions, though without endorsing them. Each person must judge for himself in regard to the sentiments expressed in them.

MR. PHILLIPS then proceeded to re-read the resolutions, as follows:— 1. Resolved, That we acknowledge with devout gratitude the marvellous triumphs of the anti-slavery principle throughout the United States—the redemption of Missouri and Maryland from the curse and sin of the infamous system—and the bright hope that Kentucky and Tennessee will soon follow their honorable example.

2. Resolved, That while these successes give us unfeigned delight, and strengthen and encourage us, and while the victorious march of the national armies enables us to execute justice between man and man, and teaches us meanwhile at every step its imminent necessity, we still recognize that the end is not yet, that real and complete success is not achieved, and that the slave's cause needs yet our most devoted efforts, and our incessant vigilance.

3. Resolved, That if, as we are assured, the present so-called reconstruction of Louisiana is endorsed by the President, and its admission urged by him in Congress, either as an allowable exception or as a model for the other rebel States, we feel bound to protest against acknowledging such reconstruction, or its admission to the rights of a State.

4. Resolved, That as we have always claimed for the negro equal civil privileges with the white man, and demanded for the slave entire, immediate and unconditional liberty, we repudiate the so-called freedom of Louisiana; seeing in it only one of the needless abortive and oft-exploded attempts to prepare the negro for freedom, and deeming its real endorsement of apprenticeship and gradualism to exert a disastrous influence in other States and on the future of the negro.

5. Resolved, That waiving our objection to it as American citizens, which may not be fully discussed on a strictly anti-slavery platform, we consider that reconstruction a practical denial of the first principles of the anti-slavery agitation, that a negro is entitled at once and of course to all the privileges that belong to a white man in the same circumstances; that any system of apprenticeship or gradual abolition is at once impossible, unjust, and the seed of difficulty only. And we hold such form of reconstruction as putting to hazard all the fruits of national victory, and postponing indefinitely justice to the negro.

6. Whereas, a nation's duty is measured by its power; and whereas, considering the nature of our government and the relations of the national and State governments, no individual is safe unless he holds in his own hands the means of protecting his own rights; and whereas, in claiming for the negro emancipation and freedom, we mean an effectual emancipation and a real freedom; and whereas, considering the nature of our Government, and the interlocking of State and Federal authority, no emancipation can be effectual and no freedom real, unless the negro has the ballot and the States are prohibited from enacting laws making any distinction among their citizens on account of race or color; therefore, Resolved, That, in our opinion, the United States Constitution needs two amendments: one prohibiting slavery everywhere throughout the Union, and another forbidding the States to enact laws which make any distinction among their citizens on account of race or color.

Distinction among their citizens on account of race or color.

MR. GARRISON made some comments upon Mr. Phillips's use of the word "reconstruction," and proceeded to read some further resolutions, as follows:—

7. Resolved, That if, as reconstructed, Louisiana ought not to be admitted to the Union because she excluded her colored population from the polls, then Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and all the Western States ought not to be in the Union for the same reason; and while they are guilty of this proscription, it is not for them to demand of Louisiana a broader scope of republican liberty than they are willing to take in their own case.

Whereas, ever since the organization of the national government till now, every State in the Union has claimed and exercised the right to determine on what conditions any of its inhabitants shall wield the ballot,—the General Government taking no cognizance of the special inclusion or exclusion pertaining to its electoral law; and whereas, it is not to be presumed that any State will consent to have this established prerogative wrested from it, and a wholly different rule forcibly prescribed, either on the plea of military occupancy or by act of Congress, without an amendment of the National Constitution; and whereas, by the conflicting laws or constitutions of the several States in the matter of voting, colored citizens who are electors in one State are disfranchised in another, and thus this usage is attended with injurious and oppressive features, and ought not longer to prevail among a people claiming to be one in nationality of spirit, purpose and destiny; and whereas, with a wise regard to the future peace and welfare of the republic, and especially the allegiance of the Southern section of it, no one class should be left to ostracise another, under the plea of State sovereignty; therefore,

8. Resolved, That Congress should lose no time in submitting to the people an amendment of the Constitution, making the electoral law uniform in all the States, without regard to complexional distinctions.

ELBRIDGE SPRAGUE, of Abington, then made a report from the Committee on Nominations, recommending the following persons as officers of the Society for the coming year:—

PRESIDENT. EDMUND QUINCY, of Dedham.

VICED PRESIDENTS. Bourne Spooner, of Plymouth; William Ashby, of Newburyport; Adin Ballou, of Hopdale; Jefferson Church, of Springfield; Josiah Henshaw, of West Brookfield; Henry I. Bowditch, of Boston; James N. Buffum, of Lynn; Ellis Allen, of Medfield; John Bailey, of Lynn; David P. Harmon, of Haverhill; Thomas T. Stone, of Bolton; Ezekiel Tiatcher, of Barnstable; Charles Lenox Remond, of Salem; John Clement, of Townsend; Atkinson Stanwood, of Newburyport; Joshua T. Everett, of Princeton; Benjamin Snow, Jr., of Fitchburg; George Miles, of Westminister; Timothy Davis, of Framingham; John H. Small, of Haverhill; William Pope, Jr., of Dorchester; Elbridge Sprague, of Abington; Elias Richards, of Weymouth.

Recording Secretary—Robert F. Wallcut, of Boston. Treasurer—Ebenezer D. Draper, of Hopdale. Auditor—William I. Bowditch, of Brookline. Counsellors—William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Maria W. Chapman, Charles K. Whipple, Anne W. Weston, John T. Sargent, Charles E. Hodges, Sarah J. Nowell.

On motion that the report be accepted and adopted, the President was proceeding to take the vote, when Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER moved that Mrs. Maria W. Chapman and Miss Anna W. Weston be excused from service on the Board of Managers of this Society, on the ground that they believe the work of the Society already done.

SAMUEL MAY, Jr. said he thought it would be quite time to excuse those ladies from the Board of Managers, when they asked to be excused. They had made no such request, and they were regular attendants at the meetings of the Board; and for one, he hoped the Society would not put itself in the singular position of adopting Mrs. Foster's motion.

In a few remarks, Mrs. Foster withdrew her motion. Mrs. DALL wished to say, for one, that the services of such old, long-trying, and faithful friends as Mrs. Chapman and Miss Weston should be claimed, and eagerly claimed, by this Society.

The question was called for, and the Society unanimously accepted the report of the Nominating Committee, thereby electing its officers for the year. SAMUEL MAY, Jr. moved that the Finance Committee be instructed to proceed to take up collections both for immediate expenses and in behalf of the work of the Society yet before it. He replied to Mrs. Foster's allusion to the small amount received and expended by the Society the past year. We were not so vain as to think that anti-slavery work was done, now, by the anti-slavery society only. Thank God, the nation had been largely converted to the truth of the leading ideas and principles of this Society. Nevertheless, a work still remains to the old anti-slavery societies. While there was a slave remaining on our soil, or a compromise remaining with the slaveholder, the Anti-Slavery Society must not die; and its friends must not allow it to die.

The motion of Mr. May was adopted. On account of the necessary absence of Mr. Dyer, Mr. Elbridge Sprague was added to the Finance Committee. STEPHEN S. FOSTER said that if the Board of Managers would present work, appoint agents, and call for funds, he had no doubt funds sufficient would be forthcoming.

JAMES N. BUFFUM made some comments on the remarks of Mr. and Mrs. Foster, and depicted in an earnest manner the wonderful change that had taken place in the sentiment of the nation, favorable to the total extermination of slavery.

MR. GARRISON said that the Board of Managers of this body have shown their faith and their faithfulness by their works, and need no better certificate than their reelection for so many years by the Society. They required neither instruction nor information as to the work to be done in the future. What they wanted was the means to do with, and they would not be lacking in effort. He rejoiced to believe, however, and all the signs of the times indicated, that the labors of this Society were rapidly coming to a close. The Jubilee is near.

MR. GARRISON read the following resolution as expressive of his feeling:—

9. Resolved, That in case the proposed anti-slavery amendment of the Constitution of the United States shall be adopted by Congress and the people at any time during the present year, the Board of Managers be instructed to summon a special meeting of this Society to celebrate the auspicious event, and to terminate its existence as an Anti-Slavery organization.

He proceeded to support it, and to vindicate the course he had pursued for several years past, as an abolitionist, and as an anti-slavery editor. He contended there was no difference between himself and other members of the Society, in regard to any principle or any right appertaining to the colored man.

He found himself less and less inclined to make speeches against slavery, inasmuch as the people have pronounced slavery accursed, and demand its extirpation. Statesmen and politicians and Generals are crying out against it, and he would not charge them with insincerity. He held such charges, assertions or insinuations to be not only unkind but impolitic. The work is great, and time is needed to complete it. His anxiety was to hold the people, at this hour, mainly to the one point of the total abolition of slavery. That is the all in all for the redemption of the colored man, and the basis of all political rights. His rule for judgment of public men was to give a fair consideration to the circumstances of each. He referred to the case of John Quincy Adams as showing an honorable appreciation, by abolitionists, of the efforts of friends of freedom with views diverse from theirs. As to Gen. Banks, what is needed is not an endorsement of all that he has done, but a recognition that, amidst very great difficulties, he has accomplished some very commendable things for freedom and free institutions.

In regard to the ballot, Mr. Garrison said it was a conventional right of society, having its limitations, and had ever been so regarded; and, important as it was, it was not to be confounded with the natural right of a man to his personal ownership and liberty. For, otherwise, one human being was as much entitled to vote as another, without condition, and irrespective of sex or complexion. He was surprised to hear Frederick Douglass make the unqualified declaration, that emancipation without the ballot was a mockery. Surely, Mr. Douglass did not think so when he burst his fetters, and fled from Maryland to the free soil of Massachusetts, where he found safety, protection, freedom of thought and speech, and was enabled every where to advocate the claims of his brethren in bonds, whom he had left behind. Surely, he then deemed such freedom an unseparable gift—something that called for heartfelt thanksgiving—though unaccompanied by the ballot; freedom from the lash of the driver, from mental and moral degradation, from cruel outrage and wrong. And he should not now forget the thrilling feelings with which he regarded his successful exodus out of the house of bondage, nor allow himself to be hurried into extravagance of statement in his commendable zeal to obtain equal political rights.

What, then, of the elective franchise? From the foundation of our government, this question has been left to the several States. The Constitution of the United States recognizes no authority on the part of Congress or the National Executive to interfere with it. Hence the diversity of action among the States—the great majority proscribing excluding colored citizens from the polls. Now, if we are going into that matter, let us have a measure which will reach not Louisiana only, but that large number of Northern States which exceed her in political injustice to the colored man. And if the right to the ballot is to be put into the category of natural rights, then let us be consistent, and demand it for the black woman as well as for the black man—for all women as well as for all men.

ing of public men was to give a fair consideration to the circumstances of each. He referred to the case of John Quincy Adams as showing an honorable appreciation, by abolitionists, of the efforts of friends of freedom with views diverse from theirs. As to Gen. Banks, what is needed is not an endorsement of all that he has done, but a recognition that, amidst very great difficulties, he has accomplished some very commendable things for freedom and free institutions.

In regard to the ballot, Mr. Garrison said it was a conventional right of society, having its limitations, and had ever been so regarded; and, important as it was, it was not to be confounded with the natural right of a man to his personal ownership and liberty. For, otherwise, one human being was as much entitled to vote as another, without condition, and irrespective of sex or complexion. He was surprised to hear Frederick Douglass make the unqualified declaration, that emancipation without the ballot was a mockery. Surely, Mr. Douglass did not think so when he burst his fetters, and fled from Maryland to the free soil of Massachusetts, where he found safety, protection, freedom of thought and speech, and was enabled every where to advocate the claims of his brethren in bonds, whom he had left behind. Surely, he then deemed such freedom an unseparable gift—something that called for heartfelt thanksgiving—though unaccompanied by the ballot; freedom from the lash of the driver, from mental and moral degradation, from cruel outrage and wrong. And he should not now forget the thrilling feelings with which he regarded his successful exodus out of the house of bondage, nor allow himself to be hurried into extravagance of statement in his commendable zeal to obtain equal political rights.

What, then, of the elective franchise? From the foundation of our government, this question has been left to the several States. The Constitution of the United States recognizes no authority on the part of Congress or the National Executive to interfere with it. Hence the diversity of action among the States—the great majority proscribing excluding colored citizens from the polls. Now, if we are going into that matter, let us have a measure which will reach not Louisiana only, but that large number of Northern States which exceed her in political injustice to the colored man. And if the right to the ballot is to be put into the category of natural rights, then let us be consistent, and demand it for the black woman as well as for the black man—for all women as well as for all men.

MR. GARRISON asked what was the authority for Mr. Phillips's statement, that Gen. Sherman made a multitude of colored followers to be brutally driven back, and subjected to be massacred by the enemy. [Mr. Phillips—"I know it to be true. I do not; and I have never seen the evidence of it. On the contrary, I have seen various statements, by different writers on the ground, all setting forth the humanity and kindness of Gen. Sherman to the colored population of Georgia. As to the alleged murderous barbarity of Gen. Jefferson C. Davis, on a certain occasion, that remains to be authenticated; and until it is, by official investigation, severe condemnation should be withheld.

MR. GARRISON expressed his entire confidence in the integrity of President Lincoln, and believed that he would fulfil all his solemn pledges and engagements pertaining to the millions he had emancipated by his proclamation.

CHARLES L. REMOND inquired whether Mr. Garrison wished the Government to institute careful inquiry as to the treatment of colored men by the army and the Generals.

MR. GARRISON said he desired and expected the Government to protect them from outrage, as far as practicable.

MR. FOSTER asked if Mr. Lincoln's pledge of retaliation for the Fort Pillow massacre had been redeemed.

MR. GARRISON replied that the difficulty in that case was not in regard to the disposition of Mr. Lincoln, but to the impossibility of the Government descending to such fendsish cruelty, and the perplexity of determining precisely what retaliatory measures to adopt. Just as in the case of our furnished soldiers in the Libby and Andersonville prisons. Who in the audience would attribute inhumanity to Abraham Lincoln?

S. S. FOSTER stated that this meeting had been called for a single day only. Some members of the Hovey Committee (so called) thought an additional day desirable, and had engaged the hall for another day. He would therefore move that, when we adjourn to-night, it be to meet again to-morrow in this hall.

MR. GARRISON objected to the motion, inasmuch as, in accordance with the course of the two past years, and after full consideration of the subject, the Board of Managers had voted to hold a meeting of but one day; and that vote was a unanimous one, in a full meeting, upon the motion of Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS said that Mr. Garrison was right in his statement that the Managers had unanimously voted in favor of one day; but, on further reflection, he had himself concluded that the various subjects of importance required a second day's discussion. He proceeded to set forth the importance of some of these subjects, especially the point of the admission of Louisiana.

MR. GARRISON spoke further in support of his view of the matter, and was followed by Mrs. Foster, who desired another day's meeting.

The question being taken, it was voted to continue the meetings through the following day and evening. The meeting was then adjourned to 7 1/2 o'clock.

EVENING. Met according to adjournment, Mr. QUINCY, the President, in the Chair.

ANDREW T. FOSS, of New Hampshire, took the floor in defence of the Government and legislation of the country against various attacks made upon them here to-day. He had been charged with "electioneering," he said. He proceeded to relate the circumstances of his speaking last autumn in behalf of the reelection of President Lincoln, which he supposed was the true reason of the outcry against him. He had been applied to by a member of the National Republican Committee to speak for them. His reply was that he was an abolitionist—an immediate emancipationist, without any delay or compromise. "That is what we want," was the reply. If I go into this campaign, was Mr. Foss's answer, I must go entirely free to say just what I have said as an agent of the Anti-Slavery Society. This was cheerfully agreed to. Now, said Mr. Foss, why should any one object to such "electioneering" as that? If the speaking of the utmost Anti-Slavery truth helps the Republican cause, should it not be helped? Indeed, added Mr. Foss, in this matter I have only done what Stephen S. Foster himself did two years earlier, when in New Hampshire he accepted the request of the Republicans to aid them in their State election, and went from town to town, giving addresses which obtained very many votes for the Republican party.

A. BRONSON ALCOFF, of Concord, asked leave to express his latest thought on some of the subjects which had agitated the meeting. He wished first to say who, he thought, were to-day the "great teachers" of ourselves and of our country. He first referred to Mr. Foss, who, 35 years ago, ventured to think and to say that slavery ought to be, could be, and must be abolished. "He is one of your teachers. But if he should fall to go forward as before, he will cease to be your teacher, and you will select some other." He then referred, by distinct allusion, to Wendell Phillips as the future leader and deliverer of the nation. Then he referred to George Thompson by name, and thought he, also, though a great teacher and leader, was "something behind the times." He spoke of R. W. Emerson as the first of Americans, in thought, in philosophy, in independence of all other countries and races and minds. He playfully said he didn't know but Boston would get jealous of Concord, and took his seat amidst laughter.

MR. FOSTER having, in his speech, charged Mr. Garrison (who was not present) with being ready to "make a compromise with the devil," and to "let down" the claims of Anti-Slavery, George Thompson arose, and made claims of Anti-Slavery, which he had taken down, and called upon Mr. Foster to prove the charge was groundless. Upon Mr. Thompson said the charge was groundless, less, calumnious, and malicious. Mr. Foster first said he used the language figuratively; but Mr. Thompson still holding him to his words, either to prove or to take them back, he asked why Mr. Foster was held to a stricter rule on this platform? Foster was held to a stricter rule on this platform than others were. He proceeded

Rev. J. T. SARGENT being called on by Mr. Foster...

Mr. Foster allowed that this was magnificent...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT again the resolution offered...

Mr. PHILLIPS said that as he had argued yesterday...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that Mr. May's motion be...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT moved that the Business...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that the Executive Committee...

Mr. S. S. FOSTER and Mr. W. B. EARLE earnestly...

Mr. EDWIN THOMPSON advocated it.

Mr. PHILLIPS also offered his adoption...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that Mr. May's motion be...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT offered the following...

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of this...

Mr. PHILLIPS explained, referring to the admission...

Mr. WRIGHT asked if this Society has ever petitioned...

Mr. PHILLIPS replied to the first question No, and...

Mr. PHILLIPS said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. DENSMORE, of Pennsylvania, opposed the last...

Mr. PHILLIPS spoke on the general aspects of...

Mr. MAY, if you say that in regard to Dr. Knox's...

Mr. PHILLIPS, perhaps not exactly that.

Mr. KNOX reiterated the statement, applying other...

Mr. PHILLIPS read some copious extracts from a...

In 1860, the Democratic party met at Charleston...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that Mr. May's motion be...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT moved that the Business...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that the Executive Committee...

Mr. S. S. FOSTER and Mr. W. B. EARLE earnestly...

Mr. EDWIN THOMPSON advocated it.

Mr. PHILLIPS also offered his adoption...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that Mr. May's motion be...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT offered the following...

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of this...

Mr. PHILLIPS explained, referring to the admission...

Mr. WRIGHT asked if this Society has ever petitioned...

Mr. PHILLIPS replied to the first question No, and...

Mr. PHILLIPS said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Alabama, South Carolina, and other rebel States...

Mr. MRS. A. C. FOSTER proposed that the resolutions...

Mr. MAY, Jr., preferring the usual method of voting...

Mr. W. B. EARLE spoke some moments in language...

Mr. PHILLIPS, by request, read again the resolutions...

Mr. PHILLIPS followed by cheering. The remaining...

Mr. S. S. FOSTER came forward, and offered the following...

Resolved, That this Society hereby recommends...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that Mr. May's motion be...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT moved that the Business...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that the Executive Committee...

Mr. S. S. FOSTER and Mr. W. B. EARLE earnestly...

Mr. EDWIN THOMPSON advocated it.

Mr. PHILLIPS also offered his adoption...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that Mr. May's motion be...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT offered the following...

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of this...

Mr. PHILLIPS explained, referring to the admission...

Mr. WRIGHT asked if this Society has ever petitioned...

Mr. PHILLIPS replied to the first question No, and...

Mr. PHILLIPS said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

LETTERS FROM NEW YORK. NO. XXVI.

The ashes of Wickliffe, dispersed to every shore...

Missouri was the parent of the murderers of...

While the Senate was considering the resolutions...

Resolved, That retaliation is harsh, always...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that Mr. May's motion be...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT moved that the Business...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that the Executive Committee...

Mr. S. S. FOSTER and Mr. W. B. EARLE earnestly...

Mr. EDWIN THOMPSON advocated it.

Mr. PHILLIPS also offered his adoption...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that Mr. May's motion be...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT offered the following...

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of this...

Mr. PHILLIPS explained, referring to the admission...

Mr. WRIGHT asked if this Society has ever petitioned...

Mr. PHILLIPS replied to the first question No, and...

Mr. PHILLIPS said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

his height, and contemplating the forcible subjugation...

Any man who yielded to the conspirators of the South...

On that ground, Mr. Everett was no small party...

Mr. PHILLIPS, by request, read again the resolutions...

Mr. PHILLIPS followed by cheering. The remaining...

Mr. S. S. FOSTER came forward, and offered the following...

Resolved, That this Society hereby recommends...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that Mr. May's motion be...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT moved that the Business...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that the Executive Committee...

Mr. S. S. FOSTER and Mr. W. B. EARLE earnestly...

Mr. EDWIN THOMPSON advocated it.

Mr. PHILLIPS also offered his adoption...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that Mr. May's motion be...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT offered the following...

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of this...

Mr. PHILLIPS explained, referring to the admission...

Mr. WRIGHT asked if this Society has ever petitioned...

Mr. PHILLIPS replied to the first question No, and...

Mr. PHILLIPS said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

action of General Major General Jeff. C. Davis in...

Mr. PHILLIPS, by request, read again the resolutions...

Mr. PHILLIPS followed by cheering. The remaining...

Mr. S. S. FOSTER came forward, and offered the following...

Resolved, That this Society hereby recommends...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that Mr. May's motion be...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT moved that the Business...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that the Executive Committee...

Mr. S. S. FOSTER and Mr. W. B. EARLE earnestly...

Mr. EDWIN THOMPSON advocated it.

Mr. PHILLIPS also offered his adoption...

Mr. PHILLIPS moved that Mr. May's motion be...

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT offered the following...

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of this...

Mr. PHILLIPS explained, referring to the admission...

Mr. WRIGHT asked if this Society has ever petitioned...

Mr. PHILLIPS replied to the first question No, and...

Mr. PHILLIPS said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Mr. SARGENT said it was best not to paint black...

Various small notices and advertisements at the bottom of the page.

Poetry.

THE NEW YEAR'S GREETING.

I come with blessing freighted, though ye may, blidged by sense and selfish passion's sway, Turn from Truth's blessed and benignant ray. I am the year of Freedom and Release;

Is not your soul the banner Which God hath blest and new, The mantle that Dr. Matha wore, The red, the white, the blue?

The Liberator.

DR. HOLLAND'S LECTURE.

EDITOR OF THE LIBERATOR: I send you herewith the opinion of our best Daily on Dr. Holland's recent lecture here. That he does not satisfy his audience, but, on the contrary, dispoints them, will be no matter of surprise to you, because you know very well, and the readers of the Liberator know that the editor of the Springfield Republican has persistently treated the friends of emancipation with whom he differs, with contempt and ridicule, as also friends of other reforms. And the connection is plain: if a man is not large-minded enough to deal fairly with those advocating the principles of true Republicanism (with which he professes to be identified), because they differ with him as to measures, or because they are interested in other questions in which he is not, he is not likely to have the temper, the breadth, the impulse of a growing man of the nineteenth century.

as the best audience, without attempting to reduce their thoughts to the finest point, turning them in all directions, and illustrating them in every position, of course for the sake of bringing them down to the comprehension of most of the audience to Dr. Holland's lecture; and it was generally conceded that with months and months of preparation, such as Dr. Holland does or should give to his lecture, he ought to be able to offer something newer and fresher than his thoughts last evening.

ADDRESS OF THE STATE TEMPERANCE ALLIANCE.

ON A STATE POLICE FOR THE CITY OF BOSTON. TO THE PEOPLE OF MASSACHUSETTS: The State Temperance Alliance begs leave to address the citizens of Massachusetts in relation to the appointment of a State Police for the City of Boston. NUMBER AND WORK OF THE POLICE. The Boston Police numbers from 330 to 350 men. An important part of their work is to execute city ordinances. The greater part, however, is the execution of State laws. Last year they made 346 arrests for violations of city ordinances, and 23,554* for violations of State laws. In Boston, the police make nine-tenths of all the arrests under the criminal laws of the State. It is safe to say that the execution of city ordinances alone would not require one-third of the present force.

THE CITY CAN CLAIM NO RIGHT TO APPOINT AND CONTROL THE POLICE.

If two thirds of the work of the police is the execution of State laws, the State surely has the best right to appoint and control them. If the City were in no respect subordinate, its claim to the control of the police could only be in proportion to its share of the work they perform. But the right of the State comes from a different source. It comes from her character as the sovereign power. It is an invaluable feature of our policy that places most of the powers of government in the hands of towns and cities. But all these powers are given by statute laws. Towns and cities have no name, no existence, no rights, and no powers, except what the State has given them. They are its agents, and the State decides what powers it will give them, and what powers it will reserve to itself. It is always a mere question of expediency. There are many local powers that the State decides not to give. She does not give Boston the power of deciding that she will, or will not support common schools, or of deciding that children of Irish or African parents shall, or shall not have a right to attend them; or of deciding what local courts, what justices, or what police judges she will have. The State is the sovereign power, and has the same right to appoint the officers that arrest criminals in Boston, that she has to appoint the officers that convict and sentence them. The only question is, whether it is expedient to exercise this right. Does the public interest demand that the State shall appoint and control the Metropolitan Police? We shall try to answer this question.

THE CITY'S CONTROL OF THE POLICE UNSAFE.

It is never safe for any State to entrust the execution of its laws to a great city. The larger the city, the greater the danger. There are frequent and grave issues between great cities and the laws of the State. In such cases the laws can never prevail, unless the State controls the police that executes them. To execute the laws in a great city, three things are indispensable. There must be a police to arrest offenders, a jury to convict, and a court to sentence them. The State may provide a faithful judge, but he can do nothing unless the police arrest the criminals and furnish the evidence. A populous city, therefore, that controls the police, can decide, and will decide what part of the laws shall be executed, and what part shall be nullified; what mobs shall be permitted, and what suppressed; what classes of criminals shall be punished, and what shall go free. No great city ever did, or ever will act otherwise. Boston is as loyal as any; and yet, if she dislikes a law, she nullifies it as effectually as if her right to do so were conferred by special statute. To show this fact, we present a single example, drawn from her police reports.

THE BOSTON POLICE REPORT OF LAST YEAR.

This Report shows that two-thirds of the arrests were for drunkenness. Out of 28,890 arrests, 19,115 were for getting drunk. Those who got drunk were arrested according to the letter of the law. Close to these 19,115 drunkards were 1,951 men who sold them the liquor on which they got drunk. These were not arrested at all. Here are two classes of offenders, standing side by side, participating in the same offence, and both equally guilty in the eyes of the law. Boston directs its police to arrest one class, and to let the other go free. Under the present system, those who control the police cannot arrest liquor dealers without losing their votes. For this reason, they dislike the law, and refuse to execute it. This is but one example, but the principle is universal. Men will not execute a law against themselves, or against friends that are powerful enough to give them office.

THE POLICE NOT CENSURABLE.

This result is not the fault of the Police. If any officer or member of the Boston Police should undertake to execute the law without orders, it would insure his dismissal. Those who control the Police, and they alone, are responsible. They control the execution of the criminal laws. They have power to overrule and nullify such laws as are executed by the Police, and they have strong inducements to exercise this power. As a result, some laws are executed faithfully, some partially, and some not at all. This nullification of a portion of the laws is our special charge against the City's control of the Police.

THE CITY'S ANSWER TO THIS CHARGE.

So far as it regards the liquor traffic, the city says it cannot execute the law. If that is her deliberate judgment, if Boston thinks she cannot do the work, it is a sufficient reason for taking it out of her hands. What sensible man would intrust a difficult piece of work to an agent who told him he could not do it? Who would expect his plans to be carried out by men who thought they were absurd and impracticable? Individuals would not employ such agents. Why then should the State? Yet this is precisely what the State is now doing.

OPPOSITION OF BOSTON TO THE PROHIBITORY LAW.

Boston has always opposed this law. There has been one mayor, but never a majority of the City government, in favor of the law. When it was first enacted, Boston made a direct effort to protect the liquor traffic against it. After its enactment, but before it took effect, Boston gave a license to every dealer that was doing any considerable business. She has constantly placed liquor dealers upon her juries. The State calls such dealers criminals. The City calls them "persons of good moral character." Besides this shielding the traffic from the law, she has always sustained it by her direct patronage. There has been no year since the law was placed on the statute book, in which Boston has not purchased liquors that were sold in defiance of law, to be drunk by members of the City government, and paid for out of the City treasury. Such actions speak louder than words. Instead of showing any wish to suppress the traffic, they show efforts to uphold and sustain it. There are many who suppose that Boston has made an attempt to execute the law, and failed on account of some difficulties that she could not overcome. What obstacles has Boston ever asked to have removed? Has she ever asked for any modification of the laws in relation to jurors, or in relation to prosecuting officers, or in relation to courts, or in relation to anything else that would aid her in executing the law? On the contrary, she has constantly opposed every effort in that direction.

anything else that would aid her in executing the law? On the contrary, she has constantly opposed every effort in that direction.

WHY CITY GOVERNMENTS OPPOSE THE LAW.

Members of city governments have a motive for opposing the law, which they would not have as private citizens. The keepers of drinking-houses have great political power. They control a great number of votes. Mayors and aldermen have a strong inducement to court their favor, and avoid their enmity. To execute the law against them is to lose their votes. So they oppose the law, instead of executing it. The customers of these houses, on the contrary, have no political power. They never had a candidate, and never will have one, and of course they have no political influence. It is therefore politically safe to arrest the customers, but dangerous to arrest the keepers. It did not, probably, cost the mayor and aldermen a single vote to arrest 19,115 of the customers, during the last year. If they had made one-tenth part as many arrests of the keepers, it would have cost them all the votes the traffic could control. This is the reason that City governments are so much opposed to the law. This is the reason they order the police to arrest the customers, and let the keepers go free.

WHAT ARE THE OBSTACLES TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAW?

A committee of the last Legislature was appointed to consider this question, and we can in no way answer it so well as by making the following extract from their Report:

"The obstacles to the enforcement of this law do not arise from any inherent difficulties in the provisions of the law itself, or in its interpretation and judicial application. Foes as well as friends now admit that the present statutes, including what is popularly called the Liquor Law and the Nuisance Act, are skillfully and carefully framed, and the forms and proceedings thereunder are now well settled. No similar laws were ever in so good working order as these now are."

The Report of the Attorney General shows that, in 1861, the whole number of cases argued before the Supreme Court, arising under these laws, was forty-two; out of these, only nine were decided against the Commonwealth, this including, of course, as well as rulings in the Court below in regard to evidence, as defects of form. In 1862, out of nine—the whole number so argued, seven were decided in favor of the Commonwealth, and only one decided for the defendant. In 1863, out of thirty-one cases, twenty-four were decided for the Commonwealth, one against, and the rest undecided at the date of the report.

Nor is the result of questions of fact less favorable than the result of questions of law. The abstract of returns for the past year shows that out of one hundred and forty-nine trials in the Superior Court, one hundred and twenty-three verdicts of guilty were obtained. These facts abundantly demonstrate that there is no difficulty in procuring evidence, or convictions by juries, in the State at large."

After showing the position taken by the City of Boston, the Committee conclude that the execution of the law is prevented by these two obstacles, viz:—

First, the protection afforded to the traffic by the City of Boston.

Second, placing cases against liquor-dealers on file without sentence; in other words, letting them go free when convicted.

In relation to the extent to which convicted offenders are permitted to go free, the Committee present this proof, viz:—

"There were on file in the Superior Courts, September 30, one hundred and fifty-one cases under this law, of which one hundred and fifty one were placed on file during the year then ending. During the same time, thirty-one were sentenced to the fine and imprisonment provided by law. In point of fact, it is believed that the important offenders have almost universally escaped punishment."

No corruption was ever more flagrant, or more clearly proved.

Their exposure of the mode in which Boston protects the liquor traffic is equally definite and conclusive.

The legislative committee proposed these two remedies, viz:—

First, the establishment of a State Police for Boston and the adjoining cities.

Second, the passage of "An Act for the better enforcement of the laws."

Both of these legal provisions seem to us to be plain, simple, effective, and indispensable. To one of them objections have been made by the Governor, especially in relation to the exclusion of rum-selling jurors, but his objections are evidently far more applicable to existing Statutes than they are to the "Act for the better enforcement of the laws."

We make no comment upon the proposed "Act," nor give any detail of its provisions, believing there can be neither any permanent difference of opinion in regard to its necessity, nor any doubt in regard to its enactment.

But to decide upon the question of establishing a State Police for Boston and the adjoining cities requires some further exposition of the evils of the present system, and more especially of the corruption that comes from the political power of the liquor-traffic in that locality.

POLITICAL STRENGTH OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC OF BOSTON.

The number of places where liquor is sold, as reported by the police, is nineteen hundred and fifty-one. Each of these controls the votes of some relatives and some customers. When the liquor-dealers are in danger, all other classes of criminals vote with them. These classes united hold the balance of power. They are strong enough to decide municipal elections. Municipal candidates and municipal officers act under the hope of gaining, or the fear of losing these votes. It is this that arrays municipal officers against the law.

BOSTON ENTIRED TO A CHARITABLE JUDGMENT. The municipal officers of Boston ought not to be harshly judged. When we ask them to execute this law, we ask them to make a greater sacrifice than most men are willing to make. We ask them to turn themselves out of office. We can hardly expect men to cut off their own political aspirations, and throw the power and patronage of a great city into the hands of their political opponents. We must remember, too, the divided state of public opinion that surrounds them. In the popular mind there is a great deal of respectability in power. There were very good citizens who could see no immorality or irreligion in slavery, so long as it could elect presidents, nor can they see any want of respectability in the liquor traffic while it elects mayors and aldermen.

To men chosen under such influences, an impartial execution of the law is exceedingly difficult. Boston municipal officers are no worse than those of other cities. Candidates there are just like candidates everywhere else; they want to be elected. They stand on one side, wanting votes. On the other side stand nineteen hundred and fifty-one men, who want to sell rum. There is no bargain between them, but the result is just the same. It is all perfectly understood. Each side gives the other what it wants, and gets what it wants itself. One side gets elected, and the other gets a chance to sell rum. If the candidates had made a written contract, pledging themselves, in case of their election, not to execute the laws against these nineteen hundred and fifty-one men, the result would have been just what we see in the streets of Boston to-day,—an open, undisturbed liquor traffic.

GAMING HOUSES AND BROTHELS.

Next to the drinking houses stand the gaming-houses and brothels. They are, to a great extent, the fruit and product of the liquor traffic. As a business, they cannot be carried on without its aid. Their customers must first graduate at the drinking-houses. The laws are not sufficiently executed against these houses. The arrests bear no proper proportion to their number, and the extent of their business. Boston does not yet fully tolerate them, as it does its drinking houses, but its tendency is strongly in that direction. Slowly, but surely, the police are tending toward the same rule of arresting only the lowest and the most noisy, and such as live in cheap houses and keep inferior

stock. This tendency is inevitable. If the laws are not executed against drinking-houses, they will not be executed against the kindred houses that depend on them for existence.

There can be no doubt that the practical license given to the liquor traffic by the mayor and aldermen of Boston does more than anything else to produce, sustain and protect the gaming-houses and brothels of the city. Nothing can be more deeply impeded the public welfare, or more imperatively demand that the control of the Police should be placed in other hands.

THE MOST IMPORTANT DUTY OF THE POLICE.

The necessity of watching and protecting a city against different classes of offenders is in proportion to the mischief they do. The most important duty of the Police, therefore, is to arrest and punish such violators of law as are most injurious. What other classes of offenders are as pernicious to the City and State as the keepers of drinking-houses, gaming-houses and houses of prostitution? Do not these nurseries of crime and poverty spread through the community the special dangers that every man fears for his children? Is it not they that cause three-fourths of the human wrecks that are thrown every year into the hands of the police and overseers of the poor? If the men who minister to these vices are more injurious to the community than any other classes of offenders, then their arrest, punishment and suppression is the first and most important duty of the Police. The City's control of the Police results in the neglect of this duty. It fails to secure its most important object, and should therefore cease.

WHAT THE POLICE NOW DO.

It is their chief business to collect the daily crop of offenders furnished by the drinking-houses. As fast as the customers of these houses reach a point where they cannot take care of themselves, or where they disturb others, the Police step in and arrest them. Their chief function is that of public scavengers, employed to collect the refuse human stock which these houses daily discharge upon the community. Instead of harming the drinking houses, the Police give them an essential aid, by taking care of their victims as fast as they are sufficiently plucked and gorged. They attend the calls of the keepers of these houses for this very purpose. This disgraceful position of the Police results from their control by the City.

DIFFICULTY OF THE WORK.

We ask for a State Police with no low estimate of the difficulty of its work. But if the work is difficult, it is the more necessary that it should be intrusted only to the most prudent, efficient and impartial men. The men to whom the State intrusts the execution of its laws at the most vital point ought, like her judges, to be as free, impartial and independent as the lot of humanity will admit. It is a dreadful mistake for the State to place the execution of its laws in the hands of men, who, if they do their duty at all, must do it at the expense of their official position.

WHAT THE CITY'S CONTROL OF THE POLICE COSTS.

It does not cost all the evils of intemperance and licentiousness. It does cost all that are produced by the open traffic, and all that are produced by houses that grow out of the open traffic. It costs all the evils that result either from a partial or total nullification of the laws. It costs, therefore, a large part of the poverty and crime produced by drinking-houses, gaming-houses and brothels. It costs the homes that would otherwise shelter and save thousands of females from a life of prostitution. It costs the education of many thousands of our children. Mr. Philbrick, Superintendent of the Boston Public Schools, says:—

"Among the causes of truancy, which so far transcend all others as to be properly considered the cause of causes, is the immoderate use of intoxicating drinks. This is the unanimous testimony of the trust officers. The liquor shops and the schools are in all respects antagonistic to each other."

The city's control of the Police costs a large part of the intemperance for which 19,115 arrests were made in Boston during the last year. It cost the poverty of more than twenty thousand, (including their families,) relieved last year by the overseers of the poor, and of many thousands more, who were relieved by private charity, and by charitable institutions. The money that should have bought food, and fuel, and clothing, was spent for drink, and they were compelled to apply to the city and to other charities for a pittance to sustain life. These are among the items of cost that get into the official records of a single city. Directly or indirectly, the cost of the City's control of the police reaches every citizen of the State. We therefore invite every citizen who desires to correct the abuses that produce this cost, to join with us in asking the State to remove them.

WHY NOT HAVE A STATE POLICE FOR OTHER CITIES AS WELL AS BOSTON?

Boston furnishes the capital, and is the seat of the wholesale traffic,—the reservoir from which the rest of the State is supplied. Not only directly, but by her example and influence, Boston has done, and is doing, much more than all other parts of the State to sustain the traffic. Execute the laws there, and there is reason to believe that it will insure their execution in other parts of the Commonwealth. If that hope is disappointed, if the same sources of corruption continue to prevent the execution of the law in other cities, let an adequate remedy be applied.

THE POLICY OF THE STATE.

The most important interest of any State is the character of its people. That character is largely formed by agencies over which the State has control. The most powerful of these agencies are the public schools and the liquor traffic. No one doubts that the schools do much to make good citizens, and no one doubts that the drinking-houses do much to make bad ones. This is the judgment of the State, and for this reason it sustains the one, and prohibits the other. The State has always looked upon the agencies that secure the character and intelligence of its people as the most important objects of legislation. Any agency that makes good citizens, confers the greatest of all possible benefits, and any agency that makes bad citizens, inflicts the greatest of all possible evils upon the State. For this reason, the most important legislation of Massachusetts is that which establishes her common schools,—the leading agency for the manufacture of good citizens. With that single exception, the most important legislation of the State is that which prohibits the liquor traffic,—the leading agency for the manufacture of bad citizens.

THE WORK DONE BY THE DRINKING HOUSES OF BOSTON.

In other parts of the State, no doubt, the schools do more good than the drinking-houses do harm. Is it so in Boston? Is there not, on the contrary, much reason to fear that the reverse is true? Two or three hundred families in Boston get a living by teaching, and two or three thousand by selling rum. Three or four hundred thousand dollars are spent for education, and two or three millions are spent for drink. Boston sends 25,000 pupils to its public schools, and its drinking-houses send every year 30,000 of their pupils into the hands of the police and overseers of the poor. Official reports indicate that the drinking-houses of Boston reduce one-sixth of its population to a position of dependence upon public charity or public correction. Where is the proof of an equally extensive work done by her schools?

THE RIGHT OF THE STATE TO APPOINT AND CONTROL THE POLICE OF BOSTON.

As the sovereign power, it has a legal right. Its equitable right arises from the interest and welfare of its citizens. The first duty of a State is to maintain the supremacy of its laws. If that supremacy is limited, or endangered, by the City's control of the Police, it is the duty of the State to place that control in other hands. The State has a right to say that Boston shall not keep open schools of intemperance and licentiousness.

The victims of those schools are to be found in every town and city of the State, and every citizen of

the State has therefore a right to demand their suppression.

Official criminal returns show that in ten years there was forty-two per cent. of the population of Suffolk county arrested for crime, while there was less than one per cent. arrested in Barnstable and Hampden. During ten years, the whole number of prisoners confined in the State was 136,246, and of these there were 71,576 from Suffolk county, and less than one-sixth of the population, more than half of the prisoners were furnished by Boston.

It is not, therefore, disrespectful to Boston to say that she, as well as all other large cities, has a disproportionate share of the criminal and dangerous classes. It is not disrespectful to say, that it is the duty of the State to make just such modification of her municipal powers as are demanded by the character and density of her population. Boston is our factory, our banker, our express, railroad, and insurance office, our workshop, our counting-room, our social, political, moral and religious center,—bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh. It is, therefore, absurd to suppose that she can be in any part of the State a disposition to do any act disrespectful to her character, or injurious to her interests.

WHAT MUST BE DONE?

The State must, at its vital point, assume the execution of its own laws. It must establish a State Police for Boston and the adjoining cities. In its haste to suppress its drinking houses and brothels, it must take the same course with its agents that practical men take with theirs. In ordinary business, agents always know that their services will not be wanted any longer than they do their work. The agents of the State must stand in the same position. Upon this point depends the question of success or failure. If such Police Commissioners as may be appointed, neglect their discharge will promptly follow a neglect to execute the law against the nurseries of intemperance and licentiousness, they, in their turn, will hold every officer and member of the Police to the same measure of office. Let the State take this position, and no one of these nuisances will any longer continue to have an open and undisturbed existence. Police Commissioners will then be as much afraid of executing, as mayors and aldermen now are of executing the law.

WILL NOT THE INFLUENCE OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC CORRUPT THE STATE'S CONTROL OF THE POLICE.

AS IT NOW DOES THAT OF THE CITY? That the State's control of the Police is subject to this danger is a fact that merits the most earnest thought of the legislature and the people. The practical difficulties connected with the execution of the law against all open offenders can be certainly overcome. The danger, however, will not end with the establishment of a State Police, and the passage of an "Act for the better enforcement of the law." The same means will be used to control the State, that are now used to control the city. Here, and here alone, rests a doubt of success. Dependent on it, the traffic and its allies will not yield without a contest at the polls. In view of this contest, we have confidence in the ultimate decision of the people.

WHAT MEASURE OF SUCCESS CAN BE REASONABLY EXPECTED.

It is the open, not the covert offenders, that are within the certain reach of the law. We do not say that the Police can put an end to intemperance and licentiousness. What they can do is to subject those who minister to these vices to the secrecy, concealment, and odium, that attach to other classes of criminals. The Police can shut up the open liquor traffic, and the half-open houses of prostitution. Especial attention to this subject leads us to the conviction, that these vices, if thus compelled to hide from the public eye, could not reach beyond one-fifth or one-sixth of their present extent.

It is not fit that a State that spends two millions of dollars every year to sustain schools that lead to virtue and good citizenship,—it is not fit that such a State should permit its policy to be defeated and its laws set at defiance by two or three thousand metropolitan schools of vice, whose product of crime requires the yearly arrest of twenty thousand citizens in a single city,—whose product of poverty makes still larger number of the people of that city dependent on public charity,—and whose influence does more than everything else to plant and sustain similar schools of infamy throughout the Commonwealth.

OFFICE OF THE BOSTON PROBIVENT ASSOCIATION.

284 WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON, February 18th, 1864. DEAR SIR,—With regard to the question you ask as to the number of families that have been aided by the Boston Provident Association, I would answer that for the past 11 years we have aided 34,128 families, containing 125,332 persons. The proportion of poverty caused by the free use of intoxicating drink should judge to be fully eighty per cent.

Yours truly, A. G. GOODWIN, Gen'l Agent. To H. D. CUSHING, Esq.

OVERSEERS OF THE POOR.

21, BRIMFIELD ST., BOSTON, Feb. 25, 1864. H. D. CUSHING, Esq. DEAR SIR,—Your note of inquiry respecting the families "relieved or supported" by the City of Boston, for the last seven years, &c., is received. In answer to an "abstract of the number of persons, including their families," &c. I must state that our Board have made no returns which would enable me to state positively as to the number of persons who may have been benefited by our charities. Some of the recipients have been single individuals; some have been families. The applicants are generally widowed or deserted mothers, who ask aid for themselves and children, varying in number from one or two, to twelve or more; and averaging, in my judgment, about four persons to each name. I find, by the "Abstracts of the Returns relating to the Poor," &c., made by the "Secretary of the Board of Overseers of the Poor, of the City of Boston," for the seven years last past, ending December 31st, 1863, is as follows, viz:—

In the year 1857,	9,889
" 1858,	8,447
" 1859,	8,131
" 1860,	12,129
" 1861,	12,196
" 1862,	11,564
" 1863,	70,917

In seven years, Estimating that four persons on an average have received the benefit of the aid rendered to each, the total amount to which the whole number thus benefited amount, will make the whole number to be 283,658 in seven years, or 40,523 yearly.

Most respectfully your obedient servant, JOHN W. WARREN, Chairman. Overseers of the Poor of Boston.

GAS FIXTURES.

THE undersigned begs leave to inform his friends and the public, that (owing to ill health) H. B. Sturtevant has been obliged to leave his situation at Messrs. H. B. Sturtevant & Co's, now Messrs. Shreve, Swanwick & Co's, where he has been employed for the last fourteen years, the work being too heavy for his physical strength, and is now prepared to do all manner of

JOBBER ON GAS FIXTURES.

In the most careful manner. New Fixtures furnished and put up, old Fixtures and Glass Drops cleaned, Gas Pipes fitted, Gas Fixtures done over, and Glass of all the furnished at short notice. Also, Gas Burners of all approved kinds. Particular attention given to Lighting up for Parties. Shop under the Marlborough House. Orders may be sent to Messrs. Hall & Stone's Provision Store, 121 Chancery Street, Boston.

WANTED.

A MAN and wife to take charge of a small farm; one who is willing to work with his own hands, and like to take care of a stock, and make no use of intoxicating drinks, tobacco, or profane language. Such an one may have a good salary. THOMAS HASKELL, West Gloucester, Mass., Jan. 4.