THE LIBERATOR.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY, AT THE
ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, 21 CORNHILL.
Robert F. Wallcut, General Agent.

☞ TERMS.—$2 50 per annum, in advance.
☞ All remittances are to be made, and all letters relating to pecuniary concerns of the paper are to be addressed (post paid) to the General Agent.
☞ Six copies will be sent to one address for TEN DOLLARS, if payment be forwarded in advance.
☞ Advertisements making less than a square in length, three times for 75 cts.—one square for $1 00.

Financial Committee.—FRANCIS JACKSON, ELLIS GRAY LORING, EDMUND QUINCY, SAMUEL PHILLIPS JACKSON.
☞ The Committee is responsible only for the financial economy of the paper—not for any of its debts.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

VOL. XX. NO. 8. BOSTON, MASS. FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1850. WHOLE NO. 998.

THE LIBERATOR.

OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND. J. B. YERRINTON & SON, PRINTERS.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!

RE 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 the price 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 that slaves should be counted in apportionment positively prohibited by the laws of God, delivered from Sinai; and thirdly, the exaction, fatal to the principles of popular government, of a fugitive slave law, requiring the surrender, not of articles of merchandize, under the name of persons. Its reciprocal operation upon the government of the nation, by giving an artificial majority in the slave representation over that of the free people, in the American Congress, and thereby to make the FREEDOM OF THE PERSON, PROPAGATION AND PERPETUATION OF SLAVERY THE VITAL AND ANIMATING SPIRIT OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.'—JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

Refuge of Oppression.

From the New York Express.

GEMS FROM THE 'LIBERATOR.'

BRILLIANT EXHIBIT OF FOLLY AND FANATICISM.

THE LATE MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

If there is any thing more than another better calculated to excite a general public disgust with the jesuitical deliberations of our abolition madmen, at the North, it is their uniform and unceasing villification of the best and purest men of both, indeed, of all parties in the country, and in the Republic. Thus, in garrison's 'Liberator,' published at Boston, we find the most vile, and, among the reported proceedings of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, a series of resolutions denouncing, in terms bitterer than ever before, the Church,—virtually a condemnation of the sacredness, and blaspheming things which the whole Christian world are accustomed to look upon as most sacred. The 'infidels' having vented their willingness to blaspheme upon the head of the Christ, the Saviour, through that paragon of a philanthropist, Theodore Parker, Pillsbury, proceeded to perpetrate the following, which, if any thing, is worse. The resolution upon which our course was adopted, amid the most frantic applause:—

Resolved, That if any thing is wanting to perfect this nation's character as the most gigantic and unparalleled hypocrite that ever deserved the universal execration of the world, it is most abundantly supplied in the professed sympathy for the fallen Hungarians, now so disgustingly poured forth from the hallowed lips of Zachary Taylor, Lewis Cass, Daniel Webster, and other representatives of a nation, whose tyrannies and crimes are unparalleled in the history of all the Austrias and Russias of the Old World; and we cannot but believe, that if Hungary knows no more of true liberty than to ask or accept the sympathies of such overgrown tyrants, she had far wise reason to be her allegiance to Austria, until a lower submission shall have fitted her for its enjoyment.

Wow! Of course, a 'guffaw' is the chiefly appropriate response of course, at the North, to such a raving like this. It will be a wonder, though, if some of our ultra Union dissolvers, on the other side of Mason and Dixon's line, don't come up and 'rather sentiment,' and therefore another argument in favor of a dissolution of the Union!

Curious beneath words, will Professor Longfellow, the poet, for having dared to write a poem eulogistic of the Union.

It is to be hoped the poet will survive this terrible reception. The cause of his unpardonable display of regard for that 'covenant with death' and that 'agreement with hell'—the Union—we are told, is set in the strongest light in the black galaxy, Samuel Ej. Jr., undertook to assert and prove, to the great satisfaction of every body present, (including himself,) that he was an ABOLITIONIST, A FAITH TO THE CONSTITUTION, WITHOUT BEING SO CONSTITUTIONALLY ALIENED IN HIS MORAL SENSE AS TO BE UNABLE TO BREATHE WITHIN IT! Yes, 'covenant' and 'standing alone,' and the holding of this last justaic, as there is that the good people of South Carolina will rush to arms at the forward nod of the 'Hunkered Democracy' of Faneuil Quatlebom; we fear he will have to cry louder, and come deeper, before he can scare up a corporal's guard to cross the old Bay State out of this 'disgusting partnership.'

From Neil Buntline's Own.

TREASON, 'BLACK AND MONSTROUS.'

I have just read the report of a body of creatures who were assembled at Syracuse, in this State, on the 15th day of January, calling themselves the Anti-Slavery Anti-Slavery Mass Convention of the 'Abolitionists of the State of New York,' and have read a resolution therein contained, astonished that such assemblages were there uttered should be listened to calmly by men professing to be *Americans*, or that those who had to speak there were suffered to go unhung for a single hour.

I have ever avoided saying one word in regard to the Abolitionists, but now, the words 'Wilmot Proviso' were never seen in those resolutions before, nor have I ever written one line either for or against the extension of slavery, as it exists in the South. I have not intended to do so, and I do not now intend to do so. But I would not be true to the ancestral blood that flows in my veins, if I could read and pass unnoticed such sentiments as these, not only uttered there, but are now being repeated through the land in the columns of the papers.

A black Democratic name, Douglass, as reported in last Sunday's Herald, used these words:—

'I believe the slaves would be more than a match for their enslavers, if left to themselves. Let the Union, then, be dissolved. I wish to see it dissolved at once. It is the union of the free people of the country, who can be summoned in their whole military strength to crush the slave, that perpetuates slavery. Dissolve the Union, and they will raise aloft the standard, arms, and demand freedom; and, if treated, would have my sympathy, despite the pious and puny opposition of their oppressors. In view of such oppression as this Union, I welcome the hour when the North shall say, let the South go—better from heaven or from hell, which shall shivver in pieces. Let this unholy, unrighteous Union be dissolved. We are called upon to imitate the wisdom and prudence of our ancestors. I know they were not Abolitionists. Talk to me of the love of liberty of your Washington, Jefferson, Henry, they were nothing to my just idea of liberality. They were not Abolitionists, and liberty for all, does not love liberty and justice. They were slaveholders, and the Fathers of Independence with one hand, and with the other clutched their hatred of liberty by the throat! Name not the men who formed the Union! I hate the Union. Give me no union with slaveholders! I wish to dissolve the union of these States, and to do it in a direct way.'

Just one *American* hear that? Did one man, who claims to be that he is an American and loves his country, stand up to listen to such language—hear the names of Washington, Jefferson and Henry polluted by such slanders from human lips! No. If a person were to come and tell me he had actually listened to these sentiments, I would not honor him by calling him a Judas or an Arnold—I would call him a coward, would be flattery, to call him a fool would be too high a compliment. Treason is a crime against treason in this land—or are the offices of the law too dastardly or too cowardly to enforce it?

I am not a friend to slavery—would gladly see it pass away from our land, by due and proper action of the people; but I would also gladly see every traitor, who dares to speak of a dissuasion of this Republic, (which can only live and prosper with them,) hung higher than Haman was! I would gladly see these fanatics, who pretend to so much feeling for the slaves, and who in their insanity are only rendering the otherwise fast loosening manacles of slavery, kicked from the Union to which they are traitors—driven like bastards, as they are, from beneath the protection of our national banner.

The head devil among them, one Garrison, used this language:—'The Constitution of the United States is a covenant with death and an agreement with hell!' And he, who is enjoying every privilege guaranteed by this Constitution, dares to utter such a thought! It were a sin, inappropriate, and, I may add, decent, for him to call his own mother a prostitute, to brand himself as a bastard. I cannot find language strong enough to express my indignation which fills my heart as I note the action of those who would be murderers, who, to carry out their own views, would gladly drown the land in blood, and glory in the groans of dying millions, and shout glory to God, while the nation which Washington and his compatriots gave to us as a birthright perished from among the nations of the world sunk, like Greece and Rome, into the sea of oblivion!

If proper action was taken, I think such meetings could be suppressed, or, at least, such sentiments could be strangled in the black throats of those who dared to utter them. I am not very easily moved to anger, but I think that if I had heard the baboon Douglass use the name of Washington as he did, I should have tried to choke all the black out of him! It is such things as Douglass, Garrison, Burleigh, and other colored pimples, that are helping to perpetuate slavery, and *forcing* those who would gladly ameliorate the condition of the slave, and prepare the way for his emancipation, to tighten, rather than loosen the bond! *They the friend of the slave?* Just as much as the devil is the friend of sinners!

From the Journal of Commerce.

IMPORTANT AND WELCOME MOVEMENT.

We are happy to see the following announcement. It is just what we have been expecting, and just what we have desired—except the political aspect of the movement, which is to be regretted. But we are not disposed to be too particular on this head; for *any* form of wisdom and patriotism is better than their opposites. The Whigs can prevent the Democrats from making capital out of the movement, by calling a public meeting to respond to the resolutions of Henry Clay. It is politics chiefly which produces the mischief, not is say *hyperactivel*, state of public sentiment which has existed at the North for the last two years, and if politics should undo the mischief it has done, it will be at least better employed than before. This artificial state of public sentiment has acted upon the pulpit and the press; and those again have reacted upon public sentiment; so that, in fact, a large part of the community have been playing the fool, that they might make fools of others. This delusion is at length passing away. Whigs and Democrats now see and acknowledge that the Wilmot Proviso is a humbug that under no possible circumstance can it do any good; that, on the contrary, it is fraught with untold mischief; and if adopted by Congress, would endanger the Union itself. Whigs and Democrats now see, that even if the South interposed no objection, and felt none, to the passage of the Wilmot Proviso, its adoption by Congress would be inexpedient and useless. If not offensive to the South, it would be so to the people of the new Territories, who naturally conceive themselves capable of taking care of themselves, in a matter exclusively concerned with them. States, to admit slavery as an expression of resentment at the decision of the Southern States, in any other reason. A thousand times we have been told that the new Territories are not adapted to slavery; that the people are sufficiently intelligent to do for themselves, they will certainly repudiate it; yet, until very recently, the North, with a strange appearance of unanimity, though we believe, by construction, in violation of the better judgment of the great majority, have been clamoring for an act of Congress, (declared by more than one third of the nation to be unconstitutional and otherwise offensive,) which should compel the people of the Territories to do precisely what they want to do, and intend to do, and in part have already done. Resolutions to this effect have passed almost all the Northern Legislatures, and it is humiliating to be reminded that such is the fact. It shows how little real wisdom there is in legislative bodies; or rather, how liable they are to be led astray by an impulse, a catch-word, a popular breath, instead of being guided by firm and enlightened principle.

The movement of Tammany Hall, we take it, is the beginning of the end." The Whigs will not permit the Democrats to monopolize a position so unpregnable. If they do, they may as well hang up their fiddles. The meeting is to be held next Saturday evening. It will be a great one, without doubt, and full of enthusiasm. "The Union of the States" is a theme on which eloquence flows forth almost spontaneously. It was the theme of Washington, Hancock, Adams, Franklin, and all the worthies of the Revolution; it is the theme of every true American, at least, the theme of his heart, at all times, and at must and will triumph over all opposition. The following is the call above alluded to:—

GREAT MASS MEETING AT TAMMANY HALL. 'The Union, it must be preserved!' The present state of public affairs is alarming. Dissensions and heartburnings threaten the Union to the verge of dissolution. The great city of New York has been too long silent. Her voice must now be proclaimed in defense of the integrity of the Union, to which she is indebted for her prosperity and her power. The General Committee do, therefore, invite all the Democratic Republican electors of this city, who are opposed to the Wilmot Proviso, and are friends of the Union, to meet at Tammany Hall, on Saturday evening, the 16th inst., at 7 1-2 o'clock, to take counsel upon the present crisis, and to adopt such measures as may tend to preserve to them and their posterity the blessings of our great and glorious Union,

'Now and for ever, one and inseparable.'

Edward C. West,	James T. Brady,
Robert J. Dillon,	William Wainwright,
James L. Roseveit,	Thomas Gilmartin,
Daniel E. Sickles,	Jas. S. Stoughton,
Augustus Schell,	Daniel Geary,
R. T. Mulligan,	Henry Arcularius, Jr.,
Thomas J. Barr,	Henry Ferrer,

Com. of Arr. of General Committee.

From the Boston Transcript.

LONGFELLOW DENOUNCED.

It will probably be news to a vast majority of our fellow-citizens, that the recent Anti-Slavery Mass Convention in Faneuil Hall went through the solemn farce of passing a resolution of censure upon the poet Longfellow, on account of the following noble and patriotic lines, which occur in his beautiful poem, entitled, 'The Building of the Ship.'

The denunciatory resolution was offered by Mr. Garrison, and passed with great applause, mingled with hisses. We copy the resolution entire, as it affords a fair index of the minds of those in our own community, whose sole business it seems to be, to make whose career affords abundant evidence that they cannot tolerate toleration—who demand freedom of conscience, yet refuse to grant it—who execute persecution, yet persecute as far as their ability extends,—and who claim infallibility, at the same moment that they confess they have passed the greatest part of their lives in error.

The neglect and coldness with which they are treated by the public, attest to the truth of the political axiom,—'That Freedom is the only certain cure for the evils of Freedom.' The monstrous assumptions in this resolution are equally ridiculous, satanic and contemptible.

Selections

SEIZURE OF FUGITIVE SLAVES.

Extract from the Great Compromise Speech of the Arch-Compromiser HENRY CLAY, delivered in the U. S. Senate Feb. 5th:—

The next resolution, sir, is as follows:

7th. *Resolved*, That more effectual provision ought to be made by Congress, according to the requirement of the Constitution, for the restitution and delivery of persons bound to service or labor in any State, who may escape into any other State or Territory of this Union.

Well, Mr. President, upon this subject, I go with him who goes furthest in the interpretation of that clause in the Constitution which relates to this subject. In my humble opinion, it is a high requirement by the Constitution of the United States, which extends to every State in the Union. And I go one step further. It extends to every man in the Union, and devolves upon him the obligation to assist in the recovery of a fugitive slave from labor, who takes refuge in or escapes into one of the free States. And, sir, I maintain all this by a fair interpretation of the Constitution. The clause is as follows:

'No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.'

It will be observed, Mr. President, that this clause in the Constitution is not among the enumerated powers granted to Congress—where, if it had been placed, it might have been argued that Congress alone can legislate and carry it into effect—but it is one of the general powers, or one of the general rights secured by this Constitution or instrument, and it addresses itself to all who are bound by the Constitution of the United States. Now, sir, the officers of the general government are bound to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. All State officers are required by the Constitution to take an oath to support it, and all men who love their country, and are subjects of it, are bound to assist in the execution of these laws, whether fundamental or derivative. I do not say, sir, that a private individual is obliged to make a tour of his whole State, in order to assist the owner of a slave to recover his property; but I do say, if he is present when the owner of a slave is about to assert his rights, and regain possession of his property, that he, that every man present, whether an officer or agent of the State governments, or private individual, is bound to assist in the execution of the laws of their country. What is the provision? is that such fugitive shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due? I have already remarked, in the course of debate upon the bill which is now pending upon this subject, that the duties assigned to the State having jurisdiction. The fugitive from labor is to be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service is due. Well, sir, has it ever been contended by any person, that the obligation to surrender a fugitive which he has [illegible] is one of surrender? I take exceptions to the performance of this duty enjoined in the Constitution, but they have not denied the general right, and if they have refused in any instance to give up the person claimed, they have not pretended to question the legal ground, not at all as questioning the general right to have the fugitive surrendered on the application to deliver him up, as enjoined by the Constitution.

I think, Mr. President, that with regard to the object of the provision, there can be no doubt. It imposes an obligation upon the States, under particular circumstances, to assist in the recovery and surrender of fugitive slaves from their masters. There has been some confusion, and I think misconception, upon this subject, in consequence of a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I think that decision has been entirely misapprehended. There was a vast difference between imposing impediments, and affording facilities in the way of recovering the fugitive slave. The Supreme Court of the United States have not said that the laws of impediment are unconstitutional. I know, sir, there are some general expressions in the opinions to which I have referred—the case of Maryland and Pennsylvania—but I know that they mean otherwise: but I think that when you come to attentively read the whole opinions pronounced by the judges, and take the trouble that I have taken to connect with the judges themselves, you will find that the whole extent of the authority that they intended to adopt was that any law of impediment created by the States were laws forbidden by the provision of the Constitution to which I have referred, and that the general government had no right to impose obligations upon the State officers than were imposed by the authority of their own constitutional laws. Why, it is impossible! If the decision had been otherwise, it would have been tantamount to saying, that no right to decide whether the laws of facility were or were not unconstitutional. The only question before the court was whether the laws of impediment passed by the legislature of Pennsylvania. If they have gone beyond the case before them to decide upon a case not before them, the decision is what the lawyers call '*obiter dictum*,' and is not binding upon that court itself, or upon any other tribunal. I say it is utterly impossible for that court with the case before them had aso, they would have transcended their own authority, and gone beyond the case which was before them.

The laws passed by the States in order to assist the General Government, so far from being laws repugnant to the Constitution, are to be regarded as laws for carrying out, enforcing, and fulfilling the constitutional duties which are created by that instrument. Why, sir, it would be a strange doctrine that if Congress were to declare war,—and no one will doubt that the power to declare war is vested exclusively in Congress, and that the State has a right to do it,—no one will contend that after the declaration of war, it would be unconstitutional on the part of any State to lend its aid and assistance to the prosecution of that war. And yet it would be just as unconstitutional to lend their aid to a successful and glorious termination of that war in subjecting the enemy, as it would be to be unconstitutional for them to assist in the performance of a high duty, which presents itself to all the States, and to all the people in all the States. Why, Mr. President, I think that the whole class of legislation, beginning in the Northern States, and extending to some of the Western States, by which obstructions and impediments have been thrown in the way of the recovery of fugitive slaves, are unconstitutional, and have originated in a spirit which I trust will correct itself when these States come to consider calmly upon the nature of their duty. Of all the States in this Union, unless it be the State of Virginia, the State of which I am a citizen suffers most by the escape of slaves. I remember, sir, I have but little doubt that the loss of Kentucky, in consequence of the escape of her slaves, is greater, in proportion to the total number of slaves held in that Commonwealth, than it is in the State of Virginia; and I know too well, and so do the honorable Senators from Ohio know, that it is at the utmost hazard and insecurity of life itself, that a Kentuckian can cross the river, and go into the interior and seek the fugitive slave, according to the requirement of the Constitution, for the restitution and delivery of persons bound to service or labor in any State, who may escape into any other State or Territory of this Union.

Well, Mr. President, upon this subject, I go with him who goes furthest in the interpretation of that clause in the Constitution which relates to this subject. In my humble opinion, it is a high requirement by the Constitution of the United States, which extends to every State in the Union. And I go one step further. It extends to every man in the Union, and devolves upon him the obligation to assist in the recovery of a fugitive slave from labor, who takes refuge in or escapes into one of the free States. And, sir, I maintain all this by a fair interpretation of the Constitution. The clause is as follows:

'No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.'

It will be observed, Mr. President, that this clause in the Constitution is not among the enumerated powers granted to Congress—where, if it had been placed, it might have been argued that Congress alone can legislate and carry it into effect—but it is one of the general powers, or one of the general rights secured by this Constitution or instrument, and it addresses itself to all who are bound by the Constitution of the United States. Now, sir, the officers of the general government are bound to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. All State officers are required by the Constitution to take an oath to support it, and all men who love their country, and are subjects of it, are bound to assist in the execution of these laws, whether fundamental or derivative. I do not say, sir, that a private individual is obliged to make a tour of his whole State, in order to assist the owner of a slave to recover his property; but I do say, if he is present when the owner of a slave is about to assert his rights, and regain possession of his property, that he, that every man present, whether an officer or agent of the State governments, or private individual, is bound to assist in the execution of the laws of their country. What is the provision? is that such fugitive shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due? I have already remarked, in the course of debate upon the bill which is now pending upon this subject, that the duties assigned to the State having jurisdiction. The fugitive from labor is to be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service is due. Well, sir, has it ever been contended by any person, that the obligation to surrender a fugitive which he has [illegible] is one of surrender? I take exceptions to the performance of this duty enjoined in the Constitution, but they have not denied the general right, and if they have refused in any instance to give up the person claimed, they have not pretended to question the legal ground, not at all as questioning the general right to have the fugitive surrendered on the application to deliver him up, as enjoined by the Constitution.

I think, Mr. President, that with regard to the object of the provision, there can be no doubt. It imposes an obligation upon the States, under particular circumstances, to assist in the recovery and surrender of fugitive slaves from their masters. There has been some confusion, and I think misconception, upon this subject, in consequence of a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I think that decision has been entirely misapprehended. There was a vast difference between imposing impediments, and affording facilities in the way of recovering the fugitive slave. The Supreme Court of the United States have not said that the laws of impediment are unconstitutional. I know, sir, there are some general expressions in the opinions to which I have referred—the case of Maryland and Pennsylvania—but I know that they mean otherwise: but I think that when you come to attentively read the whole opinions pronounced by the judges, and take the trouble that I have taken to connect with the judges themselves, you will find that the whole extent of the authority that they intended to adopt was that any law of impediment created by the States were laws forbidden by the provision of the Constitution to which I have referred, and that the general government had no right to impose obligations upon the State officers than were imposed by the authority of their own constitutional laws. Why, it is impossible! If the decision had been otherwise, it would have been tantamount to saying, that no right to decide whether the laws of facility were or were not unconstitutional. The only question before the court was whether the laws of impediment passed by the legislature of Pennsylvania. If they have gone beyond the case before them to decide upon a case not before them, the decision is what the lawyers call '*obiter dictum*,' and is not binding upon that court itself, or upon any other tribunal. I say it is utterly impossible for that court with the case before them had aso, they would have transcended their own authority, and gone beyond the case which was before them.

The laws passed by the States in order to assist the General Government, so far from being laws repugnant to the Constitution, are to be regarded as laws for carrying out, enforcing, and fulfilling the constitutional duties which are created by that instrument. Why, sir, it would be a strange doctrine that if Congress were to declare war,—and no one will doubt that the power to declare war is vested exclusively in Congress, and that the State has a right to do it,—no one will contend that after the declaration of war, it would be unconstitutional on the part of any State to lend its aid and assistance to the successful prosecution of that war. And yet it would be just as unconstitutional to lend their aid to a successful and glorious termination of that war in subjecting the enemy, as it would be to be unconstitutional for them to assist in the performance of a high duty, which presents itself to all the States, and to all the people in all the States. Why, Mr. President, I think that the whole class of legislation, beginning in the Northern States, and extending to some of the Western States, by which obstructions and impediments have been thrown in the way of the recovery of fugitive slaves, are unconstitutional, and have originated in a spirit which I trust will correct itself when these States come to consider calmly upon the nature of their duty. Of all the States in this Union, unless it be the State of Virginia, the State of which I am a citizen suffers most by the escape of slaves. I remember, sir, I have but little doubt that the loss of Kentucky, in consequence of the escape of her slaves, is greater, in proportion to the total number of slaves held in that Commonwealth, than it is in the State of Virginia; and I know too well, and so do the honorable Senators from Ohio know, that it is at the utmost hazard and insecurity of life itself, that a Kentuckian can cross the river, and go into the interior and seek the fugitive slave, according to the requirement of the Constitution, for the restitution and delivery of persons bound to service or labor in any State, who may escape into any other State or Territory of this Union.

Well, Mr. President, upon this subject, I go with him who goes furthest in the interpretation of that clause in the Constitution which relates to this subject. In my humble opinion, it is a high requirement by the Constitution of the United States, which extends to every State in the Union. And I go one step further. It extends to every man in the Union, and devolves upon him the obligation to assist in the recovery of a fugitive slave from labor, who takes refuge in or escapes into one of the free States. And, sir, I maintain all this by a fair interpretation of the Constitution. The clause is as follows:

'No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.'

It will be observed, Mr. President, that this clause in the Constitution is not among the enumerated powers granted to Congress—where, if it had been placed, it might have been argued that Congress alone can legislate and carry it into effect—but it is one of the general powers, or one of the general rights secured by this Constitution or instrument, and it addresses itself to all who are bound by the Constitution of the United States. Now, sir, the officers of the general government are bound to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. All State officers are required by the Constitution to take an oath to support it, and all men who love their country, and are subjects of it, are bound to assist in the execution of these laws, whether fundamental or derivative. I do not say, sir, that a private individual is obliged to make a tour of his whole State, in order to assist the owner of a slave to recover his property; but I do say, if he is present when the owner of a slave is about to assert his rights, and regain possession of his property, that he, that every man present, whether an officer or agent of the State governments, or private individual, is bound to assist in the execution of the laws of their country. What is the provision? is that such fugitive shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due? I have already remarked, in the course of debate upon the bill which is now pending upon this subject, that the duties assigned to the State having jurisdiction. The fugitive from labor is to be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service is due. Well, sir, has it ever been contended by any person, that the obligation to surrender a fugitive which he has [illegible] is one of surrender? I take exceptions to the performance of this duty enjoined in the Constitution, but they have not denied the general right, and if they have refused in any instance to give up the person claimed, they have not pretended to question the legal ground, not at all as questioning the general right to have the fugitive surrendered on the application to deliver him up, as enjoined by the Constitution.

I think, Mr. President, that with regard to the object of the provision, there can be no doubt. It imposes an obligation upon the States, under particular circumstances, to assist in the recovery and surrender of fugitive slaves from their masters. There has been some confusion, and I think misconception, upon this subject, in consequence of a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I think that decision has been entirely misapprehended. There was a vast difference between imposing impediments, and affording facilities in the way of recovering the fugitive slave. The Supreme Court of the United States have not said that the laws of impediment are unconstitutional. I know, sir, there are some general expressions in the opinions to which I have referred—the case of Maryland and Pennsylvania—but I know that they mean otherwise: but I think that when you come to attentively read the whole opinions pronounced by the judges, and take the trouble that I have taken to connect with the judges themselves, you will find that the whole extent of the authority that they intended to adopt was that any law of impediment created by the States were laws forbidden by the provision of the Constitution to which I have referred, and that the general government had no right to impose obligations upon the State officers than were imposed by the authority of their own constitutional laws. Why, it is impossible! If the decision had been otherwise, it would have been tantamount to saying, that no right to decide whether the laws of facility were or were not unconstitutional. The only question before the court was whether the laws of impediment passed by the legislature of Pennsylvania. If they have gone beyond the case before them to decide upon a case not before them, the decision is what the lawyers call '*obiter dictum*,' and is not binding upon that court itself, or upon any other tribunal. I say it is utterly impossible for that court with the case before them had aso, they would have transcended their own authority, and gone beyond the case which was before them.

The laws passed by the States in order to assist the General Government, so far from being laws repugnant to the Constitution, are to be regarded as laws for carrying out, enforcing, and fulfilling the constitutional duties which are created by that instrument. Why, sir, it would be a strange doctrine that if Congress were to declare war,—and no one will doubt that the power to declare war is vested exclusively in Congress, and that the State has a right to do it,—no one will contend that after the declaration of war, it would be unconstitutional on the part of any State to lend its aid and assistance to the successful prosecution of that war. And yet it would be just as unconstitutional to lend their aid to a successful and glorious termination of that war in subjecting the enemy, as it would be to be unconstitutional for them to assist in the performance of a high duty, which presents itself to all the States, and to all the people in all the States. Why, Mr. President, I think that the whole class of legislation, beginning in the Northern States, and extending to some of the Western States, by which obstructions and impediments have been thrown in the way of the recovery of fugitive slaves, are unconstitutional, and have originated in a spirit which I trust will correct itself when these States come to consider calmly upon the nature of their duty. Of

BOSTON, MASS. FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1850.

PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS.

DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 7.—IN SENATE.

Mr. Hale, of New Hampshire, presented a memorial against the admission of new States into the Union with the institution of slavery, and for a peaceable dissolution of the Union.

Objection being made to its reception, he asked the yeas and nays on the motion to lay the question of reception on the table, which were ordered, and resulted—yeas 25, nays 21.

The question being put upon the reception of the memorial, Mr. Mangum voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Hale demanded the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

Mr. Underwood said he had always been opposed to the famous 21st rule, and was in favor of receiving all petitions which requested the action of Congress, and which were not positively impossible for Congress to take cognizance of, and all that raised even debatable questions. This memorial, however, asked Congress to do that which, he could not but trust that she will not do—and was treasonable in its character. He must, therefore, vote against its reception.

February 8.

The Chair stated the first business in order before the Senate was the question of the reception of the memorial of the Senator from New Hampshire, praying for a peaceful dissolution of the Union.

Mr. Douglass gave the reasons why he should vote against the reception of the memorial. He was opposed to all petitions, excepting those coming from the Legislatures of States, which agitated the slavery question, should be rejected, whether they came from the North or South.

Mr. Sturgeon said he had examined the petition, and pronounced it spurious. It was the act of some blackhearted abolitionist, who had taken this course for the purpose of disgracing the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Hale.—Has the Clerk read the letter in which the petition was enclosed to him, showing that it was *bona fide*?

Mr. Dawson read a lecture to Mr. Hale, for presenting a petition asking so treasonable an act by Congress as the dissolution of the Union. He was culpable in thus allowing himself to be made the instrument of wicked, designing men.

Mr. Hale said that the forcible dissolution of the Union had been threatened here time after time, and no objection had been made. He objected to the pouring out of indignation upon his head because he had presented a memorial from non-resistants, who asked to have the same thing done without force.

Mr. DAVIS, of Massachusetts. Is the question of reception before the Senate?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. That is the question.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have for some years practised but one course with respect to the reception of petitions. I have believed that those petitions sent here in relation to slavery, and the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and with in the Territories of the United States, were introduced to this body because Congress had power to act upon those subjects. I have believed that Congress had power and authority by the Constitution to act upon those subjects, I believed it to be our duty to receive those petitions, and to discuss the subject in the thought right and proper. The privilege of petitioning, sir, of offering simply an humble prayer to Congress, is a very high privilege, in any point of view in which you choose to regard it. But, sir, there are some matters that are too plain to be mistaken. They are too obvious to require any Constitutional consideration. And I say among them is the question which is now presented for our consideration. I think there can be but one opinion in the Senate, but one mind among the Senators here, in regard to the power and authority of Congress, under the Constitution, to dissolve the Union, or to adopt any measures for that purpose. We have no such power, sir; they possess no such authority. The petition, therefore, is not presented to a body that has any right to act upon that subject. That matter, sir, I hold to be entirely clear, and I trust that we may be spared further than this. When we come into this chamber, the first duty which the Constitution requires of us is to go to our seats and to swear before Almighty God that we will support this Constitution. That is the first act which a Senator is bound to perform, the first duty which it is imposed upon him by that instrument; and he can never become a member of this body until he performs that act. Now, sir, what are we called upon to do? To support the instrument which we have sworn to support? No, sir; no, sir. We are called upon to destroy it. I am not prepared for a step of that description. I want, therefore, no time to consider a petition of that description. I want no opportunity to deliberate upon it. I am ready to act now, sir.

Mr. POOTE. I rise simply for the purpose of expressing my cordial approbation of the patriotic sentiments expressed by the senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. DAVIS.] He deserves the more credit, permit me to say, for the avowal of these sentiments, in consideration of the fact that within the last ten days, a large conventional assemblage of the citizens of different parts of Massachusetts met in the place in old Faneuil Hall itself, at which, after three or four days' deliberation and discussion, a solemn resolution was adopted, *providing for a dissolution of the Union*, and declaring that they did not concur with them in opinion. It is rather an amusing matter of fact, if I may mention so light a matter in connection with graver subjects, that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HALE] was most woefully castigated by various speakers who attended the same convention. Bitter harangues were delivered against him, in consequence of his not going far enough, as they charged, in support of the cause of abolition. It seems to have been understood by those who thus assembled in Faneuil Hall, as not altogether sitting upon the subject of slavery as he might be, not being committed by themselves to a dissolution of the here acknowledged Union, except upon the guarantee of the Constitution on the subject of slavery, so far as they give protection to this institution within the limits of the slave States. I think the recent action of Congress at present to have somewhat altered his attitude in regard to this matter lately; he is now willing to represent the wishes and opinions of those who go farthest in the crusade against the South, and is even now willing to become the organ of those whose acknowledged design it is to destroy the Union itself, in order to attain their full purpose in regard to slavery. Neither Garrison, nor Phillips, nor Frederick Douglass, could find fault with the course of the senator from New Hampshire to-day. Well, sir, I am not very profoundly surprised at this change in the course of the honorable senator from New Hampshire. He was so mercilessly castigated by those who assembled in the memorable convention in Faneuil Hall, that he might well apprehend some falling off in his cherished popularity in that particular section of the Union, if he did not now promptly announce his acquiescence in the teachings of those Solomons who have undertaken to counsel the descendants of the Revolutionary sires in this hour of crisis. I have heretofore observed the fact, and have remarked upon it here, that the honorable senator from New Hampshire never is demonstrative in his sympathies with the abolitionists of the North without becoming immediately more furious himself than he had been before.

Mr. HALE, (interposing.) I know that the honorable senator intends to be just always; severe he cannot help being. I appeal to his justice, whether it is fair to ascribe such motives to me, when the journal shows that a year ago eight petitions, of precisely the same character, were presented by me in this very chamber.

Mr. POOTE. Well, Sir, it may be that the honorable Senator may not have undergone so serious a change in his opinions upon this subject as I had supposed. It may be that he was not so far gone as he now seems to be. It may be that formerly, as now, he was willing to become the agent of unprincipled factionists, who have designed the destruction of the Union, but failed to accomplish the ruin of the South. But certain it is, that gentlemen and compers did not recognize him as thus disposed in times past, and devoted to the furtherance of their views, as he has now shown himself to be. Had they so understood the matter, they would doubtless have commended his services accordingly. It is certain, I understand the Senator now, if we never did before. We now understand him as being the willing agent of those who desire the dissolution of the Union, and willing to support, and declare it to be their unalterable resolution to do whatever in their power to abolish slavery. Sir, these processes, whose agents the Senator from Massachusetts now is, are quite numerous in New England; they have become quite an influential body of men; they are enabled to control many Representatives in the Northern slave electorate. The honorable gentleman is an sapping and mining agent of the abolitionists, who have designed the destruction of the Union, and who hope to accomplish the ruin of the South. But certain it is, that gentlemen and compers did not recognize him as thus disposed in times past, and devoted to the furtherance of their views, as he has now shown himself to be. Had they so understood the matter, they would doubtless have commended his services accordingly. It is certain

other day, to which I have already alluded, that this question of slavery was one ridden by political agitators in New England as a mere stalking-horse, and hobby. I fear that Garrison and his allies will hardly confine him so fully now as they might have done if he had not thus *let the first out of the bag*, and indulged in this precious confession before the whole country. But that I confide so profoundly with the honorable Senator from New Hampshire on account of the compulsion to which he is from time to time subjected, and the necessity imposed upon him of doing things here which I know he does not entirely agreeable to his own taste, in order to keep up his popularity and influence at home—that is to say, among the fictionists, which I regret to say, in my body he unfortunately is—I should be induced to apply to him and his conduct on the present occasion the harshest language and crimination. I should be even induced to go further, and to impute upon him the severest penalties to which a member of this body can be subjected. One thing is certain: it was only a few years ago that John Quincy Adams himself was very nearly being expelled from the House of Representatives for undertaking to present to that body such a petition as that now presented before us. Expelled he would certainly have been, but for the merciful postponement of action upon the motion for expulsion, which was accorded to his great and former services, and the unenviable condition of semi-satisfactory apologies in one form or another.

I repeat that, but for the commiseration which I feel for the honorable Senator from New Hampshire, constrained as he evidently considers himself to be, to play the wretched part which he is now playing in the representative and agent of fictionists and traitors, I should be not only induced to censure him harshly, but I should even be in favor of enforcing against him the heaviest penalties for flagrant misconduct. Perhaps I might even be willing to submit such a motion for expulsion myself. As it is, I will not do it. I am willing to let the Senator from New-Hampshire do pretty much as he pleases in relation to this whole subject of slavery. I believe him to be really quite innocuous at this time; I feel certain that his voice here, if it ever had any potentility, has lost it all, and that were he to talk here forever in favor of the abolition of slavery, he would not be able to alter the opinion, or modify the action, of a single intelligent human being, either in this body or out of it. I shall offer no motion for expulsion, and I feel half inclined even to take back my former threat of *hanging him*. Yes, sir, I will take it back; and I do accordingly declare that I have not the least idea of ever hanging the honorable gentleman, whatever offenses he may in the future may be. I hope that this formal declaration may be effectual to dispel all apprehensions heretofore entertained on his part.

MR. HALE. I assure the honorable Senator that I am ready to abide the decision of the Senate, whenever he sees fit to proceed with his resolution of expulsion.

MR. FOOTE. I have not threatened it at all.

MR. HALE. No, sir; but the Senator feels bound to do it, and I know that he always comes up to the mark, and does whatever he believes it his duty to do.

MR. FOOTE. *De minimis, non curat lex.*

MR. HALE. That means, I presume, the law does not take care of 'niggers.' [Laughter.]

I have only to say, sir, a word in reply to the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. Foote.] He says that I have let the cat out of the bag, I think, sir, he has done the same thing. He thinks that my remarks this morning resulted from the castigation I had received in the newspapers; and I suppose that we may therefore henceforth understand that the very furious speeches which we sometimes get from him are all owing to the castigations which he occasionally received. Well, sir, if it be so, I appeal to all the newspaper editors and all the letter-writers in the country—I appeal to them in the name of the Senate, of the audience, and of humanity, do not castigate the Senator from Mississippi; for, in so doing, you punish the Senate. [Great laughter and applause, which was immediately suppressed by the Chair.]

Mr. Davis of Mississippi opposed the reception of the memorial.

Mr. Seward gave notice of an amendment, directing the reference of the memorial to the Judiciary Committee, with instructions to report that they have no power and no disposition to consider the measure. He stated that he agreed with the opinion expressed by John Quincy Adams, that for the vindication of the right of petition, all petitions ought to be received; but it was incumbent upon the Senate to show that it possesses no power to consider petition, as he always had such propositions. He had no fear of such dissolution. Congress had no power to take measures to effect dissolution. For one, he cannot would propose it, and he had made it a principle of conference to madmen, to have no controversy with them. [Laughter.]

After some further conversation, the further consideration of the subject was postponed till to-morrow.

February 11.

A debate sprung up in the Senate to-day on the right of petition, on the petition of Thaddeus Pomeroy, presented by Mr. Hale, for the dissolution of the Union.

Mr. Chase of Ohio contended for the right without abridgement, and for a uniform rule on the subject.

Mr. Dayton of New Jersey acknowledged the right to its fullest extent, but said that no citizen had a right to petition the government to destroy itself. The petition was made disrespectful, and asked them to commit perjury. They had sworn to support the Constitution.

Mr. Cass said he discovered no disposition to push matters to extremities. The people had no other modes of redress—he hinted at the power of the purse and petitions. He demanded that the petitions for the dissolution of the Union should go to an insane hospital, [Laughter,] he said, meant war.

Mr. Webster, of Massachusetts, said—

Mr. President, I am much obliged to the member from Michigan, for the clearness and force with which he has expressed opinions, in which, in the main, I entirely concur, especially in what he says of that existing delusion which I find spread over the country, that there can be any thing so easy and a thing as a peaceable breaking up of this Union.

I am quite sorry that my friend from New Hampshire has presented any such petition as this, and I shall be quite surprised if there be any voice in the Senate for receiving it. It would be on our part an assumption of power it would look as if by possibility we could do something to the effect set up by the petition, which this, I will say, presumptuous petition, from whatever source it comes, calls upon us to do.

I think the substance of the petition is such that, to be appropriate, it should have had a preamble in these words:

'Gentlemen members of Congress, whereas, at the commencement of this session, you and each of you took your solemn oaths, in the presence of God and your fellow-legislators, that you would support the Constitution of the United States of America, therefore we pray you to take immediate steps to break up the Union, and overthrow the Constitution of the United States as soon as you can. And as in duty bound, we will ever pray.'

Mr. Cass—That's first rate.

Mr. Butler observed that it was a petition for the right of suicide.

Mr. Cooper opposed all agitation upon the subject.

Mr. Clemens threw all the responsibility on the North. Others also denounced the petition.

Mr. Seward said he would receive the petition, and then condemn it, and thus prevent the presentation of others.

The vote was then taken, and there were 3 for the reception, and 50 against it. The yeas were Messrs. Chase, Hale, and Seward.

On Tuesday a memorial praying for the exclusion of Slavery from the Territories, from 1400 women in New Hampshire, offered by Mr. Hale, being under consideration, Mr. Butler said:

I have some some petitions to offer which require immediate action; for I do not acted upon now, or at very early period, that such will be my answer in purpose. And yet every morning the gentleman representing a minority monopolizes the whole time of the Senate, by resolutions such as this, producing nothing but mischief, without rebuke, and I would almost seem with the countenance of those who vote for his resolutions. Can this be tolerated? that the ribs of the Senate, the Legislature of the United States, should be appropriated by mischievous incendiaries, who claim the right of introducing petitions, resolutions, memorials, and propositions of this kind, to the Senate? Sir, I propose to secede from the Union. War! Dissolution! Sir, I have already alluded, that this question of slavery was one ridden by political agitators in New England as a mere stalking-horse hobby. I fear that Garrison and his allies will hardly confine him so fully now as they might have done if he had not thus *let the first out of the bag*, and indulged in this precious confession before the whole country. But that I confide so profoundly with the honorable Senator from New Hampshire on account of the compulsion to which he is from time to time subjected, and the necessity imposed upon him of doing things here which I know he does not entirely agreeable to his own taste, in order to keep up his popularity and influence at home—that is to say, among the fictionists, which I regret to say in my body he unfortunately is—I should be induced to apply to him and his conduct on the present occasion the harshest language and crimination. I should be even induced to go further, and to impute upon him the severest penalties to which a member of this body can be subjected. One thing is certain: it was only a few years ago that John Quincy Adams himself was very nearly being expelled from the House of Representatives for undertaking to present to that body such a petition as that now presented before us. Expelled he would certainly have been, but for the merciful postponement of action upon the motion for expulsion, which was accorded to his great and former services, and the unenviable condition of semi-satisfactory apologies in one form or another.

I repeat that, but for the commiseration which I feel for the honorable Senator from New Hampshire, constrained as he evidently considers himself to be, to play the wretched part which he is now playing in the representative and agent of fictionists and traitors, I should be not only induced to censure him harshly, but I should even be in favor of enforcing against him the heaviest penalties for flagrant misconduct. Perhaps I might even be willing to submit such a motion for expulsion myself. As it is, I will not do it. I am willing to let the Senator from New-Hampshire do pretty much as he pleases in relation to this whole subject of slavery. I believe him to be really quite innocuous at this time; I feel certain that his voice here, if it ever had any potentility, has lost it all, and that were he to talk here forever in favor of the abolition of slavery, he would not be able to alter the opinion, or modify the action, of a single intelligent human being, either in this body or out of it. I shall offer no motion for expulsion, and I feel half inclined even to take back my former threat of *hanging him*. Yes, sir, I will take it back; and I do accordingly declare that I have not the least idea of ever hanging the honorable gentleman, whatever offenses he may in the future may be. I hope that this formal declaration may be effectual to dispel all apprehensions heretofore entertained on his part.

MR. HALE. I assure the honorable Senator that I am ready to abide the decision of the Senate, whenever he sees fit to proceed with his resolution of expulsion.

MR. FOOTE. I have not threatened it at all.

MR. HALE. No, sir; but the Senator feels bound to do it, and I know that he always comes up to the mark, and does whatever he believes it his duty to do.

MR. FOOTE. *De minimis, non curat lex.*

MR. HALE. That means, I presume, the law does not take care of 'niggers.' [Laughter.]

I have only to say, sir, a word in reply to the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. Foote.] He says that I have let the cat out of the bag, I think, sir, he has done the same thing. He thinks that my remarks this morning resulted from the castigation I had received in the newspapers; and I suppose that we may therefore henceforth understand that the very furious speeches which we sometimes get from him are all owing to the castigations which he occasionally received. Well, sir, if it be so, I appeal to all the newspaper editors and all the letter-writers in the country—I appeal to them in the name of the Senate, of the audience, and of humanity, do not castigate the Senator from Mississippi; for, in so doing, you punish the Senate. [Great laughter and applause, which was immediately suppressed by the Chair.]

Mr. Davis of Mississippi opposed the reception of the memorial.

Mr. Seward gave notice of an amendment, directing the reference of the memorial to the Judiciary Committee, with instructions to report that they have no power and no disposition to consider the measure. He stated that he agreed with the opinion expressed by John Quincy Adams, that for the vindication of the right of petition, all petitions ought to be received; but it was incumbent upon the Senate to show that it possesses no power to consider petition, as he always had such propositions. He had no fear of such dissolution. Congress had no power to take measures to effect dissolution. For one, he cannot would propose it, and he had made it a principle of conference to madmen, to have no controversy with them. [Laughter.]

After some further conversation, the further consideration of the subject was postponed till to-morrow.

February 11.

A debate sprung up in the Senate to-day on the right of petition, on the petition of Thaddeus Pomeroy, presented by Mr. Hale, for the dissolution of the Union.

Mr. Chase of Ohio contended for the right without abridgement, and for a uniform rule on the subject.

Mr. Dayton of New Jersey acknowledged the right to its fullest extent, but said that no citizen had a right to petition the government to destroy itself. The petition was made disrespectful, and asked them to commit perjury. They had sworn to support the Constitution.

Mr. Cass said he discovered no disposition to push matters to extremities. The people had no other modes of redress—he hinted at the power of the purse and petitions. He demanded that the petitions for the dissolution of the Union should go to an insane hospital, [Laughter,] he said, meant war.

Mr. Webster, of Massachusetts, said—

Mr. President, I am much obliged to the member from Michigan, for the clearness and force with which he has expressed opinions, in which, in the main, I entirely concur, especially in what he says of that existing delusion which I find spread over the country, that there can be any thing so easy and a thing as a peaceable breaking up of this Union.

I am quite sorry that my friend from New Hampshire has presented any such petition as this, and I shall be quite surprised if there be any voice in the Senate for receiving it. It would be on our part an assumption of power it would look as if by possibility we could do something to the effect set up with the tendency which this, I will say, presumptuous petition, from whatever source it comes, calls upon us to do.

I think the substance of the petition is such that, to be appropriate, it should have had a preamble in these words:

'Gentlemen members of Congress, whereas, at the commencement of this session, you and each of you took your solemn oaths, in the presence of God and your fellow-legislators, that you would support the Constitution of the United States of America, therefore we pray you to take immediate steps to break up the Union, and overthrow the Constitution of the United States as soon as you can. And as in duty bound, we will ever pray.'

Mr. Cass—That's first rate.

Mr. Butler observed that it was a petition for the right of suicide.

Mr. Cooper opposed all agitation upon the subject.

Mr. Clemens threw all the responsibility on the North. Others also denounced the petition.

Mr. Seward said he would receive the petition, and then condemn it, and thus prevent the presentation of others.

The vote was then taken, and there were 3 for the reception, and 50 against it. The yeas were Messrs. Chase, Hale, and Seward.

On Tuesday a memorial praying for the exclusion of Slavery from the Territories, from 1400 women in New Hampshire, offered by Mr. Hale, being under consideration, Mr. Butler said:

I have some some petitions to offer which require immediate action; for I do not acted upon now, or at very early period, that such will be my answer in purpose. And yet every morning the gentleman representing a minority monopolizes the whole time of the Senate, by resolutions such as this, producing nothing but mischief, without rebuke, and I would almost seem with the countenance of those who vote for his resolutions. Can this be tolerated? that the ribs of the Senate, the Legislature of the United States, should be appropriated by mischievous incendiaries, who claim the right of introducing petitions, resolutions, memorials, and propositions of this kind, to the Senate? Sir, I propose to secede from the Union. War! legislation, and yet every morning that gentleman takes up the whole time of the Senate by propositions of this kind. He has the whole time to himself. A mere minority comes here and produces all this mischief, and stands unrebuked, as far as I can see, by the Senate. I know, sir, it is a part of his existence; I am but giving him food upon which he can feed. He lives, sir, upon mischief; it is the very food which sustains him, and I know that I am not rebuking him. Sir, it is intolerable that a miserable minority, a dangerous incendiary, a madman, if you choose, should come here and trample on with the right of others. (Loud cries of 'Order, order.')

Mr. Hale. I have but a word to say, sir. The Senator from Mississippi has made special agent in this mischief, and that he furnishes me the food upon which I live. If that be the case, it is clear that no I, but he, has been denounced, and as a miserable minority, and charges me with trespassing upon the privileges of the Senate. I leave the question to be decided by others who it is that trespass upon the privileges of the Senate. But, sir, he will have to talk louder, and threaten more, and denounce more, before he can shut my mouth here. I have taken up the whole time of the Senate! I have taken two mornings only in presenting petitions since 1850 commenced—the other day and this morning; and as for the time occupied in the Senate, as I have just been charged with doing, I have confined myself simply to stating what the nature of the petition was. I think it does not become from this miserable minority? It comes from the majority, to whom I will not apply adjectives, though I have enough of them, but I will say, that I could apply if I chose.

The mischief, sir, comes from the majority, that wants to tread down this minority, and make them more miserable than they really are. Miserable as they are, I think the Senate ought to be fortunate that as will find out that our powers of speech are not exhausted; and, whilst we can exercise it within the provision of the Constitution, we will be heard from any and all hazards. We are not to be frightened, sir, out of our rights; we are not to be frightened by denunciations; we are not to be frightened even by threats of dangers personally to ourselves. Small and few as we are, we are not the miserable cowards that can be driven from the assertion and the maintenance of our rights. Sir, New Hampshire blood does not course through coward veins. She has tested, from the first moment of her existence, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and on the field of battle, her rights; and, sir, she has sons that will vindicate those rights against foes, let them come where they may. We are not to be frightened, and they will; she will not be intimidated by any language of this sort.

Mr. Mangum. I move that the further consideration of this subject be postponed until to-morrow, and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the special order of the day.

FOOTE AND CLAY.

In the Senate of the United States—a few days since—

Mr. Foote interposing, enquired whether the Senator, coming, as he did, from a slaveholding State, felt himself authorized to vote for the admission of California as she now presents herself?

Mr. Clay replied with much warmth, that it was not the first time that he had been reminded that he represented a slaveholding constituency. He, [he said,] I tell the gentleman that I know whence I came—I know my duty, also, and am ready to meet any responsibility which my country may impose. [Applause.] But I know, sir, the disposition of the South, and neglect of, and treason to, her interest. For one, he know no allegiance to the South, as a section, owed allegiance to no sovereignties; one the sovereignty of the Union, and the other the sovereignty of the State of Kentucky. To all these sovereignties he owed allegiance, and to their interests he felt himself pledged; but if gentlemen supposed that he acknowledged any allegiance to a Southern Confederation now, or in the prospective, they should find that he utterly repudiated such allegiance—he would not live under such a confederation. (Applause.) His duty to the Union, and to his State, he was prepared to do at all times, and having performed that to the best of his ability, according to the light that was given him, he was prepared to meet all the responsibilities which attached to his acts. He would say further, he received last night resolutions passed by the legislature of Kentucky, and he was prepared without a word of remonstrance that body, in the whole series of propositions which he had submitted to the Senate. The resolutions had been passed without a word of intimation on his behalf—for he had not written a single that gentleman would, in the commission of this act, place himself themselves within the limits of Senatorial decorum, and of Senatorial courtesy. For one, if the contrary practice was to be continued, and offensive personalities were to be indulged in, he did not and could not know how far he might be able to trust himself, in vindication from the personalities of any man, no matter who he might be. But he had risen to vindicate himself from the charge of inconsistency, and desired now to say that he had designed, in the event of the Senate's acting affirmatively upon his resolution to propose a separation or classification of the various subjects embraced, for the purpose of giving each its appropriate and separate reference.

DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

Henry Clay concludes his late Compromise Speech in the U. S. Senate by giving his views of the consequences of a Dissolution of the Union—as follows:—

We are told now, and it is rung throughout this entire country, that the Union is threatened with subversion and destruction. Well, sir, the festoon-ion which naturally arises is, supposing the Union to be dissolved—having all the causes of grievance which are enumerated of—how far will a dissolution furnish a remedy for those grievances? If the Union is to be dissolved for any existing causes, it will be dissolved because we have intended that it should cease to be introduced into the ceded Territories; because slavery is threatened to be abolished in the District of Columbia; because fugitives are not returned, as in my opinion they ought to be restored to their masters. These I believe will be the causes, if there be any causes, which can lead to the direful event to which I have referred.

Well, now, sir, let us suppose that the Union has been dissolved. What remedy does it furnish for the grievous complaints of the aggrieved portions? Will you be able to push slavery into the ceded Territories? How are you to do it, supposing the North, all the States north of the Potomac, and which are opposed to it—in possession of the navy and army of the United States? Can you expect, if there be a dissolution of the Union, that you can carry slavery into California and New Mexico? You cannot dream of such a purpose. If it were abolished in the District of Columbia, if the Union was dissolved, would the dissolution of the Union restore slavery in the District of Columbia? Are you safer in the recovery of your fugitive slaves in a state of dissolution, of severance of the Union, than you are in the Union itself? Why, sir, what is the state of the fact in the Union? You lose some slaves. You recover some others. Let me state the fact which has been already introduced before, because it is highly credit-ble to the courts and juries of the free States. In every case, so far as my information extends, where an appeal has been made to the courts of justice for the recovery of fugitives, or for the recovery of penalties inflicted upon persons who have assisted in decoying slaves from their masters, by aiding them in escaping from their masters—as far as I am informed, the courts have asserted the rights of the owner, and the juries have promptly and unanimously quite verdicts in favor of the owner. Well, sir, this is some remedy. What would you have if the States were dissolved? Would the fugitives from other parts would be independent of each other—foreign countries. Slaves taken from the one into the other would be then like slaves now escaping from the United States into Canada. There would be no right of extradition—no right to demand your slaves—no right to appeal to the courts of justice to demand your slaves which escape, or to take them by force of arms. *Where one escapes now, by running away from his owner, hundreds and thousands would escape if the Union were severed*; and I ask you, let me where you how you run the line, if independent sovereignties were established.

Well, sir, finally, will you in a state of dissolution of the Union, be safer with your slaves within the bosom of the State than you are now? Mr. President, that they will escape much more frequently from the border States, no one will doubt.

But, sir, I must take the occasion to say that, in my opinion, there is no right on the part of one or more of the States to secede from the Union. War and the dissolution of the Union are identical and synonymous. The Union is a mutual compact, the Union, except by consent or by war. No one can expect, in the existing state of things, that that consent would be given, and we are left to speculate upon what would be accomplished. And, Mr. President, if consent were given—if possibly we were to separate by mutual agreement and by a given time, in less than sixty days after such an agreement had been executed, war would break out between the free and slaveholding portions of this Union—a war unexampled in its destructive features into which it would be erected in virtue of the act of separation. Yes, sir, sixty days—in less than sixty days, the Mississippi would be dyed with blood, and the flowing over in numbers to the other side of the river, would be pursued by their owners, and the excitable and ardent spirits would engage in the pursuit, would be restrained by no sense of the rights which appertain to the independence of the other side of the river, supposing it, then, to be the line of separation. Every man who has property in slaves; they would be repelled, and war would break out. In less than sixty days, war would be blazing forth in every part of this land, and peaceable land.

But how are you going to separate them? In my humble opinion, Mr. President, we should begin at the commencement of the separation between the North, the confederacy of the Atlantic southern States, (the slaveholding States,) and the confederacy of the States of the Mississippi valley. If we begin it, and that vast population that has already concentrated, and will concentrate, upon the head waters and tributaries of the Mississippi, will be disposed, that the mouth of that river will be held subject to the power of any foreign State whatever. Such I believe would be the consequence of a dissolution of the Union. But other consequences would spring from time to time, as sedition and discontent were disseminated over the country. There would be the confederacy of the Mississippi, the confederacy of New-England and of the middle States.

But, sir, the veil which covers these and and disastrous events that lie beyond a possible rupture of this Union is too thick to be penetrated or lifted by any mortal eye or hand.

Mr. President, I am directly opposed to say purpose, of secession or separation. I am for staying within the Union, and defying any portion of this Union to expel me or drive me out of the Union. I am for staying within the Union, and fighting for my rights—if necessary, with the sword—within the bounds and under the safeguard of the Union. I am for vindicating those rights, but not by being driven out of the Union rashly and unceremoniously by any portion of this confederacy. Here I am within it, and here I mean to stand and die; as far as my individual power and influence go, I am within it to protect myself, and to defy all power upon earth to expel me or drive me from the situation in which I am placed. Will there be more safety in fighting within the Union than without it?

Suppose your rights to be violated; suppose wrongs to be done you, aggressions to be committed upon you; cannot you better fight and vindicate them, if you have occasion to resort to that last necessity of the sword, within the Union, with the sympathies of a large portion of the population of the Union of these States differently constituted from you, than you can fight and vindicate your rights, expelled from the Union, and driven from it without ceremony and without authority?

I said that I thought that there was no right on the part of one or more of the States to secede from this Union. I think, sir, that the Constitution of the thirteen States was made, not merely for the generation then existing, but for posterity. Posterity, unlimited—their posterity, and for every subsequent State which might come into the Union, binding themselves by that indissoluble bond. It is to remain for that posterity now and forever. Like another of the great relations of private life, it was a marriage that no human authority can dissolve or divorce the parties of the first part, and I do not refer to this same example in private life, let us say what man and wife say to each other, We have mutual faults; nothing in the Union is perfect, and we are perfect. I, for one, then be kind to each other, forbearing, conceding; let us live in happiness and peace.

Mr. President, I repeat that I solemnly believe—that the dissolution of the Union and war are identical and inseparable; that they are convertible terms.

Such a war, too, as that would be, following the dissolution of the Union! Sir, we may search the pages of history, and none so furious, so bloody, so destructive of the resources of the country, would come down, including those of the Commonwealth of England, and the revolution of France—none, none of them approach the character of a war that was ever conducted, if that event ever happens—of dissolution.

And what would be its termination? Standing armies and navies to an extent drawing the revenues of the country, and consuming them, would be created; exterminating wars would follow—not a war of two or three years, but of interminable duration—an exterminating war would follow, until some Philip or Alexander, some Cæsar or Napoleon, would rise to cut the Gordian knot, and solve the problem of the capacity of man for self-government, and crush the liberty of both the dissevered portions of this Union. Can you doubt it? Look at history—consult the pages of all history, ancient or modern: look at human nature—look at the character of the contest in which you would be engaged in the supposition of a war following the dissolution of the Union, such as I have suggested—and I ask you if it is possible for you to doubt that the final but perhaps distant termination of the whole will be some despot trampling down the liberties of the people?—that the final result will be the extinction of this last and glorious light, which is leading all mankind, who are gazing upon it, to cherish hope and anxious expectation that the human race, in some time, will sooner or later be advanced throughout the civilized world? Can you, Mr. President, lightly contemplate the consequences? Can you yield yourself to a torrent of passion, amidst dangers such as I have depicted in colors far short of what would be the reality, if the event should ever happen? I implore gentlemen—I implore the people of this country, in the name of all they hold dear in this world—by all their love of liberty—by their love fugitive slaves—by their love of liberty—by their veneration for their ancestors—by their hopes of their posterity—by their gratitude to Him who has bestowed upon them such unnumbered blessings—by all the duties which they owe to mankind, and all the duties they owe to themselves—by all these considerations I implore them to pause—solemnly to pause—at the edge of the precipice, before the fearful and disastrous leap is taken in the yawning abyss below, from which none who take it will ever return in safety.

And, finally, Mr. President, I implore, as the best blessing which Heaven can bestow upon me upon earth, that if the direful and sad event of the dissolution of the Union shall happen, I may not survive to behold the sad and heart-rending spectacle.

'SECESSION FROM THE UNION.'

The disunionists have again commenced the business of sending in petitions to the Legislature, asking that Massachusetts should 'peacefully secede from the Union.' Last year, Mr. Greene of Milton presented less than a thousand of these singular papers; and at the close of the session, the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom they were referred, reported that 'the petitioners have leave to withdraw their petitions.' Yesterday, a spirited debate arose in the House, on the question of laying the memorial of Calvin S. Greenwood and others for 'secession,' &c., to the Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. Codman of Boston opposed the motion vigorously. He said that the House would not entertain a petition containing indecent or blasphemous matter, and he could not and would indulge in the folly of referring these papers, and embarrassing the committee with their care. The petitioners know when they send them here, that the legislature will not act upon them, and therefore they thought it was better to reject them at once. Mr. Boutwell of Groton replied, and vindicated the right of petition. He did not admire the sentiments expressed in the petitions; yet legislators were but public servants, and it was not for them to dictate to the people. He instanced a case where the House had refused to entertain a petition asking that 'all clergymen in the Commonwealth who were in favor of capital punishment, be apprehended.' Mr. Codman replied that the House refused to entertain this memorial, a motion to reconsider prevailed, the petition was taken back, 'decently referred,' and a proposal to the Senate followed that the petitioners have leave to withdraw, and this report was accepted. Mr. Boutwell contended that the people had a perfect right to a hearing on all matters, and he hoped that the motion would prevail. After a few remarks from Mr. Codman, in defence of his position, the petition was sent to the Judiciary Committee.—*Boston Courier.*

A JOINT RESOLUTION

IN RELATION TO THE SLAVE TRADE, BY THE LEGISLATURE OF INDIANA.

Whereas, the policy of suppressing the 'African Slave Trade' by a armed blockade has, on the whole, proved an entire failure, said trade being as vigorous now as it was before the blockade was instituted; and whereas, it is believed that England will soon make overtures to our Government, and, by demanding a release from all treaty stipulations whereby she is bound to keep up a costly squadron for the African coast, for the suppression of the slave trade; and, whereas, both the Government of the United States and of England are convinced that some other plan must be adopted to check that traffic; and, whereas, the settlement of the African coast with colored emigrants, educated men, is the cheapest and best plan of suppressing said traffic, being likewise calculated to further the work of colonizing our people of color, which plan of suppressing the trade is true American policy; therefore,

Be it Resolved, by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby requested, in the name of the State of Indiana, to call for a change of national policy on the subject of the 'African Slave Trade,' and that they respectfully request the consul of Africa with colored men from the United States, and procure such changes in our treaties with Africa as will enable us to ship our people of color colored men from this country to Africa, with whom to effect said settlement.

GEORGE W. CARR,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
JAMES H. LANE,
President of the Senate.

Approved January 16, 1850.
JOSEPH A. WRIGHT.

The Liberator.

BOSTON, FEBRUARY 22, 1850.

No Union with Slaveholders!

KISSING THE CHAIN!

Shall Massachusetts stand erect no longer,
But stoop in chains upon her downward way,
Thicker to gather on her limbs, and stronger,
Day after day?

In our last number, we gave a brief account of the ridiculous, spasmodic and inconsistent action of the House of Representatives of this State on the presentation of petitions, asking for a Convention of the People to devise measures for a peaceable secession of Massachusetts from the Union, for the intolerable pollution of our soil by the tread of slaves, who these petitions were precipitately laid on the table by an overwhelming majority, and thus denied the courtesy of a reference; and how, the Whigs taking the alarm on seeing Mr. Boutwell (the ostensible leader of the Democratic party in the House) rise in his seat to object to such a course of action as a virtual denial of the right of petition, that vote was almost instantaneously reconsidered, and the petitions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. What has since transpired, up to the time our paper goes to press, we proceed to inform our readers.

On Friday last, the Committee with hot haste (forty-eight hours after receiving the petitions) reported that the petitioners have leave to withdraw. Thus no time was afforded for the presentation of a large number of similar petitions still circulating for signatures, and the consideration of the whole subject was to be heard in behalf of the object prayed for. Hitherto, for several years past, petitions of this nature have been regularly sent to the Legislature, and in every instance received without hesitancy, duly referred, deliberately considered, and repeatedly supported by reports from the Committee, in the hall of the House of Representatives being granted on several occasions for a hearing. By the rules of the House, the report of the present Committee was laid over for that day; but, as if anxious to make a precedent for the suppression of the voice of Greece or Free Soil movement from every suspicion of 'fanaticism,' Mr. Wilson, of Natick, the proprietor of the *Boston Republican*, moved that the rules be suspended, taken by yeas and nays, that no time be lost to signify to the world and the world where Massachusetts stands in regard to the Slavery question. The motion prevailed, and the report was accepted—Yeas, all, except 1—Mr. Tolman, (Free Soiler,) of Worcester. In common with a multitude of others, we are astonished and indignant at the conduct of Mr. Wilson in this matter—we have often displayed, on so many occasions in the House, both as a Whig and as a Free Soiler, a manly front on the subject of slavery, and at all times received at the hands of the abolitionists his full share of credit. What his motive was for thus prestigating action, we leave him to explain. It was with any hope of personal or party advantage, he will assuredly find that he has 'reckoned without his host.' If, in his conscience, he really believes that an active and willing support of the Union involves nothing of criminality—if he believes that the Union is promotive of liberty and equality, instead of perpetuating slavery—why then we could not reasonably expect that he would sanction a movement for its dissolution. Nevertheless, it is none the less extraordinary—especially in view of all he has said and done respecting the aggressions of the Slave Power—that he should be eager to satisfy those who have so long and so well shown that they hold dear in this world—by all their love of liberty—by their veneration for their ancestors—by their hopes of their posterity—by their gratitude to Him who has bestowed upon them such unnumbered blessings—by all the duties which they owe to mankind, and all the duties they owe to themselves—by all these considerations I implore them to pause—solemnly to pause—at the edge of the precipice, before the fearful and disastrous leap is taken in the yawning abyss below, from which none who take it will ever return in safety.

And, finally, Mr. President, I implore, as the best blessing which Heaven can bestow upon me upon earth, that if the direful and sad event of the dissolution of the Union shall happen, I may not survive to behold the sad and heart-rending spectacle.

'SECESSION FROM THE UNION.'

The disunionists have again commenced the business of sending in petitions to the Legislature, asking that Massachusetts should 'peacefully secede from the Union.' Last year, Mr. Greene of Milton presented less than a thousand of these singular papers; and at the close of the session, the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom they were referred, reported that 'the petitioners have leave to withdraw their petitions.' Yesterday, a spirited debate arose in the House, on the question of laying the memorial of Calvin S. Greenwood and others for 'secession,' &c., to the Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. Codman of Boston opposed the motion vigorously. He said that the House would not entertain a petition containing indecent or blasphemous matter, and he could not and would indulge in the folly of referring these papers, and embarrassing the committee with their care. The petitioners know when they send them here, that the legislature will not act upon them, and therefore they thought it was better to reject them at once. Mr. Boutwell of Groton replied, and vindicated the right of petition. He did not admire the sentiments expressed in the petitions; yet legislators were but public servants, and it was not for them to dictate to the people. He instanced a case where the House had refused to entertain a petition asking that 'all clergymen in the Commonwealth who were in favor of capital punishment, be apprehended.' Mr. Codman replied that the House refused to entertain this memorial, a motion to reconsider prevailed, the petition was taken back, 'decently referred,' and a proposal to the Senate followed that the petitioners have leave to withdraw, and this report was accepted. Mr. Boutwell contended that the people had a perfect right to a hearing on all matters, and he hoped that the motion would prevail. After a few remarks from Mr. Codman, in defence of his position, the petition was sent to the Judiciary Committee.—*Boston Courier.*

petition, pursued a course for which we intended to accord him our thanks and all due credit; but his subsequent behavior has vitiated an otherwise meritorious act. On Tuesday, as one of a committee, we requested him to present to the House sundry petitions from a number of other places, numerously and respectably signed, on the subject of disunion, similar to those already presented; and also a remonstrance, signed by FRANCIS JACKSON and others, against the precipitate action of the Committee and the House on the petitions, and asking for a hearing as a matter of justice, which to our surprise, but more to his own discredit, Mr. BOUTWELL positively declined complying with this request! On the question of the Union he was eminently patriotic—very conscientious; he could never think, for one moment, of presenting such petitions. But it is a matter of conscience, or a rule of action, with you, we asked, 'never to present a petition, except you can give it your sanction?' He could not say it was. 'Why, then, the present refusal? Do you believe there is any one, either in this Commonwealth or out of it, who would suppose that you were in favor of a dissolution of the Union merely from the fact of your presenting these petitions?' He did not suppose there was. 'You can make as many disclaimers as you may think proper; to these we do not object; these we are prepared to expect; but by what authority are petitions and this remonstrance to be laid before the House.' He should prefer that some other person would present them. 'But the same excuse that you make might be made by every other member; and where then would be the right of petition? If a memorial relating to the liberty of the people of Massachusetts, and of the Union, in this country who are groaning in bondage, couched in respectful and solemn phraseology, is to be denied a presentation, so may all others of an inferior nature. If the petitioners are in error as to the form or substance of their request, is it not obviously the duty of the House to inform them of the error, or the Legislature to show wherein they err?' He had no doubt that the dissolution of the Union would be the abolition of slavery; but he went for the Union as it is, because of the two evils! Humane man—upright moralist—profound logician! To cease 'associating with thieves and consenting with adulterers'—to refuse any longer to join in the enslavement of three millions of the people of this country—would certainly give liberty to the oppressed, and put an end to all the woes and horrors of the slave system, but it would be injurious to ourselves! It would deteriorate our character, to say the calculation! See what folly it is to obey God by remembering them that are in bonds as bound with them, and loving our neighbors as ourselves! See how safe, profitable and expedient it is to commit sin, perpetrate robbery, and exercise tyranny on a gigantic scale! 'The end sanctifies the means—I am for doing evil that good may come'—is the moral philosophy of this leader of the *Democratic* party.

Mr. BOUTWELL may reconcile—if he can—the consistency of his acts in refusing to present a disunion petition to the House; and then, after its presentation, by other hands, protesting against its being summarily laid upon the table as a virtual denial of the right of petition, and advocating its reference to the Judiciary Committee. We are unable to reconcile discrepancies so glaring.

We admonished Mr. Wilson—as we would admonish all politicians—that this great and solemn question is not to be dodged, crowded down, or shuffled out of sight, with impunity—that those who are pressing it are not lacking in intelligence or spirit, neither are they to be discouraged by defeat or intimidated by censure—that it is the religious element, in the hearts of the disinterested manifestation, by which they are impelled—a dread of sin a hatred of tyranny, a sacred love of liberty, and a sentiment of obedience to God, overriding all party ties and all constitutional requirements—and therefore not to be trifled with.

On Wednesday morning, Mr. Tolman presented the remonstrance of Francis Jackson and others, against the action of the House on Friday last, as follows:—

To the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The undersigned, petitioners for a Convention of the People of this Commonwealth to devise measures for a peaceable secession of Massachusetts from the Union, respectfully ask for a reconsideration of the vote of the House, on Friday last, by which those petitioners had leave to withdraw their petition—basing their request and their remonstrance against the action of the House on the following grounds:—

1. That the petitioners had no opportunity to be heard before your Committee in support of the object prayed for; the action both of the Committee and the House manifesting, in the judgment of the undersigned, precipitancy, and being without any good precedent.

2. That if a patient hearing is cheerfully conceded to petitions touching matters of the smallest pecuniary interest, much more does the same, of right, belong to questions involving the welfare, honor and liberty of millions.

3. That while your petitioners are subjected, by the Constitution and laws of the United States, and therefore of this Commonwealth, to be hunted, by the duty of the Commonwealth, as a Sovereign State, to petition to the Honorable Congress for redress and prevention of so grievous a wrong, which your petitioners are profoundly convinced can be heard only by a secession from the present Union.

4. That while the matter touched on in said petitions has become so much attention, and awakened so deep an interest in all parts of the country, it is clearly the duty of the Legislature, in the opinion of the undersigned, either to hear the reasons on which the petitioners found their request, or, at least, to make a plain statement of the petitioners' mistake as to the form or substance of the remedy prayed for.

6. That on a subject so momentous, such precipitate rejection of a petition, without reason given therefor, or opportunity offered to the petitioners to support their request, is a virtual denial of the right of petition.

FRANCIS JACKSON,
WM. LLOYD GARRISON,
EDMUND QUINCY,
WENDELL PHILLIPS,
WM. J. BOWDITCH,
JOHN BOGERT,
EDMUND JACKSON,
C

MR. CARLYLE AND THE W. I. NEGRO QUESTION.

Mr. Carlyle is a wonderful man; Mr. Carlyle is a great man; Mr. Carlyle is a *genius*. Few men of the present age have influenced more minds, of a certain kind, than he. But with all his strength,—and he has a strong man, also,—he is weak; and, with all his greatness, he is not powerful compositions as those where the Christian mind may discover hope for the future.

He holds himself in mid-air, by balloon agency. He looks down upon us mortals from his giddy height, and when he sees a man, or fancies his giddy height, and when he sees a man, or fancies his nature lies upon a level with the earth, he sees in him, not absolutely infernal in sight of gods and men, but ludicrously infernal in sight of himself and his fellows. In a word, Mr. C. looks at men and things from *his* new, and not from a Christian point of sight; and this is eminently the case in his article on the Negro Question, in the last number of Fraser's Magazine.

He begins by repeating, in a sufficiently sneering tone, what has been so often said in gladness by those who labored for the extinction of slavery in the West Indies, and by the friends of freedom, that 'the negroes are all very happy, and doing well'; but 'that they are all very far from being happy,' and this, C. T. tells us, 'with the sweet blighted lilies (as the American philosophic Quaker child has it) are holding up their heads again.'

West India emancipation he declares to be a failure. If it be so, I rejoice, and should rejoice again to witness it yet once more, to-morrow, to-day, in our own land. But it is not a failure. Even when considered, and in a summer light, I doubt it, upon investigation, it will be found a failure, an investigation upon which I would be found a failure, an investigation upon which I have no desire, if I expected, to enter. And if it could be so proved, 'where is the fault, and where shall lie the blame?'

England, to her honor and glory be it said and recorded, emancipated her slaves; but she made she did this, the work was but little better than half done. For what was she accomplished? Ostensibly, because it was a Christian duty; for the purpose of restoring to a million of God's children their natural rights. Did not Britain know that, the sweets of liberty once tasted, there is a longing, aye, and an 'asking for more'? The black man of the West Indies, the ignorant and ignorant, could yet understand, that 'half an hour' of labor, *per diem*, could bring him enough of 'pumpkin,' or other 'delectable fruit,' to satisfy the wants of his animal man, there was no power to compel him to work more; and if in the absence of higher attainments than such supply, he refuses to work, let the blame fall, *not* on the black, who, so far as he has been permitted to see and know, reasons correctly on what he sees and knows,—but on the government, which should have instructed him in 'the perfect law of liberty,' or on the planter who 'cannot work,' and complains that 'Quashee' will not. Let it rest on those who would crave the honor of having abolished slavery, while they would yet retain the power, and keep the negroes slaves in all things but the name. Had the slaves of the West Indies risen upon and conquered their Saxon-British masters, had they been strong, wise and wicked enough to have driven, perforce, the white man from the soil, then West India emancipation would have been a 'success,' and 'Quashee,' doubtless, in the estimation of Mr. Carlyle, a *Hero*. But the British planter is becoming 'poor;' aye, 'there's the rub.' *He* is becoming poor, and 'cannot work;' while Quashee—much to the chagrin of Mr. C—is living 'up to his ears'—and that from half an hour's labor—on the fat of the land; and all the while 'the sugar cane is rotting.'

No one will dissent from the position which not only now, but ever—to his credit be it said—Mr. C. has maintained, namely, that labor is the duty of every man; that by labor is man to be most blessed upon earth. But *for whom* shall man labor? To what end? The Scripture injunction is, to love thy neighbor *as thyself*; and I think Mr. C. would find it difficult to show, by any theory of ethics, however sublimated, that man is bound to labor for the sole purpose of maintaining others in idleness; or, knowing his, yet, instructed in the true relation man should bear to his fellow, he can be held accountable for refusing to work, beyond what will supply his wants, though these wants may not extend farther than most 'delectable pumpkin.' He may point to Hayti in evidence, as an argument in favor of this theory, that the black is unfitted for self-government; it is, when placed under like favorable circumstances with the white for education and development. We would ask him to remember that even Hayti produced Alexandre Dumas and Toussaint L'Ouverture—which last, wise, self-governing white men must have freely numbered; that we have a quondam slave (or Quashee, if he will,)—to name no more—one Frederick Douglass, amongst us, the like of whom may rise up in Jamaica and Antigua, to govern Englishmen; at least, to cause the soil to produce, by the sweat of their own good, cane that shall *not* rot; 'celestial spices,' too, which—and the English are able—they may purchase of Quashee, he, meanwhile, scorning and repudiating 'most beneficent whip.'

In our estimation, Mr. Carlyle—as we said at the outset—has taken a false view of the whole matter. His argument amounts to this: Might makes right; it is the right of the strong to govern the weak. The Saxon-British is stronger and wiser than the black of the West Indies, and in consequence, may *compel*, by force of arms, his black neighbor to do his bidding: and this is the 'Eternal Purpose and Supreme Will'!

The question, however, has been stated fairly enough, but, alas for the age—*the age of progress*—it is by such means as Mr. Carlyle indicates, it is to be answered.

'What are the true relations between negro and white, their mutual duties, under the sight of the Maker of them both?'

I do not intend to attempt, in this article, a solution of this great problem; though, to one extent, at least, I deem it not incapable of solution. It is not to be despatched in a word, even so far as relates to the present instance; or a brief sentence, though that sentence be uttered by Thomas Carlyle. Undoubtedly, it would be for the present benefit of Britain, but 'fair' we deny it to be, to compel 'Quashee' to work for the mere privilege to grow pumpkins.'

The white man cannot work; but if he cannot *work*, it is not a question worth revolving in one's mind, whether he has a right to *eat*, within the tropics? Is there not some shadow of a reason for belief, that the 'Supreme Will' eternally purposed that the black 'fair' we deny it to be, to compel 'Quashee' to work for the mere privilege to grow pumpkins.'

The white man cannot work; but if he cannot *work*, it is not a question worth revolving in one's mind, whether he has a right to *eat*, within the tropics? Is there not some shadow of a reason for belief, that the 'Supreme Will' eternally purposed that the black should be the separate abiding place of the black man? Why is not be worthy our consideration, and the consideration of the Anglo-British, what is our duty, under God—what is 'fair' and 'just' towards the black man? How fit is our duty, as the wiser and the stronger, to instruct and elevate the weaker race, and place them in a condition sufficiently analogous to our own, so that it shall be possible for white man to live beside black men, on terms that shall meet the approval of God and man?

The problem is *not* 'how white men shall *command* black men;' there is not and cannot be any 'just claim' in such a state as this question indicates; nor is it 'how West India fruitfulness can be produced,' for the purpose of maintaining the pampered laziness of West India planters. West India should, indeed, be made fruitful. The world needs its sugar, her coffee, and 'celestial spices,' and in God's own time they shall be produced; doubt it not, and it may be, as suggested by Mr. Carlyle, through Brother Jonathan.

We have not yet 'brought out' all our Douglasses; and if Jamaica can produce none from her black population, we can spare them quite a number for schoolmasters, attorneys, physicians, judges, a President, and makers of Constitutions. Our peculiar domestic institution is fast 'leading towards dissolution;' and it may be, doubtless will be found, that there is many a sable son of America who has imbibed, or inherited by direct paternal descent, something of the spirit of liberty, if not of chivalry, which they may turn to good account. It may be from such 'gods' that Britain may hear the voice, 'holding you ignominiously depart' ye quack-ridden, incompetent.'

If the English planter cannot get his cane cut and his sugar manufactured, let him forbear the attempt to overcome the prejudice of population by African importation—the folly of which C. T. has set forth with equal power and clearness—and in the spirit of justice and 'what is fair,' let him 'make it an object' for the negro to work, by the same inducements, as, *under the same circumstances*, he would hold out to his white brethren, and year by year release, *for fair consideration*, what is every day becoming less and less valuable to him, and which in the end—'so God ordains'—he will be *obliged* to release without consideration; more especially, if 'by most beneficent whip' there shall be an attempt to *force* his pumpkin-loving brother to labor.

'Slaves again' assuredly they will not be; and let English arms essay to make them so, and Jamaica ground will again be manured with the bones and blood of many 'thousand British men,' with their Cromwells, Sedgwicks, Pakenhams, Drayton and Blakes. She would indeed find, to her cost, that 'he that will not work [in W. I.] shall perish from [W. I.]—and the patience of the gods *has* limits.' A simple sitter it may be, indeed, but as frightful, believe it, as simple. 'Cut,' whether 'rose-pink' or of whatever color, will then find its place (what matter if it proceed from terrestrial parliament or Mr. Carlyle, it will down to Orcus;' and the 'conditions of growing pumpkins be definitely settled—perhaps in rather a terrible manner.'

This the whole of the W. I. Islands will ultimately fall into the hands of the blacks, is an idea I have long entertained, and one which strengthens day by day. The abolition of slavery in our own land has been decreed by God! Not the meanest of his agents for its accomplishment are the blind 'fanatics' of the South, with Mr. Calhoun at their head. What shall be the exact relative position of the blacks and whites, when that event shall have reached fulfilment, it may not be wise to predict. I will merely suggest, that a sufficient number of the blacks may emigrate, so as to prevent much of the unpleasantness of the condition, which, we think, would, otherwise, ensue—but a portion, as has been intimated, of the more intelligent—the 'schoolmasters'—who shall go 'abroad' through the British West Indies, and teach their brethren what England—did she consult her truest interests—would be teaching them now—the elementary principles of political science. Then, in addition to her pine-apples and spices, shall the West Indies grow 'beautiful heroic human lives;' beautiful 'souls and brave; sages, poets, what not,' making the earth nobler around them; not 'splinters of the old Harz Rock,' 'tis true, but yet children of God, and doing the mission upon which, by Him, they are sent.

England, to her praise and glory be it spoken, has emancipated her *foreign* slaves; now let her educate them. Instead of granting her millions sterling to bolster up a decaying aristocracy, let her look the condition of the West Indies in the face, and prepare to meet the emergency which, by a law of God, 'though all terrestrial parliaments and entities oppose it to the death, shall come.'

This shall more ennoble her than abundance of sugar or celestial spices. She may force opium down the throats of the Chinese, and attempt to force labor from her West India blacks by 'beneficent whip;' but she will find, when too late, perhaps for her salvation, that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth, even He who executeth judgment in the earth. †

† See Isaiah, xxiii. 8, 9.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WORCESTER CO. NORTH DIVISION A. S. SOCIETY,

Held at Leominster, Feb. 2d and 3d.

The first session of this Convention took place on Saturday afternoon, Feb. 2d, at the vestry of the Methodist meeting-house; President in the chair. The meeting was addressed by the President, on the subject of numbers. Fifteen years seem to show that the success of our cause depended not so much on the *numbers* of those who professedly espoused it, as upon the fidelity and devotedness of those who were engaged in it.

By a vote of the Society, the following persons were appointed by the Chair as a committee to prepare a list of officers for the year ensuing:—Alfred Wyman, Westminster: Wm. J. Whitney, South Orange; Isaac B. Smith, Leominster.

The following were appointed, also, in the same manner, as a Committee on Finance:—R. H. Howard, Berlin; Alvan Ward, Ashburnham; Mrs. Sally W. Hoar, Westminster.

While the Committee on Nomination were preparing their report, the meeting was addressed by Miss Lucy Stone, on the power of a *few* to carry on any great moral enterprise, if those few were so characterized by determination and zeal. She gave way for the reading of the report of the Committee on Nominations.

Miss Stone thought she discovered an impropriety in the report, of substituting, in the case of the women whose names were contained in it, the names of their husbands, instead of their own names.

After some remarks by way of apology from the Committee, it was voted to correct the seeming impropriety; and the following is the report, 'revised and corrected,' which was adopted:—

For President,
J. T. EVERETT, Princeton.

Vice-Presidents,
GEO. FRANCIS, Leominster;
JOEL SMITH, Leominster;
BENJ. SNOW, JR., Fitchburg;
ALFRED WYMAN, Westminster;
NOAH HUMPHREY, Princeton.

Directors.
WM. C. SNOW, Gardner;
MRS. C. S. BROWN, Hubbardston;
MRS. F. H. DRAKE, Leominster;
ALBERT C. HOWE, Princeton;
MRS. L. B. MILES, Westminster;
EDWARD WILDER, Leominster;
ISA BLAKE, Westminster;
THEODORE B. LOCKE, Barre.

Secretary,
JOHN A. MIRICK, Princeton.

Treasurer,
BENSON BIGELOW, Westminster.

Auditor,
GEO. MILES, Westminster.

The President here made some remarks upon the subject of Slavery, recommending that some time be specified at which to consider this subject; and by a vote of the Society, the hour of 11 to-morrow was assigned as the time.

Henry Watson then addressed the Convention, upon matters connected with his own experience.

On motion, it was voted, that the time of meeting to-morrow be 10 o'clock; the place of meeting being the Town Hall. The following persons were appointed by the Chair as a Business Committee:—Wendell Phillips, Samuel May, Jr., Boston; Lucy Stone, West Brookfield; Frances H. Drake, Leominster; Benjamin Snow, Jr., Fitchburg.

The Convention then adjourned, to meet at the same place at half past 6 in the evening.

EVENING SESSION.

Meeting called to order by the President, and addressed by Mr. Watson.

Votes: That all persons present, or who may at any stage of the proceedings that may transpire in the present, be invited to take part in its discussions.

Wendell Phillips then addressed the meeting. He said the American people were incapable of reasoning with regard to the Negro. The Negro was the object their hatred and prejudice, every where. There was a fable of a certain heathen, who fell in love with a favorite cat. This heathen prayed earnestly to the gods, that this cat might be transformed to a beautiful woman, that he might make her his wife. The gods listened to his prayer, and she was changed, according to his wish, and married her. She was beautiful, amiable, and gentle, and all that heart could wish, until one day a mouse happened to come into her apartment, when all her grimalkin propensities developed themselves, and she ran frantic in her eagerness to catch and devour it. So was with the American people. They might appear amiable and gentle with regard to every thing else, but when the Negro chanced to cross their path, their real character was sure to develope itself, and they sure to set their teeth upon him. Their hatred upon him, he was not taken at all into account, as a man. In their lucubrations of their own free institutions, he was not regarded as a human being. Dr. Dewey, in a popular lecture in the city of New York, exalted to the highest pitch our free institutions and impartial administration of justice, and yet, in the same lecture, he actually asked him how it was possible for him to speak in such unmeasured terms of our government as a free government, when he knew there existed under it a system of slavery which chained and lashed three hundred thousand victims. The lecturer said in reply, 'Indeed, madam, I never thought of it.'

Mr. Phillips spoke of the religious organizations of the country—the support they gave to slavery, and pointed out the men to be dealt with. We were sometimes told to go to the South. Shareholders were not the men to be appealed to. We would direct our appealing to the noblemen of England to do away with aristocracy? The American people were the jury before whom the case should be tried. The verdict of the people of England, inasmuch as they were far removed from the evil, was like the verdict thirty years hence. But at present, the great mass of the American people never thought for themselves. A mere handful of men moulded public opinion every where. The greater portion of mankind were mere chips on the current. A few gave character to New England; the merchants of the seaboard produced the Revolution.

The abolition of slavery was not the work of a day. It would take this generation to accomplish the work, unless something happen to have an immediate bearing upon it. That something *might* happen to effect the abolition of slavery at no remote period, was not among things impossible. The power of Louis Philippe was reversed, as it were, in a day. It might be so with regard to slavery. But the sentiment of the mass, with regard to it, was, Let it alone. Each sect and party claimed, that their peculiar tenets and dogmas, carried out in full, would eventually abolish slavery; each possessed within them the antidote for the evil. If they had this power, why had they not used it, and why did slavery exist? The evil was growing no less. The patient had been physicked and bandaged and bled, but was still growing worse. He went for changing the doctor.

The Church did nothing for the abolition of slavery; on the contrary, she was giving her influence to prop it up. She had translated the Bible into two hundred and ten different languages, and sent it to every nation of the earth; but it had not made the first effort to send it to the American slave. Yet she denounced us for using harsh language. Words were made for use; the fault lay in deserving them.

Mr. Phillips was followed by Samuel May, Jr., who spoke of the object of the Convention. He feared many had come here, not so much to do something to liberate the slave, as to gratify themselves, in hearing Wendell Phillips and Lucy Stone speak.

The Convention then adjourned, to meet in the Town Hall, at 10 o'clock, to-morrow.

SUNDAY MORNING, Feb. 7.

Meeting called to order by the President; and an opportunity being given, Samuel May, Jr. engaged in vocal prayer; after which, a song was sung.

Mr. May, in behalf of the Business Committee, submitted the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That our warfare against slavery can right-fully be waged only against the slave; that as men, brethren, Christians, we cannot put off our anti-slavery armor while the oppressive and accursed system, the enemy of God and man, continues to wage its terrible war upon the hearts and hopes and homes of three millions of our brethren; and with this conviction, we recognize it as our duty, forgetting the things which are behind, to press forward to the duties, labors and triumphs which are before us; and call upon all around us to join in the work of truth, of justice, of God himself.

Resolved, That Henry Clay's last Compromise surpasses all its predecessors in cunning, in hypocrisy, and in betrayal of the rights of freedom and humanity; that the boast of having never voted to extend slavery where it did not exist before is a mockery and a fraud; so long as he is, with what he now declares himself to be, opposed to any measure restricting or extending slavery from the territories of which the Union has plundered Mexico; and that his proposal to allow the slave trade to go on uninterrupted between the several States, shows him to be destitute of principle as a man, unworthy of confidence as a statesman, and a heart a foe and oppressor of the humble and the weak.

Miss Stone spoke to the resolutions. In the course of her remarks, she alluded to the case of Betsy Ann Blakely, a fugitive slave and slave mother, who had recently escaped from the prison-house of slavery. She said she visited her a few days since at her temporary home in Boston; and while talking with her upon her condition as a slave, and the motives which led her to attempt to get her liberty, she spoke of her little boy,—a child eighteen months old,—whom she left behind in slavery; and with all the feelings of a mother frantic with the thought of her offspring living in slavery, and enduring all its horrors, she said—*'I wish I had killed it'*; and in spite of all their endeavors to comfort her, by speaking of the possibility, as it was a boy, that if he lived to be a man he might escape to a free soil, the feeling of freedom still expressed the wish that, before she left it, in the stillness of night, *she had strangled it in its little nest.*

The hour which was assigned for the consideration of the subject of finance having arrived, and, owing to the storm, not so full an attendance as was desired and expected, it was voted to postpone the consideration of the matter until 1 o'clock, P. M. The Convention was then addressed by Mr. May upon the second resolution. He spoke of the course of Mr. Clay in reference to his first and last Compromises, and the comparative wickedness of the two. He was followed by Wendell Phillips.

Mr. Phillips began by saying that, in one sense, a worldly minded man was a sublime spectacle. In his determination, perseverance, and zeal,—his adaptation of means to ends, he was an object of admiration. He had an object in view, and he labored unceasingly to promote it. For this, he pore study, and, sat up late; for this, he toiled night and day. In his devotion and diligence, he was a perfect model. He related an anecdote of a man, who had been the proprietor and owner of a large village, which, by industrious, he had squandered, and became penniless. He was so far reduced, that he was obliged to perform the most degrading services to procure the means of subsistence. One day, as he was standing on an eminence which overlooked the village, and surveying what had once been his, and contrasting his present miserable condition with what it had been, the idea occurred to him that it was possible that this vast fortune might again be his—that by determination and perseverance, he might yet recover it. At any rate, he determined to try. He left the spot where he had so many times stood and meditated upon the past and revealed his determination to this and that one, with whom in former times he had been associated, and begged the privilege of performing the most menial services. He went on from step to step till he accomplished all he determined, and became again the possessor of that which, by his profligacy, he had lost. The experience of this man, and which such examples afforded us, we could not but admire. It was such perseverance, turned to other objects, that we should imitate. The work of Reformers was never done; their labor would not end with the abolition of slavery. There were a host of evils which cursed the world, which would always demand our efforts and labors. When we had reached the top of the highest mountain, we should still see a continual chain of mountains in the distance beyond, which we must climb. This was the work of the Christian, Religious and Christianity were two different things. Where was Jesus Christ in the nineteenth century? In a pro-slavery church? By no means. On the spot of the transaction of a great moral act; there was Christianity. When an evil was discerned in the distance, Christianity was the instrument in the hands of God, to combat it. The Church found fault with and condemned us for doing the things which she should do herself. We were not to apologize to the Church, but the Church to us. Why, if she had the sword of the Spirit, did she not use it? Why, if they were armed, with the preparation of the Gospel, did they not walk?

Mr. Phillips concluded his speech with some remarks in reference to the Liberator. He said no man should call himself an abolitionist, who merely paid for and read the Liberator. A far more important part of his duty was to circulate it among his neighbors and others. Infinitely less should he call himself an abolitionist, who neglected to pay for it until called upon. The Liberator could not afford to send out agents to collect its dues. It had many delinquent subscribers, and came far short of sustaining itself. Its expenses last year exceeded its receipts by $500, which friends in Boston paid.

The meeting then adjourned for one hour.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The resolutions presented at the morning session were read for further consideration.

The hour having arrived for the consideration of the subject of finance, that matter was taken up. The report of the Committee on the subject recommended that two hundred dollars be raised in this Division; that a vigorous effort be immediately taken up, and a paper circulated for pledges. The President having resigned the chair to Mr. Alfred Wyman, one of the Vice Presidents of the Society, addressed the Convention at some length, in a stirring and effective appeal to abolitionists to give in aid of the cause. He dwelt upon the apathy of many who profess to be the friends of the movement, and compared their efforts to advance this cause with what they used to do to propagate their sectarian dogmas, as members of the Church. He referred to the self-sacrifice of many of our laborers in the anti-slavery field, and stated some particular instances which he was personally knowing. His speech was listened to with interest, and, no doubt, had an influence on the amount contributed and pledged. He was followed by S. May, Jr., on the same subject. The Committee on Finance then proceeded to their duty, during which time J. T. Everett, W. J. Whitney, Mr. Humphrey, of Fitchburg, Mr. Drake, of Leominster, and Mr. Miles, of Westminster, made some remarks.

The following resolutions were then presented and discussed by Wendell Phillips:—

Resolved, That the doctrine of doing good can never be any justification for a wrong act, therefore, however important be the existence of civil government, no man is justified in doing for its continuance the slightest thing which his conscience tells him is wrong.

Resolved, therefore, That no one who deems slaveholding to be sinful can innocently vote or take office under the United States Constitution.

The Financial Committee reported the amount contributed and pledged to be $105.79. There were a few small contributions after the Committee reported, which raised the sum to $109.29.

The meeting then adjourned until half-past six.

EVENING SESSION.

Mr. Humphrey, of Princeton, proposed to take up some points in Mr. Phillips' argument in the afternoon, and ask some questions. He contended that the use of the products of slave labor contributed to the support of slavery; and that those who made use of such products were guilty of as great an inconsistency and wrong as they who swore to support a pro-slavery government.

Mr. Phillips replied to Mr. Humphrey.

Mr. May replied to the question, whether if he abstained from those products himself, and in what way he carried out his principles. If he did not, why?

Mr. Humphrey confessed that he did not abstain.

The following resolution was also presented and discussed by Wendell Phillips:—

Resolved, That the North will end the slave demands the dissolution of the American Union.

All the resolutions which were before the Convention were taken up, and adopted—the one relating to dissolution strongly.

The Society voted that the proceedings of the Convention be published in the Liberator and Anti-Slavery Standard.

The Convention then adjourned, *sine die.*

JOSHUA T. EVERETT, *President.*
JOHN A. MIRICK, *Secretary.*

THE GRANITE STATE.

MR. GARRISON:

DEAR SIR—I wish to inquire, through the Liberator, if we cannot have some anti-slavery lectures in this place, the present winter, or at some early period in the spring. We have supplied ourselves with lecturers from Massachusetts to favor us with a lecture or lectures, but without success. Is there good reason why four-fifths of the anti-slavery labor performed in New England should be expended in Massachusetts? Is she so bad as to need it, or so good as to deserve it? Surely, the cause of freedom should go much farther than here, in other directions. It is, or has been, the glory of the enterprise, that it is not confined within State lines, or any geographical limits. Nor ought it to be confined to those places which pay best. There is a little anti-slavery here, and there would be more if we could have more public lectures. Will not yourself, or Mr. Phillips, or Miss Stone, or some other able speaker, take this subject into consideration? It is said the present is the most useful session of Congress ever held. Has New Hampshire contributed any thing to subject of the U. S.? If so, it has not entitled to much regard? Enough said.

Yours, for broadcast anti-slavery truth,

J. W. PILLSBURY.

Milford, N. H., Feb. 11, 1850.

THE FAIR AT MILLVILLE

Will unquestionably be a most interesting and pleasant occasion. The ladies of Milleville and Hopedale have made great exertions to prepare a beautiful display of articles, and to furnish whatever is needful for a delightful social anti-slavery gathering. It will be seen that Wendell Phillips and Lucy Stone will be present, and will doubtless address the company assembled on the evenings. We hope a large attendance from all that neighborhood will reward and sustain this labor of love. Remember February 21st and 22d.

The Great Controversy.—Sophia Foote is the only man, except Judge Marshall, who has been able to make speeches that remain entirely unanswered! Nay, he has the satisfaction even of which Chief Justice in this particular. That great man made *one* speech, (in the case of Jonathan Robbins) to which no one replied, however hard he tried to answer it. Mr. Foote, during his short Senatorial career, has made at least fifty of the same sort. Nobody ever answers Foote; nobody can answer him. There is nothing in his speeches which present a tangible point. He enjoys the eminent gift of declaiming for hours without saying a single sentence, in which he does not find a monopolise, and which no man envies him. Foote has tried his hand upon all the notabilities of the Senate, and with the same result. Webster, Benton, Seward, Clay, all have been answered by Foote, but he knows, we yet, how to answer him. He still maintains his proud position. He is alike unanswered and unanswerable.—*Richmond Whig.*

The New York Resolutions.—The New York Assembly have adopted the resolutions of the Senate, recommending California and slavery, the fugitive amendment which has been concurred in. As passed, the resolutions instruct the Senators and Representatives of New York to use their best efforts to put an end to the slave trade in the District of Columbia, to secure the insertion of the Wilmot Proviso in all territorial bills, to resist firmly the extension of slavery, or the jurisdiction of Texas over any part of New Mexico, and to admit California as a free State under her present Constitution. The test vote on the resolves in the Assembly was, yes 74, noes 16. In the Senate, on the amendments, yes 20, noes 11.

The Southern Convention.—Gen. Walker, Speaker of the House of Representatives of Alabama, has introduced a bill into that body to provide for the election, in May next, of four delegates to the Legislature, and two from each Congressional district by the people, to the Southern Convention. The bill was referred to a select committee of one from each Congressional district, with instructions to report immediately.

Alabama.—In the Senate of this State, on the 28th ult, resolutions were adopted recommending to Congress the return of the resolutions of the Connecticut Legislature on slavery to the Governor of that State, with a respectful declaration that they were insulting to Alabama.

The First shall be Last, and the Last First.—Daniel Webster made a speech before the Senate week before last in favor of forwarding Washington's Farewell Address for general distribution. He has not yet found any thing to say upon the trivial question of slavery. The great matters in their Constitution are important first! It is to be hoped that after despatching all the momentous concerns like the above, he will reach the minor question of Human Rights. How 'god-like' Daniel is!

Coming to It.—The Richmond Whig thus comments on the Free Soil position of Gov. Fish's Message to the New York Legislature:—

'We have another Free Soil Message to the tune and temper of the Governor of New York on this vexed question. He's courteous enough. Neither do we object to the tone of the message. We like it very well above. All we have to say is, that if the Northern people have come to the determination declared by Gov. Fish, that there shall be no more Slave States admitted into the Union, we are prepared at once for a dissolution of that Union. We do not intend to argue the question; but if the South is to be deprived of rights and privileges, the Union which our fathers established no longer exists.'

Important.—Some of the Tammany Hall politicians have resolved that they consider Martin Van Buren a traitor and an ingrate, and that they detest those who supported the infamous coalition formed at Buffalo by the Whigs, negroes, and the Van Buren faction!

☞ Sam Houston, while on his way to Washington, made a speech at Montgomery, Alabama, in which he declared himself the author of the Wilmot Proviso ought to be sent right straight to hell.

Mr. Carlyle's famous (or, rather, infamous) article *Fraser's* will be found, amongst the reactionary on negro slavery in the West Indies; that the blacks may produce 'spices' for a 'wiser' race of men, who are, he says, 'born lords of them.' We have received many indignant protests from sable pens. [One is, we believe, from Stuart Mill.] Carlyle and his imitators worship strength and 'heroic' power, and not the sacrifice of truth and justice.—*Gateshead Observer.*

Warm Reception.—The whale which made a pleasure excursion into Provincetown harbor last week, very inhospitably treated the boat's crew of that place, being harpooned and cut up within an hour after his arrival. He made about fifty barrels of oil.

Conviction.—At the Court of Common Pleas at Dover, N. H., last week, Francis Prescott was convicted of a rape on Mrs. Betsey Woodward of Durham, 77 years of age, and was sentenced to the State Prison for life. Prescott is 19 years old, and is a nephew of the Prescott who was hung at Hopkinton, N. H. some ten years ago.

A Man Shot by a Woman.—In a quarrel in one of the Five Pointish localities of Ithaca, N. Y., known as Canada, one Lewis Letts was shot by a woman named Susan Walker. The wound, if it does not prove mortal, will cripple him for life. Letts had just broken the woman's jaw bone by a blow with a billet of wood.

A Reformer Arrested.—Mr. J. H. Green, the 'reformed gambler,' was arrested Thursday for obtaining money under false pretences.

Burnt to Death.—A man named Michael Daley, 60 years of age, was found dead on the floor of his room, in Boston, in consequence of his clothes taking fire, while he was in a state of intoxication.

Praiseworthy Bequest.—We learn from the Cambridge Chronicle, that among the bequests of the late Mr. Samuel P. Allen of that city, is one, which provides that the interest of a certain sum be annually distributed among the poor, and for charitable purposes generally; Mrs. A., his widow, being the almoner.

Steam Boiler Explosions.—In the Massachusetts Legislature, a motion has been made, that the Judiciary Committee consider the expediency of providing that stationary steam engines used for driving machinery shall be placed in buildings, and that persons in which the people connected with such establishments are employed. Also, whether any other legislation is necessary for the greater security of human life from the explosion of steam boilers.

Legislators.—In the Massachusetts Senate there are 10 merchants, 8 lawyers, 7 farmers, 6 manufacturers, 3 physicians, 2 soldiers and seamen, and 1 clergyman. In the House are 70 farmers, 30 merchants and traders, 25 lawyers, 16 manufacturers, 9 editors, &c.

Dreadful Accident.—A wedding took place at the house of an Irish woman in Philadelphia, recently, and while the bridesmaid, Miss Bridget Lynch, was retiring to bed, her clothes took fire from the explosion of a camphene lamp, and she was so shockingly burned that it is supposed she will not survive.

Suicide in Taunton.—Mrs. Betsey, wife of Charles Freeman, of Taunton, committed suicide on Tuesday of last week, by taking laudanum.

☞ Mr. James Maxwell, a conductor on the road between Portland and Boston, died at Portland, of consumption, on Thursday, 14th inst.

☞ The cost of the great suspension bridge over the Dnieper, at Kieff, in Russia, recently completed, was two millions of dollars. The model, and three thousand tons of iron used in the bridge, were furnished from England. In the Kieff, recently completed, the model and stand, of which the cost was thirty thousand dollars. The passage over which the bridge is thrown is half an English mile in length.

Crime at Fall River.—Mary O'Brien was found dead on Sunday morning, at Fall River, at the foot of a rocky bank thirty-five feet high, near the old railroad depot. She was found by a boy falling off of her, but the coroner's jury said the cause of her death was to them unknown. Pitman Freelove, a young married milkman, is under arrest for attempt at rape upon Mrs. Gershom B. Wordell, a young woman.

The Lawrence Tragedy.—The Coroner's Jury upon the body of Miss Catherine L. Adams, found dead in a sink near Lawrence, have returned the following verdict:—

'That Catherine L. Adams came to her death between the evening of the 21st Dec. last past, and the 6th of January following, (1850,) at the house of Moses P. Clark, in Lawrence, by means of an attempt to procure abortion—followed by a blow on the head with some weapon or instrument, and by suffocation from the application of cotton cloth over the mouth, done by some person or persons to the jury unknown.'

Dr. Clark and his wife have been arrested, and are to be examined on Tuesday next. He is sixty years of age, and formerly practiced in Georgetown, Mass.

ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR IN MILLVILLE.

The ladies of Millville and Hopedale will hold a Fair in aid of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, in DAGUERREO HALL, Millville, on Thursday and Friday, February 21st and 22d. WENDELL PHILLIPS is engaged to be present the first evening, and Miss Lucy Stone will be present the second evening. A variety of rich articles from friends of the cause in America and Great Britain will be offered for sale, with abundance of refreshments.

A band of music and choir of singers will also be in attendance. It is hoped that no friend of the cause will neglect this opportunity of at once aiding those in the 'house of bondage,' and securing a rare intellectual treat for himself.

WORCESTER COUNTY (SOUTH DIVISION) ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Annual Meeting of this Society will be held on Saturday and Sunday, Feb. 23d and 24th, at WORCESTER. The meeting will commence on *Saturday evening*, at 7 o'clock, at BRINLEY HALL.

PARKER PILLSBURY, SAMUEL MAY, JR., and LUCY STONE, with other speakers doubtless, will be present.

A general attendance of the members and friends of the Society is confidently expected.

HENRY GREENLEAF, *President.*
JOHN C. WYMAN, *Secretary.*

HENRY WATSON,

A fugitive slave, will speak in behalf of his enslaved countrymen in the following places:—

Newburyport,	Friday,	Feb. 22.
West Gloucester,	Saturday,	" 23.
Gloucester Harbor,	Sunday,	" 24.
Rockport,	Monday,	" 25.
Annisquam,	Tuesday,	" 26.

NORFOLK COUNTY A. S. SOCIETY.

A Quarterly Meeting of this Society will be held at NEPONSET, on THURSDAY, Feb. 26, commencing at 10 1-2 o'clock, A. M., and continuing through the day and evening.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, PARKER PILLSBURY, and other advocates of the cause are engaged to attend.

The meeting will be held in *Union Hall*, only a few yards from the Neponset Depot. This village being on the line of the Old Colony, South Shore, Fall River and Milton railroads, we hope to have a large gathering. Cars leave Boston at 6.30, 8, 9.30 A. M., 1.15, 2.45, and 5.15 P. M.; back to the city at 4.40 and 8 P. M. Plain refreshments will be provided, at or near the Hall, by the Abolitionists of Dorchester.

EDMUND QUINCY, *President.*
FRANKLIN WILLIAMS, *Secretary.*

MIDDLESEX COUNTY A. S. SOCIETY.

The Annual Meeting of this Society will be held in CONCORD, in the Vestry of the Unitarian Meeting-house, on TUESDAY, March 6, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M., and to continue through the day and evening.

PARKER PILLSBURY, LUCY STONE, SAMUEL MAY, JR., and other advocates of the anti-slavery cause, will be present.

The members and friends of the Society are requested to give a full and punctual attendance.

WILLIAM WHITING, *President.*
LEVI D. SMITH, *Secretary.*

ESSEX COUNTY ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

A Quarterly meeting of the Essex County A. S. Society will be held at Lynn on Saturday and Sunday, March 16th 23rd and 24th, to commence at 2 o'clock, P. M. The Board of Managers are desirous that this meeting should be one of the most spirited and profitable meetings ever held in this County. While Congress is almost wholly employed in discussing the questions, whether this curse of slavery shall be extended over one more territory or not, and whether in the old—while the whole South are excited to action, and are calling Conventions to take measures to strengthen Slavery—what are the friends of Freedom ought to be equally vigilant and active. Come, then, one and all, and take counsel together, and devise measures for the furtherance of our cause. Mr. Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Lucy Stone, with other eloquent speakers, have engaged to be present. Rev. Samuel Johnson, of Salem, will address the friends at the close of the meeting, Sunday evening, upon the present aspect of the cause, and the duty of the Abolitionists. Per order of the Board of Managers.

RUTH BUFFUM, *Rec. Sec.*

PARKER PILLSBURY,

An Agent of the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society, will lecture as follows:

Waltham,	Tuesday,	February 26.
East Abington,	Wednesday,	" 27,

and will attend the Neponset meeting, Thursday, the 28th.

ORNAMENTAL NEEDLE-WORK.

Mrs. HENRY BIRD will give instructions in Ornamental Needle-Work, in a course of lessons, commencing on Wednesday, February 20th, 23, and repeated every Wednesday and Saturday afternoon, at No. 8, Southac street, Boston. She has met with much success in Providence and Worcester, having been patronized by ladies without distinction of color. For further particulars, inquire at No. 8, Southac street.

THE PRISONER.

John M. Spear will give two discourses in the Unitarian meeting-house in Athol, next Sunday, on the Duty of Society to the Prisoner.

HOUSES IN NEPONSET.

For sale or to let, a two story house now building near Neponset Depot, containing eight rooms, and pleasantly situated on Neponset River, commanding a fine view of Dorchester, Commercial Point, Boston, the Harbor, Squantum and Quincy Bay, and within a short distance of the Depot, on the bank of Neponset river. If not sold in April, it will *be let for one year.* Also a cheap two story house near the Depot, price $1,000, payable in instalments, the first of April. Inquire of H. W. BLANCHARD, Neponset.

TAYLOR & LANE,

Business and Intelligence Office,

No. 100 Cambridge Street,

(Near the corner of Garden st.) BOSTON.

THE undersigned would respectfully inform the citizens of Boston and vicinity that they have taken the above place for the purpose of performing the following business:—

1. To give information to all persons who are in want of employment, or help in any kind of occupation, whether for mechanical or laboring purposes.

2. To take charge of hiring and letting houses, stores, &c.

3. To for

POETRY.

From the National Era.

SOUTHERN AND NORTHERN LOGIC.

The Southron says, 'All equal are,
To boast it is our glory;
But 'niggers' have no right to come
Within this category.
If dark the skin, 'tis clear as light
The owner is a brute, sir,
And therefore negroes are not men!
There, isn't that astute, sir?

'O yes,' says Jonathan, 'you're smart;
Of that I have no doubt, sir;
Your reasoning's good—perhaps 'twere better
If it were carried out, sir.
For negroes three* you get one vote—
That's one vote for three brutes, sir;
I've fifty cows—how many, then,
Ought I to have, my 'cute sir?

For if it be as you assert,
A negro has no mind, sir,
In brutish qualities my brutes
Leave negroes far behind, sir.
Your brutes have two legs, mine have four,
And they know how to use them;
Yours run from their kind master's door—
Mine never so abuse them.

From your brute's life there hangs a tale
Of misery and the lash, sir;
My brute's tale, never troubling me,
Hangs quiet as their backs, sir.
Then 'Primrose,' and 'Old Brindle' too,
Who feed upon my land, O,
Shall have a voice at Washington,
As well as Cuff and Sambo.

By long-eared Dobbin they will be
Most nobly represented;
In Halls of Congress he shall stand,
Braying like one demented.
For there he'll find a brotherhood
Of legislative asses;
But mind! he'll kick, if by their aid
Again a gag-law passes.

'Stop! stop!' says Southron, 'blacks *are* men,
Suppose we that allow, sir;
Their fathers were our fathers' slaves—
Why shouldn't *they* be ours, sir?'
Says Jonathan, 'Your argument
Shall meet no contradiction,
And we shall see the rule will work
Unto your own conviction.

'Your sire rebelled 'gainst British laws,
For which he did get hung, sir;
It follows, then, that 'round *your* neck
A rope, too, should be strung, sir.
If hoisted twenty feet in air,
From you we'd hear no more, then,
Of right to make men slaves, because
Their fathers were before them.'

* The number may be incorrect; I have no book at hand to ascertain.

From Douglass's North Star.

THE PLANTER'S ODE TO THE AMERICAN TREE OF LIBERTY.

The planter wears a broad brim hat,
Is sallow, lean and lank;
He hates John Bull because he's fat,
And hates a Boston Yankee.

He loves to smoke, to chew and spit,
And boast with nasal drawling;
In rocking-chair delights to sit,
With calfless legs wide sprawling.

He scorns to say that black is white,
Yet white he calls the yellows;
But black is odious in his sight,
The hue of nigger 'fellars.'

O'er sugar-canes the Planter gloats,
And cotton, rum, tobacco
On liberty he says he doats,
But here he tells a cracker.

'Tis human flesh 'free trade' he craves,
No freedom else he owns;
The blacks are born for cowhide slaves,
For lords the whitey-browns.

He breeds like sheep the sable race,
And turns them into dollars,
With iron heels he tramples their face,
And decks with chains and collars.

On flag of *stripes* the Planter doats—
'Tis Freedom's flag he waves:
The flag of Freedom, eh, that floats
O'er thy three million slaves?

Poor child of bondage! from thy birth
Thy *Christian* tyrant foe
Torments thy body, while on earth,
And seems thy soul to woe!

England, Jan. 1850. E. B.

WAR AND CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

BY J. O. SAXE.

We're all alike,—no thinking man defines
The people's temper by their party lines.
With high exceptions, few and far between,
Like spots of verdure in a winter scene,
From Rio Grande to Penobscot's flood,
The whole vast nation loves the smell of blood!

But wars cost money; and though fond of wars,
We worship Mammon quite as much as Mars,
And so consent the battle to forego,
And wait till Interest justifies the blow.
Meantime, though Mars upon the shelf is laid,
We yet can summon Draco to our aid.
The cockpit's vulgar; and the pleasant game
Of baiting bears is reckoned much the same;
The manly ring is held improper too;
The Duel's wicked, and will never do;
'Tis plain to see as any comet's tail,
That war's immoral on so small a scale!
But Draco's grave, decorous and discreet,
And gives diversion a respectable aspect,
'The most fastidious,'—in the showman's phrase,—
Can't be offended with his bloody ways,
For, like the doctors, though he cut and bleed,
He shows a broad diploma for the deed!
As boys a penny pleasure find in rags
On annual tigers in a travelling cage,
So by the strictest pathologic rule,
A monthly hanging keeps the nation cool!

SHALL CARNAGE NEVER CEASE?

What! shall the horrors of all war,
Tears, grief and carnage never cease
To blight the earth as heretofore?
Shall we be strangers still to Peace?
Forbid, sweet Heaven, our hands again
Should blush with fratricidal blood,—
Great God of the tribes of men,
Teach us to know our brotherhood.

Abroad on wings of lightning send,
Ye poets and ye sages true,
The heaven-born thoughts that soon will bend
A world of grateful hearts to you!
Share then your mental heritage,
And thus your moral courage prove;
And in the combats of our age,
Bless and subdue your foes with love.

Reformatory.

A SCRIPTURAL VIEW OF WOMAN'S RIGHTS AND DUTIES, IN ALL THE IMPORTANT RELATIONS OF LIFE.

MR. GARRISON:

We observe, in the Liberators of January 4th and 18th, that Henry Grew has made some remarks on the main position, namely, the equality of the sexes, which we have endeavored to establish in our work of the above title. Or, as our republicans say, 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men (mankind) are created equal.' &c. &c. Mr. Grew attempts to show not only man's official preeminence over woman in some relations of life, but also to show a *natural* distinction in the sexes as it respects rights; hence woman is not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Before we proceed to consider Mr. Grew's remarks, we gladly avail ourselves of the opportunity of tendering you, Mr. Garrison, our *grateful* acknowledgments for the encouraging and commendatory manner in which you have been pleased to notice our book. The kind and animating words of the editor of the Liberator, the gifted, far-sighted champion of human liberty, (whom we considered well qualified to judge, and no flatterer,) when 'Woman's Rights and Duties' first made its appearance, were opportune and highly gratifying, and inspired us with hope that our humble efforts would not be fruitless. We were well aware that it was the most unpopular question which could have been presented to the public, and would have to encounter opposition of a more or less malignant type. As an earnest that our expectations in this respect would not be disappointed, immediately after 'Woman's Rights and Duties' made its appearance, it was noticed in a number of religious periodicals in the city of Philadelphia, and censured with virulence, mingled, *in some*, with no small portion of buffoonery.[1] Extracts were given, torn from their contexts, and placed in connexions they did not occupy in the book. 'The school of Garrison, Abby Kelly & Co.' came in for their share of contumely, and ourselves classed with 'certain she infidels,' (as they, in their sublimity of style, were pleased to call them,) who were dangerous in the community, endeavoring to overturn all governments, and not striving to excite prejudice against the book. Pitiful subterfuge! we rejoice that our work has elicited investigation on this question, 'which is second to none in importance and extent.'

We will now proceed to make some brief observations on Mr. Grew's remarks, although every objection of any importance which he has offered has been considered in the book; it is before the public; it can speak for itself. Mr. C. commences by saying that 'he is an advocate for woman's rights.' We think this intimation highly necessary, as it could not have been discovered from the principles he exhibits. Then he proceeds to eulogize woman, as is common, 'for the constancy of her affections through all the vicissitudes of life,' &c. &c. She has been a good, faithful family drudge, watching over man with 'enduring patience,' in seasons of helpless infancy, in his sickness and his sorrows. Are men manifesting gratitude to their mothers, when they are torturing their imagination to show how much lower than men women are in the scale of humanity? Mr. G. acknowledges that 'man has exercised dominion over woman which God never gave him, that he has grossly perverted the institution of marriage, to gratify the pride, carnality and selfishness of his depraved heart; has robbed woman of her rights, and himself of the benefits which a recognition of those rights imparts.' Thus acknowledging all that we charge man with, and also acknowledging the evil consequences resulting. Then the prophecy is fearfully fulfilled, 'Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee,' striking hands with Satan, 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman.' We most emphatically ask brother Grew, if there ever was any class of the human family, who claimed such an amount of authority as the male sex claims over the female, who did not abuse it? How is it known when woman is robbed of her rights? If she has less than man, how much less? If she has less rights in one respect, why not in another? Mr. G. exhibits great zeal in order to prove that woman is *inferior* to man *by nature*; he must think there are two human natures, and that sex is the criterion.

We will now attend to the texts which Mr. G. has cited to prove the inequality of the sexes. He says—'It is recorded that God said, it is not good that man should be alone; I will make an helpmeet for him. That neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man; and the man is the image and glory of God, but the woman is the glory of the man.' He exclaims, 'Is there no difference here? Is this the language of perfect equality?' Farther, he says, 'In respect to authority and submission, it is written not only thy husband shall rule over thee, but the head of the woman is the man.' Thus is, she son is the mother's head as to subjection and authority, as he is the man, and she is a woman. Mr. Grew's rights are all one-sided. As he is a great admirer of Paul, we will ask his opinion on this matter. What duty does the head owe the body, say you, Paul? 'No man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth it and cherisheth it even as the Lord the Church.' Does Paul say, in any place, any thing about the heart ruling the body? What duty say you, Paul, do the honorable members of the body owe to those members they consider less honorable? Do they rule them? No; upon these they bestow more abundant honor, that there may be no schism in the body. Mr. G. thinks that it was just for man's pleasure that woman was and is created. Now, 'Gird up thy loins like a man, for I will demand of thee, and answer thou me.' 'Where was' man when God entered into the consultation, and laid the plan of man and woman's creation, at the same time, and for the same purpose? Gen. 1:26. Are we to suppose that the only purpose God had in creating man and woman was to take the oversight of the beasts, because He said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion?' As far as man was concerned, woman was made for him. 'Was it for her to be added as another subject to his government? No; it was because he was not capable of answering the end of his being without a helpmeet; the plan of creation was not finished until woman was created, and so till then, as far as mankind's creation was concerned, did God pronounce all very good, but the contrary; it was not good for man to be alone. There is as much reason to believe that man is inferior to woman, as there is that woman is inferior to man, because he could not do without her. But Mr. Grew says, 'Woman was made of the man,' and exclaims, 'Is this perfect equality?' Not of the dust of the ground, like Adam.

Mr. Henry, in his Commentary, with reference to this, says, 'The man was dust refined, but the woman dust double-refined—one remove farther from the earth.' Is this perfect equality? Christ was made of a woman. Does that make woman superior to Christ? Now, if man has a right to glory, because woman was made of him, here woman more. And Christ was made for his people, and not his people for him, as far as his human nature was concerned. And it is fashionable, now a days, for all men to be by the woman. Is this perfect equality? 'The woman is the glory of the man.' Is it inferior things that are our glory? All these things you have mentioned are mere adventitious circumstances, and have nothing to do with our rights. Our rights are kill in the intellectual and moral nature of man; and our capacity to rule is from the *same source*—the *Godlike attributes of our nature*. We receive facilities from our physical organization, but not our rights. When we say man and woman are perfect equals, we mean they are equals in moral and intellectual beings, hence equal as to rights.

We will now consider some criticisms that Mr. Grew has made on some of the sentiments we have exhibited in our book. One proof we gave why man and woman were created equal was, they were made of one blood. See book, p. 17. He says, 'This proves too much, as it would destroy the authority of the master over the child, and that of the master over the servant.' There is no Scripture authority predicated on superiority, for the person in authority to the subject, mentioned in Christ's precepts. The authority of father and mother over the child is entirely for the child's benefit; and the parents are emphatically the servants, if they perform their duty faithfully. When the child arrives at the age of majority, the parents' authority ceases. Nor is it on the principle of superiority that the master has authority over the servant. There is a mutual and reciprocal contract between them; and the servant is as much obliged as the master, and has equal rights and privileges (if not a slave). There may be a great difference in their circumstances, and in their rights. The servant has perfect control over every thing that belongs to himself, and all his time not given away by contract—perhaps as much unoccupied time as his master; but he has no right to go into his employer's house and conduct his business as he pleases, except the employer delegates this authority. And the servant, in his turn, can direct those he employs to do business for himself. For example, if a tailor makes him a garment, he has a right to direct the form and choose the material. We are all servants, and members one of another. 'If that this was better understood and acted on as a principle, with none would arrogate to himself superiority, but all act as brethren, according to the directions of our Lord. Mr. G. says—'Pages 22, 23,' (of our book,) 'individuality is claimed for the woman. She is not to be merged in the husband. Yet to prove that there can be no *superiority*, or inferiority, they are pronounced one.' To prove that they are one in authority, the words of the Savior are quoted, I and my Father are one.' He says, 'If these words prove equality of authority, then the prayer of our blessed Lord, that his disciples may be one as he and his Father, were as (they) are one, proves their equal authority with the Father and the Son.'

We said, as far as husband and wife are concerned, they are pronounced one, and where there is no divisibility, there can be no superiority or inferiority; for there is no individuality. There is no contradiction here. For example: these United States are one in their national character, yet each State retains its individuality and sovereignty, governing its own internal regulations. But whatever affects their interests as a nation is decided in the National Legislature, each State having a voice in the decision. In like manner, the husband has a right to do as he pleases with what relates to himself personally, as far as the wife is concerned, provided he does not violate her rights; and the wife has just the same rights; but when both their interests are involved, they have both a voice in the decision. Neither husband nor wife can resign their personal liberty, because God still holds them accountable as individuals. We did *not* quote the words of the Savior, I and my father are one, to prove the equality of authority of husband and wife, as quoted them to show that it would be the common understanding and mind, that when two individuals constitute but one person, they must be equals; and that the Jews understood Christ to say that he was equal with God, when he said, I and my father are one; and he taught us that we should do to others as we would, there is no comparison between the oneness of believers in Christ with the Father. What mere human being can be one with God in his essential character? We might be one with him in love and aim, &c. &c. It is said, 'man was made in the image of God. Do we understand from this, that God has man the first? or a 'secondary God,' as our brethren please to style themselves? Certainly not. But when Seth is said to be in his father Adam's likeness, and after his image, Gen. 5:3, we understand Seth to be an exact image and likeness of his father, (as the Almighty is a perfect portrait painter,) in all the characteristics of humanity, because Adam and Seth were of the same essence and grade of being. So when husband and wife are said to be one, as they are creatures of the same grade and essence, it implies they are perfect equals. Mr. G. says—'by what logical process it is inferred from the command to children to honor both parents, that wives are not to be obedient to their husbands, we have yet to learn.' Well, we do not profess to be adepts in logical lore, but the common sense view we take of it is, it is the spirit and performance duty of children to honor their most important reason why families are organized, is to rule and discipline children; and woman thus rules and disciplines, hence she is a *governor* of that family in the most important feature of family government, not a subordinate.

Another example: it is only the right of an equal ruler in the family to give of the pecuniary means of that family, in extreme cases against the will of her associate. Then the wife is an equal governor of the family, for Abigail gave of the pecuniary means of the family, against the expressed will of Nabal, and it was sanctioned by God. Had she not been an equal ruler in that family, she would have been an usurper, a thief and a robber. Could she have obeyed 'God and her husband both.' in that case? We have shown in Sarah, the second chapter of our work, that there is not a moral duty incumbent on the husband, in the family relation, but that is also incumbent on the wife. There is no room left for the husband's legislation; and when their duties are the same, their rights must also be the same. Mr. Grew says—'That their duties are *entirely* the same is not true. Wives are to be obedient to their own husbands, but husbands are not told to be obedient to their wives.' It is one of the duties of the husband, 'to care for the things of the world, how he may please his wife.' It is not in any place said to the wife, that she that loveth her husband loveth herself, or that she is to nourish and cherish the husband, even as the Lord the Church. Are we to suppose that the wife is not to perform these duties, because she is not specially directed to do so, if the case demands, and she has ability? Most certainly she should. And then it would become the duty of the husband to submit and be obedient to her, nourishing and cherishing. But would it confer a favor on her to rule him? It would only add a tremendous responsibility. God forbid that he should have to resign his liberty for a period of years, or that she should assume superiority over him, from the circumstance of ability to do him an act of kindness, even if he had reduced himself to that situation by debauchery, (which is frequently the case.)

Mr. Grew attempts to prove the husband's authority and the wife's subordination from the wife's duty to the husband. Is not the husband's duty to the wife, &c. &c. Certainly we have the same authority to judge of duties reciprocal duties by the directions given to the husband; a rule is not a good one, except it work both ways.

We will now examine the kingly authority claimed for the husband, from the revealed will of God. 'When a man takes to wife a new wife, he shall not go out to war, neither shall he be charged with any business; but he shall be free at home one year, and shall cheer up the wife which he hath taken.' Deut 24:5. 'Her husband, also, and he praiseth her.' Prov. 31:28. No kingly authority yet. He, 'the husband, hath not power over his own body, but the wife,' 1st Cor. 7:4. 'He that is married careth for the things of the world, how he may please his wife.' Verse 33. Is there any kingly authority here? 'He (the husband) is the savior of the body.' Eph. 5:23. 'Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it.' Verse 25. Is this kingly? 'So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies; he that loveth his wife, loveth himself.' v. 28. 'For no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it even as the Lord the Church.' v. 29. 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and be joined unto his wife, and the two shall be one flesh.' v. 31. 'Let every one of you, in particular, so love his wife, even as himself.' v. 33. 'Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them.' Colos. 3:19. No kingly authority yet. 'Likewise, ye husbands dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel.' 1st Peter, 3:7. What! the husband honor the wife, as well as the wife to reverence the husband! Is this not perfect equality? 'And God said unto Abraham, in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice.' Gen. 21:12. Now, here is a command given to Abraham to be obedient unto the voice of his wife, in a most important matter. Is this a proof of his kingly authority over Sarah? If it had been from the husband to the wife, how we would have heard it heralded abroad, as a triumphant example of the husband's right to command! Brother Grew attempts to show that we contradicted ourselves when we asserted that there was not one instance, on divine record, of a husband's commanding a wife. 'Afterwards,' he says, 'we admit Gen. 18:6 to be one.' We presume our brother means Gen. 18:6. Why not contrast us with the portion of Scripture which contains the command, namely, Abraham telling his wife to bake cakes? It has only excited the risibility of our hearers to call it a command! We would respectfully advise our brother never to bring it up again. It do incontrovertibly prove of his ability to produce such testimony, compared with these inspired precepts. What must be our estimation of the assertion, that the husband is invested with the kingly authority of Christ, (!!) when there is nothing like the semblance of kingly or lawgiving authority on the side of the husband, from Scripture authority, either by precept or example? This kingly authority of the husband is like Paddy's flea, when we put our finger on it, it is not there! Nor would ruling her have any tendency to nourish her, and it would be subversive of the end proposed, namely, gladdening her heart; as every individual of mature age and judgment has an instinctive desire to rule themselves. The comparisons drawn between husband and wife, masters and servants, magistrates and subjects, parents and children, have no bearing on the question at issue; they are all parallel cases. The wife is the husband's companion, and his associate in the government of his family. See 'Woman's Rights,' pp. 63 and 70.

Mr. G. says—'The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church. Eph. 5:23. If the phrase in the former case denotes no authority, neither does it in the latter.' He says—'Our zealous author refutes her own ingenious arguments for the claim of entire equality, by the concession, that the husband's character in temporalities corresponds to Christ's in spiritual matters.' It is only as far as nourishing and cherishing are concerned, that we made those concessions, *not ruling*; nor is it because woman is unqualified by nature more than man to nourish and cherish herself, nor is it that she should be cared, and her companion burdened, but that there *should be a mutual care*; that it may be as useful, as arduous, as important and as honorable, as is man's, and far more self-sacrificing; and administers as much to man's interest and happiness as man does to hers. He is both physically and morally benefitted by her society. 'Their dependance is mutual, and their obligations are mutual.'

Mr. G. says—'The declaration that Christ is the head of the Church implies his authority in spiritual matters.' Where is the proof? Is Christ spoken of as ruling the Church in connection with his headship? He dispenses spiritual blessings in his character of head, but disclaims rule. He says, 'That He (Christ) is the patron, protector, and owner of his Church is true, but no more true than that he is her *king* and *lawgiver*.' (Christ is her prophet and priest, also. Does the husband occupy these offices?) 'The difference, as to authority, is simply, in the case of Christ and his Church, and the husband and wife are indeed widely different.' How wide is the difference? Paul makes no difference; he says, they are of like extent 'in every thing,' and you say it is Christ's kingly authority to which he has reference. Define your position. How will you know when you are doing your duty, if you are unacquainted with its extent? Do not back out, brother Grew, when you are about ascending the throne of Christ, not as an understrapper, like the Pope, but just like Christ himself, exalted above any earthly potentate. Don't hide away your talent in a napkin. Let us, 'when you are just about to be inaugurated. This is not boys playing king. Mr. G. says, 'God is the Legislator of the family.' He is now dethroned, and man is the occupant. Put on your magnificent robes, wouldbe sovereign head, bring all your dignity into requisition. 'Deck yourself with majesty, and excellency; and array thyself with glory and beauty. Cast abroad the rage of thy wrath; and behold every one that is proud, and abase him.' And if your subject proves contumacious, then visit her transgression with a rod, and her iniquities with stripes. This is your indisputable right, as God's vice gerent. As many as you love, rebuke and chasten; you claim to have on your vesture and on your thigh a name written, King of Wife and Lord of Woman!' Blasphemy.

Now, let us take a view of this sovereign on the throne, who is so much inflated with power, the head of the wife, a being all head; a *heartless monster!* How can the head act distinct from the body? The body and head constitute but one individual; consequently, one person cannot be both ruler and subject.

It may be observed, in the reasons Mr. G. gives for man's authority, there is *not one* a moral or intellectual character; nor does he adduce *one argument* to show the moral fitness of his arrangement. Just dominion for its own sake! He disclaims the mental faculties having any thing to do with the question at issue. The legislation governing the premises in that woman was made, and placed under the government of man, to show the might of his power, and for the honor of his majesty! The admirers of the kingly authority of the husband are hard pushed for testimony—their testimony either proves too much or too little.

When the husband is considered to represent Christ in his mystical character, as head of influences dispensing spiritual blessings, nourishing and cherishing the Church, it is involved in no absurdities, and requires no strained construction of Scripture, accords with the duties assigned the husband by Scripture authority, and also the liberties of the wife, and the loving, sweet companionship of husband and wife. And it comports with the functions that Christ represents himself to exercise, when He represents himself as the husband of the Church. He gives no laws in the character of husband or mystical head. See 'Woman's Rights,' p. 56. No person will doubt that the husband has a moral right to love, nourish and cherish the wife, as the Lord the Church. If he has not physical ability, that is not his fault; a man is accepted for what he has, and not for what he has not. No person believes that the husband has a moral right to rule the wife, as Christ rules the Church, 'in every thing.' Mr. Grew *repudiates the opinion* himself.

With Mr. Garrison's permission, we will consider Mr. Grew's remarks on the position of woman in the Christian Church in a subsequent number.

ELIZABETH WILSON.

THE CHRIST OF JUDEA.

Extracts from a work on 'Moralism and Christianity; or Man's Experience and Destiny. In Three Lectures, Delivered in Hanover Street Chapel in New York by J. S. Redfield, and for sale by Bela Marsh, 25 Cornhill, Boston:—

The literal Christ has passed away; never again shall we behold him after the flesh, or finitely. The literal Jesus has also impel death; never more shall its altars smoke, nor shall the sound of tabor and pipe enliven its streets. But both Judea and the Jews have a spiritual resurrection or glorification—Judea in the arts and institutions of our modern civilization; the Christ in all those instincts of freedom, in all those aspirations after peace, after harmony, and the more nobly disciplined exercise of one's faculties of action, which are subtly but irresistibly laying that civilization law.

I have a perfect faith that Christianity had never such vitality on earth as now; that all those great events which occurred under Herod and Pontius Pilate, were, first, only figurative of the transcendent realities in which we live, in us and not. The controversy of the Christ with the Jew, and his delivery by the Jew into the hands of the Roman, only symbolize the present controversy which the interests of human individuality encounter at the hands of the Church, and the interested sycophancy of the latter to the Roman, the temporal power. Once gets tired of witnessing the barren idolatry of Jesus, an idolatry which consists with the habitual profanation of every truth he uttered and put into life; tired of hearing him called Lord! Lord! while a yet we obey every influence to which he gave his life a sacrifice. For my own part, I seek to know Christ more and more, that I may do more like him. Infinite and perishable form. I seek to know him henceforth only in his second or infinite and universal manifestation, as the power of God in every individual soul. The sphere of God is the soul of universal humanity, and His highest revelation is in the individual life. I perceive, that a life that is whose every act and word are true to the sovereign soul within, will ever be the truest revelation of God, as it is the highest expression of Art.

When Jesus Christ, amidst the dripping scorn of all the devout minds of his nation, outpake the measureless kindness with which his heart was aglow towards the woman taken in adultery; when he confronted the dignitaries of his people, those who were esteemed by all his friends and neighbors as eminently the servants of God, and pronounced them mere actors or hypocrites, children of their father the devil; when he met the obtrusive and self-righteous impertinence of his mother by the stern rebuke, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?' when, finally, feeling in his deepest soul the shallowness and vanity of these merely natural ties, he said to those who told him that his mother and brethren stood without desiring to speak with him, that 'he had no mother nor brethren except such as did the will of God,' he, in all these cases, only typified that supreme and beautiful life which is yet to reveal itself in every man. He, indeed, exhibited the divine or perfect man under humiliation, under the obscuration of warring circumstance. His life did not seem beautiful, because the common or established life was so false as to turn his into an incessant protest against incessant wrong. But it was at bottom the most beautiful and sovereign life exhibited on earth. He alone, of all the race of men, has dared to be exactly true to his own soul, or God within him. When I find it so hard for myself to decline an invitation to some paltry tea-party, for fear of offending the customs of society; when I feel it a severe trial to forego the empty and expensive ceremony of mourning, lest some infinitesimal moralist be shocked; when I hide my hands between my knees at the opera, lest I should offend some one of their destitution of an orthodox covering; when I hide away my cards on a Sunday evening for fear of my neighbors' censure; when I cower and quail before me at whist with my children; the contrast I am thus made aware of between him and me, leaves me little doubt of his greatness.

He seems, indeed, the only man in history. All other men seem but lacqueys. For the peculiarity of Christ's manhood, the very divinity of his manhood, was that, that he was superior to the spirit of his time, and finally fell a victim to it. Unlike the moralist, he despised the cheap fame which flows from popular sympathies, and for this reason he never failed on any occasion to justify the criminal. I cannot find, in all my persevering search of the gospels, an instance in which Christ was found executing himself above the blackest sinner. He seems to have had no outward sanctity of any sort. He ate and drank with the common herd, that they whose righteousness very clearly consisted in oddities of diet, and other ritual whimsicalities, were fain to consider him gluttonous, and a wine-bibber. I find no instance, in his life or history, in which he ever did a stroke of work whereby to gain a living. On the contrary, so far as *any* light is shed upon the subject, he appears to have preferred living by the free-will charity of his followers, some elderly women being incidentally designated as those who ministered to him of their substance. Not a single word is reported of his concern about observing the Sabbath, but on the contrary, he is described as profaning it to the popular estimation by doing things upon it which were commonly thought unlawful. And finally, he did not hesitate to declare that the kingdom promised in so many words to his people by their sacred prophets, a kingdom over the whole earth, should never be theirs, that setting himself in direct and glaring opposition to the whole obvious scope of sacred scriptures.

I see not, for my own part, how the respectable and orderly classes among the Jews could have acted otherwise than they did with Jesus. I see not, indeed, how we shall be able to justify the Christ historically upon any of the current maxims of morality. It seems to me, that if he were to re-appear in our day, we should be called to regard him as menacing the peace of society. For though he should himself infringe no statute of the moral law, yet if, whilst avowedly acting in the name of God, he should set himself to assume, as we condemn to imprisonment and death, 'I do not condemn thee, go and sin no more,' we should feel that he was grinding the principles of morality, the prevailing ethics, and tacitly rebuking our most hallowed institutions.

I am indeed well aware that the Christ is commonly reputed to have been a zealous friend of the current morality. I know very well that he is commonly reputed to have come not for the purpose of fulfilling the law by the introduction of a better righteousness than the law itself conferred, but of re-acting it in an intensely aggravated form. And it is easy to see how this fallacious representation has come about. The great controversy between Jesus and the Jew was as to the true divine name by which the spirit-world stood approved in God's sight. The Jew contended that it was the man who was blameless in all the moral righteousness, in all the righteousness required by the law of Moses. Very well, replied Jesus, but a law to be fulfilled truly, must be fulfilled in the spirit, as well as the letter. 'Now, as for you, you have neither love to God nor love to the neighbor, if you do not in your hearts love your neighbors as yourselves, but on the ground of your superior holiness, you assume to lord over them, it is quite manifest that you miss the whole spirit of the law, and stand condemned by your own standard. It is another Moses, I may be argued, of a divine man, that he zealously obeys the literal enactments of the law. Every thing depends upon the spirit with which the law's obedience is rendered, whether with a spirit of love to the neighbor, or with a spirit of self-exaltation. He alone truly fulfils the law who regards it not as a task imposed by an outward authority, and who, in view therefore to its rewards, but with an inward delight, as breathing the divinest and most universal love. It justifies no man but him who does its works for their own sake alone, and not as a means to his own spiritual distinction above other men; who does them not because he may thereby commend himself to the divine favor, but only because of their intrinsic consonance with his own profoundest life. In a word, he who truly fulfils the law does so it *from* life, and not *to* life; must do it spontaneously, and not from a mere sense of obligation.

☞ Of all remittances of money from California, made during the last two months, through the house of Ing houfe of Willis & Co., Boston; 207 were in favor of women, who have husbands or sons in that country.

Desertions in the Whaling Fleet.—A letter received in New Bedford, reports that the harbor of Honolulu was full of whalemen, and officers and crews were deserting at every opportunity. The mountains are said to be full of runaway sailors. Recruits were high, owing to large numbers having been shipped to California.

Whittier's Poems.

B. B. MUSSEY & CO.
HAVE just issued a new and splendid edition of the above popular work. It is printed on the best of paper, and embellished with fifteen fine steel engravings. It is to be had at the store, 29 Cornhill. Feb. 15.

Great Cough Remedy!

AYER'S
CHERRY PECTORAL
For the Cure of
COUGHS, COLDS, HOARSENESS, BRONCHITIS, WHOOPING-COUGH, CROUP, ASTHMA and CONSUMPTION.

THE annals of medical science, affording as they do ample proof of the power and value of many medicinal agents, have furnished no examples to compare with the salutary effects produced by AYER'S CHERRY PECTORAL.

The remarkable cures of diseases of the lungs which have been made by its use, attested as they are by many prominent professors and physicians in this and foreign lands, should encourage the afflicted to persevere, with the strong assurance that the use of the CHERRY PECTORAL will relieve and ultimately cure them.

We present to the public unsolicited testimonials from some of the first men in our country, upon whose judgment and experience implicit confidence may be placed.

DR. PERKINS, President of Vermont Medical College.

Sir, one of the most learned and intelligent physicians in the country, considers it a 'composition of great excellence for the cure of that formidable disease, Consumption.

NORWICH, April 26, 1847.

Dr. J. C. Ayer—Dear Sir—Agreeably to the request of your agent, we will certainly state what we have known of the effects of your CHERRY PECTORAL and they have been astonishing indeed. Mrs. Betsey Streeter has been afflicted with a severe and relentless cough, which reduced her very low that little hope could be entained of her recovery. Numerous remedies had been tried without effect before the CHERRY PECTORAL; and she was cured thereby. George Walker, Rowdon College, Dr. Buttersfield, Willoughby College, Ohio; Prof. Martin Hawes, Leeds (Eng.) Medical College; Sir Richard Kane, Queen's College, Ireland; Prof. Rosenbaum Leipsic.

The public have but to know the virtues and astonishing effects of the CHERRY PECTORAL in curing diseases of the Lungs, when they will feel assured from these hundreds of testimonials, they can be obtained.

☞ Prepared by J. C. AYER, Chemist, Lowell, Mass., and sold by Druggists everywhere.

Jan. 25 3m

SOLOMON GUESS'S

Indian Blood Purifier.

A VALUABLE remedy for Liver Complaint, Jaundice, Dyspepsia, Costiveness, Dropsy, Search Warrant, and Tonic Compound, superior article for Fevers, Cramp, Cholera, Pleurisy, Rheumatism, Piles, Diarrhea, Summer Complaints, Fever, attacks, &c.

These Medicines are recommended, and are expressly prepared for family use; and as they are so admirably calculated to preserve health and restore health to the sick, they are highly valuable. The proprietor of these valuable Medicines derived his knowledge and skill of preparing them from those who had been among the Indians for many years, and has had experience in an extensive and diversified practice, by which he has had ample opportunities of acquiring a practical knowledge of diseases, and of remedies best calculated to remove them.

BOSTON, Jan. 10, 1848.

This is to certify, that I was afflicted with weak and sore eyes, and had tried many kinds of medicine, but never obtained any relief. I had spent thirty dollars at the Eye Infirmary, without experiencing any benefit; but on using Solomon Guess's Indian Blood Purifier,' I was effectually cured. MICHAEL ONLY.

BOSTON, Feb. 10, 1848.

This is to certify, that I have been troubled with an attack of Consumption, and had tried many different kinds of medicines, but never obtained any relief, until I made use of Solomon Guess's celebrated Medicine, called the Indian Blood Purifier, and after taking three bottles, I soon recovered my health again. WILLIAM TWAY.

BOSTON, July 25, 1848.

This is to certify, that I was very ill with the Chills, and by hearing of Solomon Guess's Medicine, called the Indian Blood Purifier, and taking a few doses of said Medicine, I was permanently cured. JOHN BROWN.

BOSTON, Aug. 24, 1848.

This is to certify, that I was very ill of the Diarrhea, and after taking Solomon Guess's Medicine, called the Indian Tonic Compound, I obtained immediate relief. CAROLINE WILLIAMS.

BOSTON, Aug. 12, 1848.

This is to certify, that I was very ill with the Diarrhea, and after taking Solomon Guess's celebrated Medicine, called the Indian Tonic Compound, I soon recovered my health. COFFIN PITTS.

BOSTON, April 26, 1848.

I hereby certify, that for some years past I have been troubled with a complaint called Neuralgia, and after taking three bottles of 'The Blood Purifier,' prepared by Solomon Guess, consider myself perfectly cured. M. J. JOHNSON.

BOSTON, Feb. 12, 1848.

This is to certify, that I was attacked with the Pleurisy Fever, and after taking Solomon Guess's celebrated Medicine, called the Search Warrant, I soon recovered my health. GEORGE CLARK.

BOSTON, May 2, 1848.

I hereby certify, that for some time past I have been severely troubled with Rheumatic pains, and happening to hear of Solomon Guess's celebrated Medicine, called the 'Search Warrant,' and 'Blood Purifier,' I am now perfectly cured, and I do recommend the excellent health. F. ANNATEST.

BOSTON, May 3, 1848.

I hereby certify, that a short time since I inhaled ether, for the purpose of undergoing a short surgical operation, which produced severe spasms and pain in my side and head. I took two or three doses of Solomon Guess's Medicine, such as is recited in the foregoing certificates, and was almost immediately relieved. HUTSON KNIGHTS.

☞ Sold in Boston, wholesale and retail, by the Proprietor, Solomon Guess, No. 4 Friend street, Boston, *Principal Office*, and at No. 32 Brattle street; in New Bedford, by Thomas Bliss, Third street, and by Wm. Gates, Div. 55, N. E. Protective Union, south side of the market; in Fairhaven, by Joseph Mosher, Toll-house; in Nantucket, by Edward Mitchell, Main street.