





teful features as this. In its general tone and spirit, it makes charity a crime, and puts out of the way the sacred principle of liberty. It strikes us as a reflection on the liberty of the citizen which has been extorted from tyranny through centuries of blood, from the time the victorious barons Runnymede extorted Magna Charta from King John to the present. It denies the right of trial by jury where more than life and property is concerned. It prohibits the *habeas corpus*—the writ of liberty. It prevents the confronting of the witnesses with the accused, and deprives him of the right of an open and fair cross-examination. It gives a direct and open right to the judge to decide in favor of the rich, against the poor and friendless—small, indeed, but sufficient, for no one will hold office where he may be an executioner of this inhuman law, whose integrity would be profaned against bribes of five dollars. Treating persons as property, and the claimants of this species of property as privileged above others, it provides for the return of, upon the mere suggestion of apprehended danger, at the expense of the public Treasury.

In my judgment, it is unconstitutional in this respect, that it is not within the power of legislation granted to Congress, and it is unconstitutional in its terms, as it is in compliance with the requirements of the Constitution. I know it is contended that the commissioners referred to in this act have a right to try, do not act as judges; but that they are only ministerial officers, and their only office is to return persons to the place from which they fled, or trial there; and we are gravely assured that justice always prevails in Southern tribunals. The proceedings under this act are likened to those for the return of persons accused of crime. But the manifest distinction is, that the act is formally demanded by the Executive of one State from the Executive of another, that he will neither be demanded nor surrendered by such magistrates, unless responsibly charged, by indictment found, or on a case otherwise satisfactorily established, with a crime generally acknowledged as a felony; and when surrendered, he is put into the charge and keeping of the law and its officers for trial only, and is to be taken to the particular State and county where charged with crime, to be tried by a jury, and in an open, fair, and legal way, in the other case, a citizen may be claimed by some base speculator, who has bought a negro running, and may prove a general description by deposition of straw-headed witnesses whom nobody has ever seen, and make an unimpeachable record under this law, which would not be a respectable record for a justice's court; and the man seized under such proceedings is beyond the relief of *habeas corpus*, and is given up, not as in the other case to the officers, and put under the protection of the law as an accused citizen, with an acknowledged right to a public trial, but surrendered as property to a master, who, instead of returning where either are known, may sell him to hopeless bondage in the nearest slave mart. The trial, or mockery of trial, before the commissioner, is therefore final, and his judgment conclusive, and subject to no appeal or review. Is he not, then, to all intents a judge, exercising most important judicial functions?

We do not propose the repeal of this law; let it stand, a fit monument of the folly and madness of the times; but it is not enough to try the *temper* as well as the faith of the believer in human progress, that such a law could be passed by an enlightened Republic, in the nineteenth century, and that it is made not only the test of the citizen's loyalty to his country, but of the Christian's to his God? It must have been expected—I believe it was intended that such a law should produce counter legislation in the free States—that personal liberty bills would be passed as they have been—ought not half as stringent as they are, to be—ought to discharge the duty which every independent State owes to each of its citizens, however humble—I mean protection to their personal liberty.

It must have been expected that so infamous a law would have been evaded by underground railroads, and by all other honorable methods. And let me assure gentlemen that there is any real difference in sentiment among Northern people in relation to this law. All parties are in the same relation to it. All sympathize with the fugitive who proves, by a successful flight, that there is enough man in him to make an earnest effort for freedom. He who can suppress such sympathy, and on the requisition of the marshal, under the fifth section, attempts to show that he is a good citizen by aiding and assisting in the prompt and efficient execution of this law whenever his services are required, ought himself to be a slave.

I am not, sir, a believer in the doctrine that a bad, infamous, and unconstitutional enactment—cannot be obeyed—should be obeyed until it is repealed. I have not so learned the true spirit and genius of free and democratic government. No citizen would ever be sustained in any factious resistance to just and equal laws, upon any light and trivial ground of inconvenience, or even unavoidable and unintentional hardship; but where a real question of personal and civil right and liberty is involved, or the rights of conscience are invaded, it is the duty of the citizen to resist. In a question of right and conscience, the individual citizen is the final judge, and not the Government, or any branch thereof, Executive, Judicial, or Legislative. If the encroachments of the Government are generally tyrannical and oppressive, so that they become intolerable, there is the well-established remedy in the people—the right of revolution. If the tyranny does not reach the whole State, nor call for that last resort of an oppressed people, but only is directed at a sect, a class, or even an individual, there is the equally clear and indisputable right of peaceful resistance short of revolution. So the Friend resists the law compelling men to bear arms, and the Catholic the tax on his church, and the abolitionist the law of an unjust and wicked law, public attention is called to its injustice, and the wholesome lesson is taught, that

"Firm endurance wins at last  
More than the sword."

And so I contend that no citizen in a Republic discharges his duty, who fails to bring an infamous law into public odium and disgrace, and steadfastly to resist its encroachments. So old Eleazar taught, when he refused to eat the flesh abhorred by his conscience and his religion, or even to seem to eat it; and rather than submit to the law which demanded it, went manfully to the torment, lest he should bring reproach upon his gray hairs, and the excellent of his most honorable years; and so he died, leaving a notable example of courage, not to young men only, but to all generations. This was the teaching of Milton, and Hampden, and Sidney; and in our own age and land, of Otis, and Adams, and the patriots and martyrs of the Revolution. And I regard it as a sign of the degeneracy of the times, that the test of good citizenship in a free Government has come to be blind and unresisting submission to judicial or legislative, any more than to executive tyranny; and if this be treason, make the most of it."

Mr. Mason. I would suggest to the Senate, what I did not know until since this question was last before the Senate, that there is another memorial from the same man, which was presented here some considerable time since, and laid upon the table. I presume I was absent from the Senate at the time when it was presented. I did not know until there was such a memorial until it was brought to my notice a few days ago. I suggest to the Senate that both papers be taken up at the same time.

Mr. Sumner. I have no objection.

Mr. Mason. It will be understood, then, that both memorials are now before the Senate.

Mr. Sumner. The first memorial was not presented by me, and I have no distinct recollection of it. I remember that there was a memorial from Mr. Sanborn, but the precise purport of it is not in my mind.

Mr. Mason. I did not examine who presented it; nor is it a matter of moment, I presume. I did not know such a memorial was presented, nor was it brought to my notice, until since the subject was last up.

Now, Mr. President, only for the purpose of determining what the precedent of the Senate shall be in a like case, I shall object to the reference, or if it be in order as the superior motion, which the Chair will decide, I shall move that both memorials be rejected, upon the ground that the memorials are rejected, upon the ground that the memorials, by the statements contained in them, show, in both instances, that he is in contempt of the authority of the Senate, and refuses to obey it; and by analogy (and I think a very proper analogy) to proceedings in a court of law, where a witness in contempt, as it is called—usually a technical contempt—where he denies or disobeys contumaciously the authority of the judiciary, as in this case—I suggest this person has denied and disobeyed the authority of the Senate—he is not allowed to come before the tribunal, except for the purpose of purging himself from the contempt. I move, therefore, that both memorials be rejected, if that be the superior motion.

The Vice President.—The Chair will state to the Senator from Virginia, that these memorials have been received, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. Mason. I am perfectly aware that I cannot move that the memorials be received, because they have already been received; but they have only been received as a presentation, a pending question before the Senate; and the question would then be: "What disposition is to be made of the papers?" In my judgment, a motion to reject is not an equivalent motion to a motion to receive. We cannot know the contents of a paper until it is presented; and it is on the presentation in contempt; and it is on the presentation in contempt that I move to reject them both. Perhaps it is necessary that the memorials be read, that we may know what their contents are. I ask, therefore, that they may be read.

The Vice President. If there be no objection, the memorials will be read.

Mr. Mason. I will suggest, and I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts will concur, that as both are before the Senate, the one first offered be the first read in continuity.

Mr. Sumner. I know nothing about the one first offered.

Mr. Mason. As you please, sir.

Mr. Sumner. My own motion was, that the memorial offered by myself, in which Mr. Sanborn complains of an outrage perpetrated upon him by certain persons pretending to act in the name of the Senate, be taken up and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Vice President. This is the only memorial before the Senate at this time.

Mr. Mason. Let it be taken up.

Mr. Hale. I thought the Senator from Virginia moved that the first memorial be taken up.

The Vice President. The Chair has no recollection of that motion.

Mr. Mason. I will not press it. I did move that it also be taken up, and understood it to meet the assent of the Senator from Massachusetts that they should be considered together; but I do not press the motion. Let the last one be taken up.

The Vice President. Does the Senator object for the reading of the memorial presented by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. Mason. Yes, sir.

The Vice President. The Secretary will read it.

After the memorial had been read, Mr. Mason proceeded—

Mr. Mason. I did not hear whether the Chair had finally decided that a motion to reject took precedence of a motion to refer.

The Vice President. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. Mason. With all respect to the Chair, I presume that the decision is founded upon the fact that the petition has already been received and laid upon the table as a pending question, and that a motion to reject would be equivalent to a motion not to receive. I do not mean to appear at all from the decision of the Chair, but as an opinion adverse to a precedent before the Senate, and that decision would show that the petition had advanced too far to make the objection. I therefore withdraw any opposition to the reference.

The Vice President. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that this memorial, with the accompanying papers, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Sumner. Mr. President, I think that I ought not to listen to such a proposition as has been made by the Senator from Virginia, with reference to this petition, without one word in reply. Here is a gentleman a gentleman of perfect respectability, charged with no crime, presumed to be innocent, complaining of a gross outrage at the hands of certain persons pretending to act in the name of the Senate. The facts are set forth in his petition. They are authenticated also by documents now of record. The Senator moves—without any reference to a committee, without giving the petitioner the decency of a hearing, according to the ordinary forms of this body—that it be rejected; and he does this with a view to establish a precedent in such a case. I feel it my duty to establish a precedent also in this case, by entering my open, unqualified protest against such a suggestion. Sir, it was said in antiquity of one of the judges of hell, that he punished first, and heard afterwards—*castigatque auditque*—and permit me to say, the Senator from Virginia, on this occasion, takes a precedent from that court.

Mr. Mason. The Senator from Massachusetts, it seems to me, makes an opportunity to use language in the Senate Chamber which, as far as language goes with the world goes, is not usual of our Senate Chamber. There is nothing in it that I have a right to take as personally offensive to myself. The Senate is the proper judge and arbiter of the decorum of its own proceedings. I have said that the Senator makes occasion, because he chose to reply in the language which he had used, to a motion which, for the reasons I stated—reasons purely of the regularity of proceedings—I had withdrawn. Sir, I can have no personal feeling in this matter, and if I were to attempt, I could not work myself into any personal feeling connected with it. I mean to leave the matter to the Senate, and to my motion was simply, not that I would establish the precedent of the Senate, but to submit to the Senate what precedent should be established. I acquiesced very cheerfully in the decision of the Chair, that it could not be done now, because of the preceding decision of the Chair that the paper had been received, and that therefore the motion to reject would not be in order. My design was not to prejudice in the slightest degree anything connected with it; but the petitioner here alleges that he has received injury, insult, and oppression at the hands of those who were deputed by the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, and asks the Senate to inquire into it, and to redress his grievance, so far as I comprehend the petition, and declares that he had disobeyed the mandate of the Senate, so that he might try the question in a different tribunal. Thus he was certainly, within the legal meaning of the term, in contempt for the authority of the Senate. He had appealed to other tribunals; and to those tribunals it would seem to me he should be left to redress, and not to the Senate. The report comes from the Committee on the Judiciary, it will be properly reported, and, if there be an occasion for it, whether it was properly exercised, and what was done.

Mr. Sumner. Only one word. I presented a petition to this body, setting forth an outrage. The Senator from Virginia moved its rejection. I characterized that rejection as I thought it was authorized to do, and I referred to a precedent in antiquity, and that was all; and that is the occasion for the language which I used, and that is the manner in which one should conduct on this floor. From the heights of his self-confidence, he addresses me. Sir, I wish to say simply in reply, that when an outrage comes before this body, I shall denounce it in plain terms; and if a precedent from a very

bad place should seem to be in point, I shall not hesitate to quote it.

Mr. Mason. Mr. President, I am not going to continue such a discussion as this. The Senator said that Rhadamanthus, the judge of hell, had first punished, and then heard—*castigatque auditque*; and, said he, the Senator from Virginia has taken that precedent. I did not undertake to lecture that Senator, of all others, upon the subject of manners or propriety. I do not mean to offend, but for my own convenience, I should consider it time thrown away. All that I said was, that I was not accustomed, in my intercourse with the world outside of this Chamber, to hear language of that sort in the circles in which I move.

The consideration of the memorial was still pending at this point, when the order of the day were taken up. On Tuesday, both of the memorials of Mr. Sanborn were referred to the Judiciary Committee without further discussion.

## The Liberator.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.

BOSTON, APRIL 27, 1860.

### ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will be held in the city of New York, at the Cooper Institute, on TUESDAY and WEDNESDAY, MAY 8th and 9th, commencing each day at 10 o'clock, A. M.

Independent of all religious and political organizations, and dealing impartially with them all, this Society continues to pursue its grand distinctive object, THE IMMEDIATE AND TOTAL ABOLITION OF AMERICAN SLAVERY, without regard to geographical boundaries, by moral instrumentalities alone—animated by a spirit which seeks the safety, happiness and prosperity of every section of our widely-extended country, 'knowing no East, no West, no North, no South,' as such. Its 'treason' is embodied in the Declaration of Independence, and its 'fanaticism' in the Golden Rule. Declaring that man cannot be the property of man, it measures men, parties and institutions by this simple and unerring test, and will not yield to any compromise, or consent to any postponement of the claims of justice and humanity.

We trust it is needless to remind the members and friends of the Society, that never were greater vigilance and activity demanded on their part than at the present time. The nation is just entering into another Presidential election, which will probably be unparalleled on the score of popular excitement, and which will present a powerful temptation to many to swerve from the strict line of rectitude, by lowering the Anti-Slavery standard for the sake of party success. Let the dead bury their dead! Let us eschew all compromises and compromisers, and be faithful to our rallying-cry, 'NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!'

Among those who are relied upon to be among the speakers at this anniversary are the following:—

WENDELL PHILLIPS, WM. LLOYD GARRISON, REV. DR. CHEEVER, REV. BERAH GREEN, EDMUND QUINCY, MRS. ELIZABETH CARY STANTON, ROBERT PURVIS, ESQ., REV. DR. FURNESS, MRS. J. ELIZABETH JONES, OF OHIO, REV. S. J. MAY, REV. G. F. NOYES, OF NEW YORK, REV. A. B. BRADFORD, OF PENNSYLVANIA, WM. WELLS BROWN, AND OTHERS.

In behalf of the Executive Committee,  
WM. LLOYD GARRISON, President.  
WENDELL PHILLIPS, Secretary.  
C. C. BULLIOTT, Treasurer.

### WEST INDIA EMANCIPATION.

THE RIGHT WAY THE SAFE WAY—proved by Emancipation in the British West Indies, and elsewhere. By L. MARIA CHILD. New York: Published and for sale at 5 Beekman Street. 1860.

To the immense service which Mrs. Child long since rendered to the Anti-Slavery cause, by her valuable writings, she has recently added much by her Correspondence with Gov. Wise and Mrs. Mason, of Virginia, and now by this elaborate and reliable work, triumphantly refuting the malicious statements of a pro-slavery press respecting the results of West India Emancipation, and demonstrating that those results are, in view of all the circumstances, in the highest degree encouraging. It makes a neat pamphlet of 95 pages, divided into the following chapters:—

CHAPT. I. The West Indies before the abolition of slavery.

CHAPT. II. Antigua, after immediate, unconditional emancipation—Testimony of Planters, Magistrates, Teachers, Clergymen, Missionaries, and Emancipated Slaves.

CHAPT. III. The Windward Islands during the Apprenticeship—Testimony of Planters, &c., &c.

CHAPT. IV. Testimony concerning West India from 1840 to 1859.

CHAPT. V. Jamaica. [The population of Jamaica, at the time of emancipation, was 37,000 whites; 311,692 slaves; 55,000 free colored people.]

Mrs. Child has chosen for her motto the words of Dr. Davy—"The world is beginning to understand that injuring one class, for the immediate benefit of another, is ultimately injurious to that other; and that to secure prosperity to a community, all interests must be consulted." This is most clearly proved by this admirable compilation of facts and testimonies, which deserves the widest circulation and the most thorough perusal.

### AFRICAN CIVILIZATION.

On Thursday evening, 11th inst., a mass meeting of the colored citizens of New York was held in Zion's Church, for the purpose of discussing the merits of the African Civilization Society. The church was closely packed by a large audience. Revs. H. H. Garnet and J. Sella Martin defended the Society, while George T. Downing, Wm. H. Leonard, and others, opposed it. The debate was very exciting between Messrs. Garnet and Downing, and the confusion so great that the lights were put out, in order to bring the meeting to a close. Next week we shall try to find room for an extended report of the proceedings, as published in the *Anglo-African*.

### BASE AND UNNATURAL PROSCRIPTION.

Douglass having been refused a passport to enable him to visit Paris, by Mr. Dallas, the American minister at London, on the ground that they do not recognize persons of color as citizens, the required permission was furnished by the French consul at Newcastle!—A fresh cause for European jeers at American Democracy.

### SPEECH OF HON. CHARLES B. SEDGWICK.

One of the ablest speeches yet made in Congress, in opposition to the claims of the Slave Power, was recently delivered by Hon. Charles B. Sedgwick, of Syracuse, N. Y., who stands in the forefront of his profession as a lawyer. The extract we have made from it in another column is a specimen of its force and directness. In the course of his speech, Mr. Sedgwick made honorable mention of our humble labors for the abolition of slavery—the first instance, we believe, during a period of thirty years, of any member of Congress having had the courage and justice to allude to us by name in commendatory terms. He may be sure that we duly appreciate his act.

### NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION.

That desperate creature, the National Democratic, alias Satanic Convention, assembled at Charleston, S. C. on Monday last, to nominate a Presidential ticket—Caleb Cushing, of Massachusetts, with admirable fitness being chosen to preside over its fiendish deliberations. No nomination has yet been made.

### MORE DECEIT IN THE INDEPENDENT.

Since, with advancing time, the purity of Mr. Garrison's life, the excellence of the principles he inculcates, and the superior efficacy of his method of assailing slavery impress themselves on a constantly increasing number of people, the policy of the *Independent* demands, from time to time, a repetition of the old falsehood that he is 'an infidel, of a most degraded class.' The simple lie would answer the purpose (as it has in tens of thousands of cases already) with people who place implicit trust in the *Independent*, and who do not see, hear or read Mr. Garrison. But since those who do hear him lecture, or read his writings in the *Liberator*, or pass an hour in conversation with him, find that they have been grossly deceived by the above representation, the *Independent* finds it necessary to add sophistry to its calumny, to divert the attention of its readers from the unadorned lie by a show of reasoning, and to make its present statements seem more plausible by a crafty intermixture of truth with the falsehood. I propose now to untwist some of the deceptive windings (there is not room for all) in its last week's comment upon my criticism in the previous week's *Liberator*.

The *Independent* quotes from my article, actually giving to its readers a fragment from the beginning and a fragment from the end! Both these passages are strictly fragmentary, being not only pieces detached from the building, but pieces broken off from two separate bricks, and laid side by side, as if giving so much of a continuous statement by me. In reality, its readers get about as much of the meaning of my article as one would of the meaning of the Bible who should hear the following read from it:—

'And Judas departed, and went and hanged himself.'  
'Go thou, and do likewise.'

So much for the *Independent's* honesty in quotation. Let us now look at its ingenuity in the suggestion of falsehood. Here is one of its paragraphs:—

'Larrouque, in his recent work, *De L'Esclavage chez les Nations Chrétiennes*, disowns the divine origin of Christianity, because, as he alleges, the Bible does not condemn slavery, which is contrary to the law of nature. Larrouque charges the Evangelists with contradictions, and the Mosaic code with immorality. But he frankly avows that he is not a Christian, nor a believer in any religion, past or present. Yet he asserts that he believes in God, in the immortality of our entire humanity, however this has been degraded and dishonored in the present life. He acknowledges also the general purity and elevation of the teachings of Jesus, but believes in a 'religion of the future,' yet to be evoked. Does Mr. Garrison go any farther than this? But Mons. Larrouque says of himself that he is no Christian.'

What villainy could be greater than the putting of these two names together thus? Yet the Editors of the *Independent* know (since that paper exchanges with the *Liberator*) that which every reader of the latter of course knows, that such a parallel is grossly calumnious to Mr. Garrison, alike upon the positive and the negative side. The Reverend gentlemen of whom we are speaking mean to misrepresent him. This is the necessary pre-requisite of vilifying him.

So, again, after I had stated certain opinions of my own, respecting some portions of some of the thirty-nine books of the Hebrew Scriptures, and had pointed out certain resemblances between these portions and the Koran, (which, as the *Independent* acutely remarks, was written long afterwards,) that paper makes the following ingenious interrogative suggestions:—

'Does Mr. Garrison then believe, &c. &c.'  
'If Mr. Garrison is willing to accept this as the statement of his views, &c. &c.'

Every reader of my article would see that these views had no more to do with Mr. Garrison than with Rev. Dr. Joseph P. Thompson. But if suited the *Independent's* purpose to mis-state me, and its quotations from my article were so carefully selected as to throw no light upon the misrepresentation.

The following double-barreled falsehood from the *Independent's* reply to me shall be my last quotation:—

'Our criticism had no reference to Mr. Garrison's personal character; nor to the opinion that the rights of man do not rest upon the Bible alone.'

To show that the latter of these two statements is directly and absolutely false, I need only repeat the quotation from Mr. Garrison, on which the *Independent's* whole article, asserting his infidelity, is founded. It is this, forming part of a notice of Dr. Cheever's last book:—

'Dr. Cheever has here met the pro-slavery argument drawn from the Bible with consummate logical acumen, scholarly ability and irresistible power. We commend this work to all who profess to revere the Scriptures; at the same time protesting against making the rights of man to depend upon any parchment whatever.'

As to the former declaration, that this charge against Mr. Garrison had no reference to his personal character; let us look at it. When we remember that the policy of the *Independent* has always been to make the term infidel as opprobrious as the term Pickpocket, and to cause men to fear, avoid and detest the former of these quite as much as the latter—when we remember that the Reverend Editors of that paper have tried to deepen even this stigma, by calling Mr. Garrison 'an infidel of a most degraded class,' and that, though repeatedly urged to retract this slander by friends of their own, solicitous for the credit of their paper, they have never done it—and when we remember that, from that time to the present, they have been constantly making occasions to hoot at that gentleman, 'Infidel! Infidel!'—he, meanwhile, quietly going on with his work of calling upon them, and the churches, and the nation, to take their feet off the neck of the slave—it will plainly appear that they might as well say of one after whom they had been shouting 'Pickpocket! Stop thief!'—'—that they had 'no reference to his personal character.'—C. K. W.

### MEETING AT WORCESTER.

The Annual Meeting of the Worcester County South Division Anti-Slavery Society was held in Washburn Hall, Worcester, on Sunday, April 24, 1860. The meeting was called to order by JOSHUA HENSHAW, of West Brookfield, one of the Vice Presidents, who spoke in feeling terms of the loss the Society had met with in the death of its late President, EFFINGHAM L. CAPRON. Prayer was offered by a colored friend, whose name we failed to learn. SAMUEL MAY, Jr., read an appropriate passage of Scripture from the 23d chapter of Jeremiah.

A committee of seven was nominated by the chair to report a list of officers for the ensuing year, viz.: Samuel May, Jr., James A. Whipple, Sarah E. Wall, Adams Foster, Alfred Wyman, Ezekiel Pitts, and Isaac Mason.

Mr. May offered the following resolutions for the consideration of the meeting:—

1. Resolved, That we renew our protest against those men and associations, untruly called Christian ministers and Christian churches, who, in this city, county, this State, and this nation, take upon themselves the name of Christ, and under cover of that name, claim large powers and privileges, and the most sacred rights, for themselves, while they refuse to bear his cross, reject the claims of his most needy and oppressed brethren, and prove themselves recreant to his spirit and commandments by their indifference and hostility to the subject of American slavery.

2. Resolved, That, on the eve of another contest between the political parties for the possession of the Presidential office, and the control of the National Government, we feel bound to declare our conviction that no one of the men who has been proposed or is likely to be nominated for the next Presidency is worthy of the confidence or support of those who have, from principle, arrayed themselves on the side of freedom, and of equal and impartial justice to all men, and especially of such as mean to be true to the great work of the overthrow of American slavery.

### THE INFLUENCE OF SLAVERY ON NORTHERN YOUNG MEN.

Our minds have recently been turned to this subject by seeing a letter from an old school-mate, since a graduate of Williams College, and now a teacher in one of the Southern States. A few extracts from his letter will serve as a fitting introduction to a brief train of thoughts which it has suggested. He says:—

'The great source of trouble between North and South (setting aside the ambition of political men) is, that the people do not understand each other. Do not become acquainted with each other. If Northerners and Southerners, instead of going to Europe, would make a tour of their own country; their influence would be in favor of conciliation. The system of slavery goes by a bad name at the North, but I have seen but little that could be called slavery. What better could be done with the slaves? I do not know, then if you do better by them, and by the whites too, than to do it. But if freedom is to put the negro in the same position as the free negro of the North, or even to land him, where he ought always to have been kept, in Africa, I would not lift my finger to free all the negro slaves I have seen here. I think the most crucial and important thing to do is to derive them from the protection of their masters, and send them to take care of themselves. I honestly believe that the negroes are the happiest class of human beings on earth. They have no ambition to rise, and are contented; they have no care for themselves, but are well taken care of, if sick.'

Very many of the slaves are pious, truly so, I think; at least they are very happy in thinking themselves so. They have just as good opportunities to attend church as the whites, and you may be assured they avail themselves of the privilege. 'Sundays is nigger's day.' The mass of slaves are better off than they would be if free; they are not in need of the sympathy of the pious, misguided fanatics of the North. They despise an abolitionist.'

After reading these passages, and some others of a like nature, our first instinctive exclamation was, Who is it that writes this? Is it some young aristocrat, who was reared on a princely estate, surrounded by vassals to do his bidding, taught from infancy that the blood in his veins was of a superior quality, that the negro was only fit to occupy the subordinate position of a servant, having no rights he was bound to respect, and that labor was disgraced to the white man. Such a person we could pity; for him there might be the semblance of an excuse; his habits of life, his social condition, his religious training, his education, all would have tended to blur his moral sense, and make him dead to these great crimes. But such is not the case. The above monstrous sentiments were indicated by one who was born and educated in New England. They are the utterances of both a traitor and a rotten heart. After having enjoyed the benefits of freedom, its free schools, its colleges, its social equality and refinement, its diffusive intelligence, this young recreant indignantly tells us that the reason why we do not love the tyrant is because we do not know him; that 'the great source of trouble, between North and South, is, that the people do not understand each other.' If we, poor deluded New Englanders, only knew the blessings of slavery, we should say no more against it. Verily, our young friend illustrates the truth of his own words.

But his condition is not peculiar. It is almost invariably the case with young men who go South to engage in business. They leave home, believing that freedom is right and slavery wrong. But, on reaching the land of sunshine, they are met with the allurements of unbounded wealth; they see the splendor of a lordly estate; the planter and his family living in idleness, luxury, and exercising unlimited power; they know that such means will secure them good situations, if the favors of their possessors can be won; selfishness begins to look on the bright side, and seek for excuses, and all at once they discover that the slave is the happiest being on earth; that the planter is the most benevolent man living, and that all our prejudice against the 'peculiar institution' results from our ignorance of it. But, young man, is it possible that you think you can thus deceive people? Ah! is it possible that you think you can thus deceive yourself? You cannot. You know better, and you insult us by sending back such false, such demoralizing representations of the most accursed system of bondage which ever existed under the sun. You tell us that the main cause of discord between North and South is ignorance of each other. But, we ask you, can opposites agree? Can the man who believes that all men are by nature free and equal, that the rights of every human being are sacred, inviolable, inalienable, live in friendship and union with the man who crushes that freedom, and violently takes away those rights? Will not the thought of an oppressive institution arouse the indignation of his soul? Do not tell us that slavery needs but to be seen to be loved. The more we see of it, the more we hate it. Whenever its features are portrayed to our view, an irrepressible conflict rises between them and every liberty-loving soul. And had your soul drunk in the spirit of freedom; had it not been tainted with selfishness and avarice and pride, you would never thus disgrace the homes of your childhood.

But again, you tell us that you know of no better way to treat the slave than to keep him where he is, in bondage. Young man, the better instincts of your soul set the seal of eternal falsehood upon that declaration the moment it is uttered. You know it would be treating him better to acknowledge his manhood, to give him power over his own soul and body, to compensate him for his labors, to educate and enlighten him, to teach him a lesson of conjugal fidelity by preventing the sundering of family ties, and by laying upon him duties and obligations, setting before him hopes and motives which would call into action and strengthen his native faculties, and fit him for a higher sphere of life. You say, 'The slaves are happy; that you would not set them free if you could; that it would be cruel to deprive them of the protection of their masters.' But are their enjoyments such as properly pertain to human beings or to brutes? If theirs is so blessed a condition, why do you not plunge into it? Why do you not send for your mother and sisters, and introduce them to its delights? Would you love to see them upon the auction-stand; torn from your embrace; prostrated to the unbridled lust of gross and unprincipled men; doomed to servile toil, to be whipped and hunted like beasts of burden and prey? Stop and think, young man, before you talk to free and intelligent minds of the happiness of slaves! Think how you are commending ignorance, sensuality, and the lowest form of life! Think how you are taking sides with the enemies of mankind, and throwing hindrances in the way of human progress!

And do you realize that you are casting contempt upon all religion, when you talk of the piety of slaves? In what does their piety consist? Does not every female slave live in a state of perpetual concubinage? Are not husbands and wives made and separated at the master's will? Do not slaves steal and lie and drink? Are they not the creatures of mere passion and blind credulity? Can they be otherwise while slaves? And are such people pious? Yes, after the fashion of the slave system, but not in the Christian, the true sense. Nine-tenths of all the religious instruction they receive is addressed to them in the form of exhortations to obedience to their masters and of appeals to their fears; and yet you would make us believe that beings who are governed by such low motives are pious—truly so!

No intelligent mind can be duped with such pretensions, and those young men who think to deceive people in this way make themselves objects of contempt. Let the young man who wishes to maintain his integrity, and at the same time to succeed in business, seek a more promising field than the slave States. If he goes into them, he must either be a slave himself to their popular opinions, or be driven away in disgrace. 'What will it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?'

F. S. BLISS.

### SENATORS MASON AND SUMNER.

We copy from the *Congressional Globe* a verbatim report of that portion of the discussion on the reception of the Sanborn petition, which passed between Senators Sumner and Mason—as follows:—

After reading the papers connected with the attempt to arrest Mr. Sanborn, including the return of officer Carleton, who was deputed by Mr. McNeill, the Sergeant-at-Arms, to make the arrest, and the judgment of the Supreme Court, Mr. Mason said:—

Mr. Mason. I move to refer those two warrants, with the papers connected with them, to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to inquire and report whether any, and what, further proceeding may be necessary to indicate the authority of the Senate, and to effect the arrest of the witnesses named in the warrants.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Sumner. I move that the memorial of Mr. Sanborn, and the accompanying papers that are already on the table, be taken up and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary also.

The Vice President. The Chair will first put the question on taking up the memorial and papers.

The motion was agreed to.

The Vice President. The question now is on the second branch of the motion, to refer the papers to the Committee on the Judiciary.







POETRY.

For the Liberator. THE SLAVE'S SONG. To Canada, to Canada, To Canada the free,

In Canada, dear Canada, Where only freedom dwell, Our chains drop off, our limbs are free,

Helper! thou comest in a time of need, Rebuking sinners for a damning deed,

From the Worcester Spy. ON THE SCAFFOLD. BY ALBERT SUFFLE. Arthur Maltravers, is this the end?

Then you told me a tale of happy love; And the buds and blossoms heard either side;

Now the parson kneels down to pray; May God have mercy on your soul!

GREEN FOR THE DEAD. O, hearts that never cease to yearn! O, brimming tears that ne'er are dried!

The living are the only dead; The dead live—nevermore to die;

Or why should memory, veiled with gloom, And like a sorrowing mourner craped,

Even now a radiant angel goeth forth, A spirit that hath healing in its wings—

THE LIBERATOR.

A TRIBUTE OF RESPECT. At a meeting of the Ohio State Anti-Slavery Society, held in Xenia, January 3d, 1860,

Resolved, That we, the Ohio State Anti-Slavery Society, do mourn his death; that the Society has lost a faithful and efficient member;

Resolved, That a copy of the eulogy be forwarded to the widow of our departed friend.

W. SHELTON, Chairman. EULOGY ON THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF JOHN I. GAINES.

Delivered at the first Annual Meeting of the Ohio State Anti-Slavery Society, by JOHN M. LANGSTON, at Xenia, Ohio, January 3d, 1860.

MY FRIENDS!—It is proper that we mourn the death of the great and good; not complaining at the decrees of an all-wise Providence,

JOHN ISOM GAINES was born in the city of Cincinnati, on the 6th day of November, 1821, and died on the 28th day of November, 1859,

On the 19th day of June, 1845, John I. Gaines was married to Miss Louisa Martin, who this night, as his widow, unites with us in mourning the great loss we have sustained in the death of her husband,

As a man of business, Mr. Gaines was distinguished for his integrity, enterprise and promptness. His engagements were always met and fulfilled according to appointment.

His productions are distinguished for their originality, profundity of thought, and accuracy of expression.

the right and the true, and his deep insight into the necessity and importance, the dignity and mission of the great moral enterprises of the world.

But John I. Gaines was not only an anti-slavery reformer, he was an ardent defender of the temperance cause. He would have liquor used for no other than mechanical or medicinal purposes.

Let us, my friends, one and all, emulate the example set us in the life and character of John I. Gaines, remembering the truthful and beautiful words of the poet:

Lives of great men all remind us, We may make our lives sublime, And, departing, leave behind us Footprints on the sands of time;

NON-RESISTANCE. The reply of CHARLES K. WHIPPLE to the questions of Dr. MANN upon Non-Resistance, in the Liberator,

He assumes as his 'rule,'—by which he is understood to mean the standard by which the righteousness or wrongfulness of an act is to be judged,—what he terms 'Christianity.'

History teems with examples of the ease with which men may be induced to give verbal assent to a 'rule,' or standard of right, presented to them in the form of a command by an authority for whom they profess reverence,

When Mr. Whipple says, 'I choose as my rule Christianity,'—I choose this rule because it is the best I can find or conceive of,—and offers no demonstration of authority inherent in the standard chosen,

He had an abiding faith in the living and true God, and held fast to the belief that we are accountable to Him as our moral Governor.

As a reformer, the life of our co-laborer was most interesting and beautiful. Ever active, laborious, and consistent, he was distinguished for his broad philanthropy, his catholicity of spirit, his manly toleration of differences of opinion, his unyielding devotion

stration to the reason of individuals, by proofs addressed neither to their veneration nor their fears, but drawn from their own observation of facts which they cannot deny, and whose teachings they cannot pervert,

Taught by observation and experience, all intelligent persons are agreed that certain immutable properties inhere in matter, and pertain to mind, constitutions unchangeable, yet perpetually active relations between them.

Towards an investigation of the relations which the human creature sustains to physical matter, great attention has been given, through ages, yet with scarcely a dim perception in the minds of such inquirers,

Then, too, the daily papers have given us Wendell Phillips's magnificent speech at Brooklyn. It is good to read it so soon after Mr. Seward's great speech, good to compare the clear crystallization of Seward's intellect with the glow and fire of Phillips's,

These and similar considerations appear to indicate, with some degree of clearness, the direction in which we may expect to discover a 'rule,' or standard, for testing the rectitude of our social action.

When we study the relations which men have been created to sustain to each other, it becomes apparent that the interests of the whole race have been made one and indivisible.

Henry Ward Beecher. Henry Ward Beecher finds his speech to his church in general, and trustees in particular, was not quite correct in all particulars.

I thought at that time, from information derived both from the papers and from gentlemen that I presumed knew the facts in the case, that there had been, through timidity, a disposition on the part of the Trustees of this church to prevent any trouble and unpopularity that might seem to accrue from yielding this room to Mr. Phillips.

Now, I desire so far to retract the remarks of last Sunday evening, as they bear upon the action of the Trustees of this church. I take back nothing I said of the sacredness of free speech, nor anything that I said about the cowardice of a church that is afraid of exposing itself to unpopularity for the sake of asserting the truth.

According to Beecher, his very dear friend, Wendell Phillips, although a disunionist and an infidel, is one of the most moral and upright men in the Union, because he has the moral courage to proclaim what he thinks to be true.

testimony could be given in her presence, it would be overwhelming in her absence. But her resolution and spirit were equal to the emergency, and she followed the defence with a determination which would do credit even to her old friend and associate, Mrs. Burdell Cunningham.

There was but little sympathy for the venerable defendant. It would hardly do to subject his department to the test of strict examination. But the object of the suit no one could mistake, and no right-thinking person could approve.

For the last week, one has needed to read no books of history or romance—for the newspapers have told of heroism and daring adventure, of noble self-sacrifice and of Christian endurance, that are unsurpassed in the world's history.

Then, too, the daily papers have given us Wendell Phillips's magnificent speech at Brooklyn. It is good to read it so soon after Mr. Seward's great speech, good to compare the clear crystallization of Seward's intellect with the glow and fire of Phillips's,

These and similar considerations appear to indicate, with some degree of clearness, the direction in which we may expect to discover a 'rule,' or standard, for testing the rectitude of our social action.

When we study the relations which men have been created to sustain to each other, it becomes apparent that the interests of the whole race have been made one and indivisible.

Henry Ward Beecher. Henry Ward Beecher finds his speech to his church in general, and trustees in particular, was not quite correct in all particulars.

I thought at that time, from information derived both from the papers and from gentlemen that I presumed knew the facts in the case, that there had been, through timidity, a disposition on the part of the Trustees of this church to prevent any trouble and unpopularity that might seem to accrue from yielding this room to Mr. Phillips.

Now, I desire so far to retract the remarks of last Sunday evening, as they bear upon the action of the Trustees of this church. I take back nothing I said of the sacredness of free speech, nor anything that I said about the cowardice of a church that is afraid of exposing itself to unpopularity for the sake of asserting the truth.

According to Beecher, his very dear friend, Wendell Phillips, although a disunionist and an infidel, is one of the most moral and upright men in the Union, because he has the moral courage to proclaim what he thinks to be true.

IT IS NOT A DYE. MRS. S. A. ALLEN'S WORLD'S HAIR RESTORER. The only preparation that has a EUROPEAN REPUTATION. Warranted not to contain deleterious substances.

IS THERE ANY WHITE IN Mrs. S. A. Allen's Hair Restorer? We can answer this question by saying that we have already seen persons who have derived benefit from it.

MRS. S. A. ALLEN'S HAIR RESTORATIVE has given me perfect satisfaction, wherever it has been used. It can be used with perfect safety, and its perfect freedom from all soiling, renders it a very desirable article for the toilet.

Another objection to dyes is the unlike-like color and appearance they give to the hair, and the only way to have grey hair assume a natural and youthful color, is to use that which will restore the hair and yet not a dye—Mrs. S. A. Allen's World's Hair Restorer will do this.

There is no Hair preparation, we believe, that has acquired more popularity than Mrs. S. A. Allen's World's Hair Restorer. Why is this? Simply because it is a preparation of real merit, and has never failed, in a single instance, to produce the good effects ascribed to it on the part of its proprietor.

Mrs. S. A. Allen's World's Hair Restorer. The most successful remedy of the day. We know of instances where its good effects have been remarkable.

Mrs. S. A. Allen's World's Hair Restorer. We are rejoiced to be assured that Mrs. S. A. Allen's World's Hair Restorer is among the best articles of its kind ever discovered; indeed the wide circulation and immense sale it has achieved, fully demonstrate that its efficacy is generally appreciated.

Mrs. S. A. Allen's World's Hair Restorer. We are rejoiced to be assured that Mrs. S. A. Allen's World's Hair Restorer is among the best articles of its kind ever discovered; indeed the wide circulation and immense sale it has achieved, fully demonstrate that its efficacy is generally appreciated.

Mrs. S. A. Allen's World's Hair Restorer. We are rejoiced to be assured that Mrs. S. A. Allen's World's Hair Restorer is among the best articles of its kind ever discovered; indeed the wide circulation and immense sale it has achieved, fully demonstrate that its efficacy is generally appreciated.

DEPOT, 365 BROOME STREET, N. Y. where address all letters and inquiries. We export these preparations to Europe, and as well as they are superseding all others there as well as in the United States.