







LITERARY.

ALAS FOR THE POOR SLAVE!
Alas, for the poor slave! his streaming brow
Is dark with pain, his eyes are dim
To weep of his wrongs for every year
Is as a dagger in the heart of him
Who wields oppression's rod—

TO WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON
Where all these dire calamities on our land
Is this thy feeling, thou friend of man?
Let not trouble thee, still keep thy post
Let Seta's rage, and all the world run mad
In vain thy wish, and all thy strength

HYMN.
See where slaves, in anguish bleeding,
Outrag'd by the tyrant's lash,
With his shrieks and tears are pleading,
Aid'd by each opposing gasp
God of heaven!

HYMN.
Ev'ry Ghost, now to each heart,
Fervent love, and faith, impart,
Forth to us your power bestow
Faith, to win each labour'd prayer
To us, my soul, be true,
Teach us, my soul, to love,
Teach us, my soul, to love,
Teach us, my soul, to love

HYMN.
Roll on this joyful day,
Which tyrant's proud array,
Shall to the ground be hur'd,
And freedom's flag, unfur'd,
Shall wave throughout the world,
O'er every shore
Freedom! Ah!
Let the glad angels fly,
Let every voice reply
At Slavery's fall!

ABOLITION DEBATE IN CONGRESS.

(From the New-York Journal of Commerce.)

U. S. SENATE—TUESDAY, JAN. 18.
ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.
The consideration of the petition from Ohio and Pennsylvania, for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia coming up, as the unfinished business of the day.

Mr. Wright expressed regret that those petitions had not been permitted to pass as they had formerly, since they were now given to them, but he felt it his duty to express his long and ardent desire to see them pass.

Mr. Calhoun did not conceive, if the statement of Northern feelings was correct, how any possible objection could be taken by the constituents of the Hon. Senator from N. York, if these petitions were rejected.

Mr. Wright rose to explain, that in the instance of the petition from the State of New York, he had recently found it difficult to find bills against some residents of that city, and he did not desire to screen themselves by having their names entered into the printing office of that paper, and throwing the types into the street, in consequence of the paper advocating abolition principles.

Mr. Calhoun, for the sake of unanimity, hoped the Senator from S. C. would be satisfied by the motion made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and that he would be satisfied by the motion made by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
Wednesday, January 20.
ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN D. C.—SPECIAL ORDER.
The following resolutions, heretofore ordered, came up at the special order of this day.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this House, the subject of the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia ought not to be entertained by Congress.

And it is further Resolved, That in case any petition praying for the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia should be presented, it shall be referred to the Committee on the subject of the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Hays, of Georgia, said he regretted that so much discussion had been excited on this subject. In regard to the constitutional point, he was not prepared to say more than that he was in favor of the power of Congress over Slavery in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Hays, of Ky., and Mr. Peyton, of Ten., simultaneously claimed the floor, and the Speaker declared Mr. Hays to be the senior member.

Mr. Hays refused to yield, and the Speaker repeated his decision. Mr. Hays said that he represented a deep and ardent interest in this subject, as the people of any other portion of the Union could feel.

Mr. Peyton then addressed the House for upwards of an hour and a quarter, insisting on the constitutional right of Congress to legislate on the subject of Slavery in the District of Columbia.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.

Resolved, That to alter, change or abolish the right of property in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the owners, would be unjust and despotic.