

THE LIBERATOR: PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY, AT THE ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, NO. 25 CORNHILL.

W. Williams, General Agent: To whom all remittances are to be made, and to whom all communications, relating to the pecuniary concerns of the office, should be addressed.

OL. XI.—NO. 25. FUGUE OF OPPRESSION. From the Christian Index.

From the Morning Star. Seventh annual meeting of the New-Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society.

From the British and Foreign A. S. Reporter. Address to the President of the United States.

From the Concord (New-Hampshire) Register. The Convention.

From the Bay State Democrat. The Principles of Democracy.

signally failed of doing so by a vote of the Society. What epithet will properly describe the conduct of those who, after all this, excluded that protest from the paper, omitted all mention of the vote for its insertion, and conveyed an impression in regard to it so utterly at variance with truth, we leave the honest reader to decide for himself.

Against the vote of the Connecticut Anti-Slavery Society at its present meeting, by which a portion of its members, and of the members of its auxiliaries, were excluded from participation in its business, whose names are underlined, do enter our protest, for the following reasons:

1. It is a palpable violation of the Constitution of the Society, which makes no distinction among its members, in regard to the rights attached to membership, and prescribes no condition of membership except contribution to the funds of the Society, and assent to the doctrine that slavery is sinful, and ought immediately to be abolished.

2. It is an infringement of the rights of the excluded members and delegates, who have complied with all the requisitions of the Constitution, and are as much entitled to the full privileges of membership as any other persons present.

3. It is an invasion of the rights of those auxiliaries whose delegates have been rejected, and an unwarranted assumption of the power to prescribe to them, and of course to all other auxiliaries, whom they may, and whom they may not, send to represent them. One of the Societies which have thus been injured is a county, and another a city Society, both of which were formed at an earlier date than the State Society itself, and are as yet unrepresented in its formation, among its most efficient auxiliaries.

4. It offers a gross indignity to these auxiliaries, by intimating that they are not competent to select their own representatives in the State Society, and to the delegates whom they have selected, by intimating that they are not suitable persons to participate in the business of a benevolent association.

5. It makes war upon the fundamental principles of abolitionism, that human rights belong to mere human nature, depending not upon peculiarity of physical conformation, and that these rights are inalienable. By assailing this principle, it thus far takes sides with the slaveholder, and opposes the cause which it was organized to advance.

6. It introduces an extraneous topic, and attempts to settle a vexed question which ought never to have been raised for a moment, concerning a non-Slavery Society, and virtually superadds a test of membership not only unknown to the Constitution, but at variance with the genius and spirit of our enterprise.

Jonathan Leonard, Theodore Scarborough, Erasmus D. Hudson, Martha Hudson, Lucian Burleigh, Abby Kelley, Augustus V. Read, Timothy Read, James R. Guild, A. F. Guild, Susan Byrne, B. A. H. Chapman, A. B. Martin, Warren Clark, Joseph Case, Cyrus M. Burleigh, Leonard Tuttle, Rhoda Tuttle, Geo. W. Benson, James L. Smith, Wm. M. Steele, Freeman Hubbard, John B. Guild, Frederick W. Gunn, Ellen Byrne, Eliza A. Fitch, Caroline Perkins, Sarah A. Perkins, Wm. W. Johnson, John S. Hall, Thomas M. Holmes, Lauren Wetmore, Bulter N. Strong, James Monroe, Lyman Davenport, David Chapman, Milton Bartlett.—43.

The Gag Law. In the House of Representatives, June 1, Mr. Adams made a good speech upon his motion to rescind the Gag Law of the last Congress, the concluding portion of which was as follows:

But, to return: the majority by whom this bill was passed consisted of 78 Democrats and 36 Whigs. This stood the vote in reference to political parties. Of the Democrats, there were 36 stiff, and sturdy, and stubborn friends of the last administration, who voted against that rule, and 72 Whigs, so that the members were pretty much reversed; but it was emphatically a Democratic or administration measure. Now, the members of the North, with southern principles. True, it was brought in by a southern man, but it was either that he had been made the tool of that party, to carry forward this rule; and it was caused by the votes of some gentlemen, who, on no other subject, voted with the Democratic majority on that occasion.

Now there was another point of view in which he wished to consider the rule, and that was a most important one—he alluded to the geographical position of the majority on that occasion. How stood it then as to the division of North and South? Why of the members north of Mason & Dixon's line, there were 23 only who voted for that rule; and south of that line there were 91. With reference to the Southern members, he considered that position of the West which called itself slaveholding States, as being of the same party. The States of the North-West deny the right of the Southern members to vote on that line, then, there were only 23 of both political parties who voted for this rule, and 91 south of it.

To the opposite nature of this rule to the constitutions of the south, he would particularly call the attention of the southern members. He would tell them that the operation of this rule is precisely this—as effectually as if it had been thus worded—that not more than one in ten of the petitions from the north of Mason & Dixon's line shall be received by this House. It was in fact the rejection of nine-tenths of the petitions which came North of Mason & Dixon's line, while all the southern petitions were received and considered. This was a peculiar oppression on the people of the north. Only 23 of the most devoted northern friends of the then existing administration dared to vote for that rule. They were called upon to support the administration, but they looked across the rubicon. He believed some of those who did vote for that rule have felt the displeasure of their constituents; and believed he could point to one or more now in this House who had kept their seats on no other consideration but of having voted against the rule.

The sense of the people of Massachusetts was soon expressed on this subject, through the Legislature of that State, in a series of resolutions, in which the Legislature declared that this rule was a palpable violation of the Constitution, and of the rights of the people—which could never be submitted to by a free people—they protested against it, and declared it was of no binding force—they asserted that it was the right of any people, however mistaken their notions, to petition Congress, and Congress was bound to receive and give them a respectful consideration—and that the manner in which their petitions had been treated, was a direct denial of the right of petition, and the proceeding itself was despotic in its effect. He (Mr. Adams) had the honor of presenting those resolutions to this House, and there were perhaps many here now who knew how they were treated. He moved their reference to a special committee; the motion was an ordinary one on such occasions; but they were laid on the table. He then moved that the House be called together to reform the abuses and correct the vices of that administration; he hoped it would correct this abuse, for there was none of a deeper die. In Massachusetts there was no diversity of opinion on this subject; many persons there

signally failed of doing so by a vote of the Society. What epithet will properly describe the conduct of those who, after all this, excluded that protest from the paper, omitted all mention of the vote for its insertion, and conveyed an impression in regard to it so utterly at variance with truth, we leave the honest reader to decide for himself.

Against the vote of the Connecticut Anti-Slavery Society at its present meeting, by which a portion of its members, and of the members of its auxiliaries, were excluded from participation in its business, whose names are underlined, do enter our protest, for the following reasons:

1. It is a palpable violation of the Constitution of the Society, which makes no distinction among its members, in regard to the rights attached to membership, and prescribes no condition of membership except contribution to the funds of the Society, and assent to the doctrine that slavery is sinful, and ought immediately to be abolished.

2. It is an infringement of the rights of the excluded members and delegates, who have complied with all the requisitions of the Constitution, and are as much entitled to the full privileges of membership as any other persons present.

3. It is an invasion of the rights of those auxiliaries whose delegates have been rejected, and an unwarranted assumption of the power to prescribe to them, and of course to all other auxiliaries, whom they may, and whom they may not, send to represent them. One of the Societies which have thus been injured is a county, and another a city Society, both of which were formed at an earlier date than the State Society itself, and are as yet unrepresented in its formation, among its most efficient auxiliaries.

4. It offers a gross indignity to these auxiliaries, by intimating that they are not competent to select their own representatives in the State Society, and to the delegates whom they have selected, by intimating that they are not suitable persons to participate in the business of a benevolent association.

5. It makes war upon the fundamental principles of abolitionism, that human rights belong to mere human nature, depending not upon peculiarity of physical conformation, and that these rights are inalienable. By assailing this principle, it thus far takes sides with the slaveholder, and opposes the cause which it was organized to advance.

6. It introduces an extraneous topic, and attempts to settle a vexed question which ought never to have been raised for a moment, concerning a non-Slavery Society, and virtually superadds a test of membership not only unknown to the Constitution, but at variance with the genius and spirit of our enterprise.

Jonathan Leonard, Theodore Scarborough, Erasmus D. Hudson, Martha Hudson, Lucian Burleigh, Abby Kelley, Augustus V. Read, Timothy Read, James R. Guild, A. F. Guild, Susan Byrne, B. A. H. Chapman, A. B. Martin, Warren Clark, Joseph Case, Cyrus M. Burleigh, Leonard Tuttle, Rhoda Tuttle, Geo. W. Benson, James L. Smith, Wm. M. Steele, Freeman Hubbard, John B. Guild, Frederick W. Gunn, Ellen Byrne, Eliza A. Fitch, Caroline Perkins, Sarah A. Perkins, Wm. W. Johnson, John S. Hall, Thomas M. Holmes, Lauren Wetmore, Bulter N. Strong, James Monroe, Lyman Davenport, David Chapman, Milton Bartlett.—43.



OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND. BOSTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1841.

SELECTIONS. From the Morning Star. Seventh annual meeting of the New-Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society.

BR. BURR.—If I could enjoy this feast alone, to the exclusion of your thousands of readers—if there were not power in language to convey truth—if there were not virtue in the periodic press to carry abroad over the world the waves of light and salvation—if it were not one of the principal objects and offices of a religious paper, legitimately conducted, to diffuse the accumulating influences to righteousness as they arise, and if they are appropriate to the peculiarities of the times—if it were not for these considerations, I cannot consistently resist, if I would, I should spare myself the labor and yourself the perplexity of this communication: for you know the difficulty of bringing one's self to the work of written composition amidst scenes of public interest; and I am aware of your desire to preserve the Star uncommitted on the question between old and new organized anti-slavery. I hope I may tell something of this meeting of the N. H. Anti-Slavery Society, (in accordance with gospel liberty,) on my individual responsibility, not committing any person or any thing but myself.

The meeting convened yesterday morning at the Baptist meeting-house in this city, led by Harper, President of the Society, in the chair. The meeting opened with prayer, led by H. C. Wright. A resolution was then presented, 'acknowledging, with gratitude to God, the hand of his mercy and faithfulness in enabling so many of the abolitionists to abide by their principles amidst the persecution that has thinned them.' In the discussion of this resolution, our dependence upon God for all truth and strength, and his goodness and faithfulness in carrying forward the purpose of mercy and blessing by instrumentalities such as human wisdom could not devise or human power sustain, were so recognized and felt, as to make the season one of peculiar refreshing. It was a season of great harmony of action and of great tenderness and power of feeling; and the resolution was adopted without opposition and with perfect unanimity. The following resolution was next presented:

Resolved, That the principles of the anti-slavery enterprise are of God, and, like their Author, are eternal and unchangeable, and are to be carried out to the uttermost, in every age, of religious sect, political party, reputation, property, friendship, and life itself; and that, as abolitionists, we will throw ourselves on these principles, determined in the strength of God to defend them, to walk in them until victory shall crown our labor, or death release us from them.

This was a full and entire consecration principle, and the meeting suffered itself to be baptized into the full, living gospel. I have been in no anti-slavery meeting, (not excepting even the Convention at Philadelphia, at which the American Anti-Slavery Society was organized,) in which such depth and strength of sentiment has prevailed. And I may add, that I recollect no religious meeting, in which a deeper, more powerful, solemn, harmonious and sanctifying religious feeling was manifested. The true Gospel 'sound,' as our Front-street Baptist brethren and sisters expressed it, was fully in the meeting.

Resolved, That anti-slavery is a branch of the Gospel tree, and that in following it out to full success, it will bring us to the very root of that tree, full consecration to God and the cause of human salvation. The resolution was adopted unanimously. The following resolution was adopted unanimously. To live up to it will be a greater thing.

Yesterday afternoon and evening, and this morning, relations of the sectarian religious organizations in relation to the professed Christian ministry of America, to slavery, have been under consideration—in which much interest has been manifested by the attending auditory. The following has occupied much of the time and elicited much feeling:

Resolved, That the great body of American clergy, with all their pretensions to sanctity, and to the prerogatives of the Christian ministry, stand convicted in their deadly enmity to the anti-slavery movement, and in their inveterate support of the slave system, a great brotherhood of thieves, and that it is the solemn duty of abolitionists to brand them with this moral felony before the people.

The declaration made by this resolution, at first struck many as untenable, if not absurd. Some among the most advanced, seemed at first not to clearly apprehend the ground upon which the resolution stood. A slight amendment was proposed. But truth shone brighter and brighter while the discussion proceeded. The amendment proposed was withdrawn—and the resolution was adopted heartily and unanimously.

This afternoon, a most intense interest prevailed under the discussion of the following:

Resolved, That the sectarian organizations, called churches, which fellowship the slaveholder, or apologize, as a Christian, a faithful to his abettors, ought not to be recognized as Christian churches, but reprobated as a great fraternity of MAN-STEALERS.

Resolved, That the American clergy, to a great extent, by their determined silence and indifference in relation to the professed marriage among their relations of the people of our country, have proved themselves regardless of the claims of that holy and heaven-appointed institution, and dangerous guardians of the morals of the community.

This sketch admits not an attempt at record of even the letter of argument and eloquence with which these resolutions were sustained. O that the whole land and world could have participated in the sight, the blood-chilling view of the abominations of the American churches, in the persons of his little ones, bought and sold, enslaved, as pictured in the descriptions and demonstrations by Wright and Foster among others. O that the melting eloquence of Abby Kelley, pleading the cause of the slave-wife and husband, the slave-parent and child, all crushed, every sacred tie torn asunder, under a system upheld by professed ministers and churches, could have come upon every soul in the nation.

This evening, the crowded auditory has been addressed by Miss Kelley in a speech of an hour's continuance, which would do honor to any speaker, and which 'teaches our senators wisdom,' if they are the Legislature, now in session, being present. Several of them have attended the meeting during most of its sessions, and a larger number during the recesses of their own sittings. We may say they come to this school, if they are to have anything to do with liberty or justice in their legislation. We feel that this has been a good day for the slaves, the freedman, and the cause of our Redeemer, in respect to this meeting. May the kingdom come.

Your fellow servant in its labors. E. MACK.

Favorable Prospects.—The London Anti-Slavery Reporter says that a movement in favor of abolition has been made in Sweden. In both houses of the Diet, an address to the king has been moved and carried, soliciting an inquiry into the state of slavery at St. Bartholomew's, and a view of its determination. The address was moved in the Upper house by Professor Gier, a person of distinguished literary rank, and by his brother in the lower.

Slave Vessels.—The total number of slave vessels which have been captured under the late treaty with Spain, and in pursuance of the act 3 and 3 Victoria, from 1837 to 1840 inclusive, appears, by a return lately published by Captain Pechell, M. P., to have been 179.

From the British and Foreign A. S. Reporter. Address to the President of the United States. The Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society have requested Mr. Sturge to present to the President of the United States an address, of which the following is a copy:

Sir,—As the great of a great confederacy of States, justly valuing their free constitution and political organization, and tenacious of their rights and their character, the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, through their esteemed coadjutor and representative, Joseph Sturge, would respectfully approach you in behalf of millions of their fellow-men, held in bondage in the United States. Those millions are not only denied the political immunities enjoyed by the citizens of your great republic generally, and the equal privileges and the impartial protection of the civil law, but are deprived of their personal rights; so that they cease to be regarded and treated, under your otherwise noble institutions, as men, except in the commission of crime, when the utmost rigor of your penal statutes is invoked and enforced against them; and are reduced to the degraded condition of 'chattel personal' in 'the hands of their owners and possessors, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever.'

This is the language and the law of slavery; and upon this law, guarded with jealousy by their political institutions, the slaveholders of the South rest their claims to property in man. But, sir, there are claims anterior to all human laws, and superior to all political institutions, which are immutable in their nature—claims which are the birthright of every human being, of every clime, and of every color—claims which God has conferred, and which man cannot destroy, and which no law can strip with-out sin. Personal liberty is among these great and best, for it is the root of all other rights, the conservative principle of human associations, the spring of public virtues, and essential to national strength and greatness.

The monstrous and wicked assumption of power by man over his fellow-man which slavery implies, is alike abhorrent to the moral sense of mankind, to the immutable principles of justice, to the rights law of God, and to the benevolent principles of the gospel. It is, therefore, indignantly reprobated by the fundamental laws of all truly enlightened and civilized communities; and by none more emphatically than by that over which, sir, it is your honor to preside.

The great doctrine that 'God hath created all men equal,' and endowed them with certain inalienable rights, and that amongst these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,' is affirmed in your Declaration of Independence, and justly in the preamble of your constitutional laws. But there is a stain upon your glory. Slavery, in its most abject and revolting form, pollutes your soil; the wailings of slaves, mingle with your songs of liberty, and the clank of their chains is heard in horrid discord with the chorus of your triumphs.

The records of your States are not less distinguished by their wise provisions for securing the order, and maintaining the institutions of your country, than by their ingenuous avowal of the degradation of your colored brethren. Their education is branded as a crime against the State; their freedom is dreaded as a blasting pestilence; their bare suggestion of their emancipation is proscribed as treason to the cause of American Independence.

These things are uttered in sorrow; for the Committee deeply deplore the flagrant inconsistency so glaringly displayed between the lofty principles embodied in your great charter of liberties, and the evil practices, which have been permitted to grow up under it, to mar its beauty and impair its strength.

But it is not on these grounds alone, or chiefly, that they deplore the existence of slavery in the United States. Manifold as are the evils which flow from it, dehumanizing as are its tendencies, fearful as its reaction confessedly is on its supporters, the reproach of its existence does not terminate in the indignity which it receives among you, and the subline principles and benign spirit of Christianity are dishonored by it. In the light of divine truth, it stands revealed, in all its hideous deformity, a CRIME AGAINST GOD, a daring usurpation of the prerogative and authority of the Most High. It is as a violation of his righteous laws, an outrage on his glorious attributes, a renunciation of the claims of his blessed gospel, that they especially deplore the continuance and support of this system among you, and the spirit of christian love and fraternal solicitude, would counsel its immediate and complete overthrow, as a solemn and imperative duty, the performance of which no sordid reasons should be permitted to retard, and no political considerations to prevent. Slavery is a sin against God, and ought, therefore, to be abolished.

The utter extinction of slavery, and its sister abomination, the internal slave trade—second only in horror and extent in the United States to African slavery, and in some of its features even more revolting—can be argued by the philanthropists of this country only, on the abstract principles of moral and religious duty; and to those principles the people of your great republic are pledged on the side of freedom beyond every nation of the world.

The negro, by nature our equal, made like ourselves in the image of his Creator, gifted with the same intelligence, impelled by the same passions, and redeemed by the same Saviour, is reduced by the spirit of avarice and heedless tyranny! Men have presumptuously dared to wrest from their fellows the most precious of their rights—to intercept, as far as they may, the bounty and grace of the Almighty—to close the door to their intellectual progress—to shut every avenue to their moral and physical improvement—to starve between them and their Maker! It is against this crime the Committee protest, as men and as Christians; and they earnestly and respectfully call upon you, sir, to use the high powers with which you are invested to bring it to a peaceful and speedy close.

May you, in closing your public career, and in the latest hours of your existence on earth, be consoled with the reflection, that you have not despised the afflictions of the afflicted; but that faithful to the trusts of your high stewardship, you have been 'just, ruling in the fear of God'—that you have executed judgment for the oppressed, and have aided in the deliverance of your country from its greatest crime, and its chief reproach!

Signed on behalf of the Committee, THOMAS CLARKSON. London, March 28, 1841.

From the Concord (New-Hampshire) Register. The Convention. The Baptist Anti-Slavery Convention was held in the Chapel of McDougall St. Baptist Church, in New-York, on the 11th May.

The attendance was not large. About one hundred delegates enrolled their names, from ten States. Bro. E. W. Brisbane, J. W. Sawyer, and D. Williams, Vice Presidents; C. P. Grovernor, Cor. Sec.; L. Tracy, Rec. Sec.; W. Denison and A. L. Post, Assistant Sec'ys; S. G. Shipley, Boston, Treasurer. The Board of Managers is composed of brethren in twelve States—those for Maine, are J. Gilpatrick, S. Adams, E. R. Warren, T. O. Lincoln, Vermont, Alvah Smith, S. Hutchins; New Hampshire, A. T. Foss, E. Worth, J. Newton, Brown, J. B. Wood, S. Cooke, G. Williams.

The Report of the Executive Committee was read by the Corresponding Secretary. During the session, the following resolutions were presented, discussed and passed.

Resolved, that in the opinion of this Convention, for independent Baptist churches to decline fellowship with what, after careful investigation, they fully believe to be a palpable violation of the moral law of God, is not the institution of a new test of communion.

Resolved, that the organization and action of this Convention of our own denomination, and the christian world in general, is such as to encourage us to persevere in our labor of love, and furnishes, at the same time, occasion for devout gratitude to the God of the oppressed.

Resolved, that we gratefully acknowledge the formal removal from our brethren of the English Unitarian and Unitarian, and respectfully instructed to reply to it at an early day.

Resolved, that we have undiminished confidence in God, that he will give final success to the anti-slavery cause; and that the recent events in the Triennial Convention have not only given us fresh proofs of the gallant ecclesiastical power of slavery, but they have strengthened our convictions of our present means for the accomplishment of the great and good work of emancipation.

Resolved, that we respectfully and earnestly solicit the Board of the American Baptist Home Missionary Society to adopt immediate measures to supply the destitute colored population of the United States, both slave and freemen, with the precious gospel of Christ.

Resolved, 1st, that whereas the American and Foreign Bible Society, state in their annual Report that 'the bounds of their labors are limited only by the bounds of the world,' we therefore earnestly solicit the Board of the American Baptist Home Missionary Society to adopt immediate measures to supply the destitute colored population of the United States, both slave and freemen, with the precious gospel of Christ.

Resolved, 2d, that it is the imperative duty of the American Baptist Publication and Sunday School Society to use all the lawful means in their power to give their tracts, and other appropriate religious publications, to the benighted and enslaved millions of the southern States.

Resolved, 3d, that the Baptist Education Societies of this country are under the most binding obligations to seek out and take the proper steps to educate such colored young men as may be approved by the churches for the christian ministry.

Resolved, 4th, that the Executive Committee of this Convention be instructed to appoint appropriate Committees to wait on, or correspond with the Boards of the above named institutions, and respectfully inform them of the passage of these resolutions.

Other resolutions, approving the World's Convention and its doings—in favor of the Christian Reflector—and approving the recent Address of the Executive Committee to southern Baptists—were adopted.

Two reports were presented by committees, which we shall insert as soon as we find room. Joseph Sturge of England was present, and addressed the meeting, in a most interesting and respectful manner, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, to take immediate measures to supply the destitute colored population of our beloved country, both bond and free, with the bread of life.

As the deliberate opinion of this Convention, Resolved, 2d, that it is the imperative duty of the American Baptist Publication and Sunday School Society to use all the lawful means in their power to give their tracts, and other appropriate religious publications, to the benighted and enslaved millions of the southern States.

Resolved, 3d, that the Baptist Education Societies of this country are under the most binding obligations to seek out and take the proper steps to educate such colored young men as may be approved by the churches for the christian ministry.

Resolved, 4th, that the Executive Committee of this Convention be instructed to appoint appropriate Committees to wait on, or correspond with the Boards of the above named institutions, and respectfully inform them of the passage of these resolutions.

Other resolutions, approving the World's Convention and its doings—in favor of the Christian Reflector—and approving the recent Address of the Executive Committee to southern Baptists—were adopted.

Two reports were presented by committees, which we shall insert as soon as we find room. Joseph Sturge of England was present, and addressed the meeting, in a most interesting and respectful manner, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, to take immediate measures to supply the destitute colored population of our beloved country, both bond and free, with the bread of life.

As the deliberate opinion of this Convention, Resolved, 2d, that it is the imperative duty of the American Baptist Publication and Sunday School Society to use all the lawful means in their power to give their tracts, and other appropriate religious publications, to the benighted and enslaved millions of the southern States.

Resolved, 3d, that the Baptist Education Societies of this country are under the most binding obligations to seek out and take the proper steps to educate such colored young men as may be approved by the churches for the christian ministry.

Resolved, 4th, that the Executive Committee of this Convention be instructed to appoint appropriate Committees to wait on, or correspond with the Boards of the above named institutions, and respectfully inform them of the passage of these resolutions.

Other resolutions, approving the World's Convention and its doings—in favor of the Christian Reflector—and approving the recent Address of the Executive Committee to southern Baptists—were adopted.

Two reports were presented by committees, which we shall insert as soon as we find room. Joseph Sturge of England was present, and addressed the meeting, in a most interesting and respectful manner, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, to take immediate measures to supply the destitute colored population of our beloved country, both bond and free, with the bread of life.

As the deliberate opinion of this Convention, Resolved, 2d, that it is the imperative duty of the American Baptist Publication and Sunday School Society to use all the lawful means in their power to give their tracts, and other appropriate religious publications, to the benighted and enslaved millions of the southern States.

Resolved, 3d, that the Baptist Education Societies of this country are under the most binding obligations to seek out and take the proper steps to educate such colored young men as may be approved by the churches for the christian ministry.

Resolved, 4th, that the Executive Committee of this Convention be instructed to appoint appropriate Committees to wait on, or correspond with the Boards of the above named institutions, and respectfully inform them of the passage of these resolutions.

Other resolutions, approving the World's Convention and its doings—in favor of the Christian Reflector—and approving the recent Address of the Executive Committee to southern Baptists—were adopted.

AGENTS. MASS.—Jas. Clarke, Weymouth; Edward Southwick, Augusta; A. Soule, Bath. NEW-HAMPSHIRE.—Davis Smith, Plymouth; P. Egan, Concord; William Willbur, Dover; Leonard Chase, Milford. VERMONT.—John Bennett, Woodstock; Rowland T. Robinson, North Ferrisburgh. MASSACHUSETTS.—Wm. E. Kimball, Topsfield; Moses Emery, West Newbury; C. Whipple, Newburyport; Isaac Sturges, Ware; J. B. F. Newell, Newburyport; S. W. Wilder, Ferrisburgh; J. T. Everett, Princeton; J. Church, Springfield; W. & S. B. Ives, Salem; Henry Hammond, Dudley; Daniel G. Holmes, Lowell; Josiah V. Marshall, Duxbury; and vicinity; Richard C. French, Ferrisburgh; J. B. Standen, New Bedford; Wm. Henderson, Haverhill; Isaac A. Austin, Andover; Elias Richards, Weymouth; Edward Earle, Weymouth; Wm. C. Stone, Waterbury; A. Beard, Concord; Isaac Perkins, Lynn; E. Bird, Taunton. [For a continuation of this list, see the last page, last column.]

J. BROWN YERRINTON, Printer. WHOLE NO. 546.

who were devoted friends of the late administration on every other subject, never speak of the course taken in this matter but with regret.

He had been led into these observations further than he had intended, and he would now only say that he hoped the amendment would be adopted. But he wished to be correctly understood. The Washington newspapers of this morning had incorrectly reported his motion was to rescind the 21st rule, and not to 'repeal it,' as the newspapers had represented; and the motion was a motion to 'repeal' and not to 'rescind' it, as the newspapers had represented.

Correspondence of the N. Y. Journal of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, Thursday, June 3.

In the House, the motion of Mr. Wise to adopt the rules of the last House, for the present, and to appoint a Committee to revise the rules, was taken up, the question being on Mr. Adams's motion to amend by excepting the 21st rule and rescinding the same.

Mr. Underwood signified a willingness to meet the question involved in Mr. Adams's amendment, but he wished also to propose several other amendments in relation to the rules of the House. He enumerated the many modes of proceeding under the present rules by which time was sacrificed. He drew attention to the disgrace and disorder attending personal allusions on the floor, which had become too common of late. He had more than once witnessed cases of assault and battery under the very nose of the Speaker, and he had often heard language of personal insult in the debate, that was too foul for repetition. It had been found impossible to punish any of these disorders after they had happened. The only remedy would be to take away the right of free speech, and to deprive of punishment for each offence of this sort, and he hoped the Committee would be instructed to report rules accordingly.

Mr. Wise remarked that he had not intended to discuss this question, but a word or two was necessary for him in reply to what had fallen from the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) when he offered the amendment. The venerable gentleman had said that the 21st rule, excluding abolition petitions, was a relic of the late administration; and he had made it a covert plea to the Whigs to rescind it as a Van Buren rule. There was no evidence whatever of the truth of this assertion. It had no foundation, except in the bewildered, dazed, and prejudiced imagination of the gentleman. That rule was brought forward by his friend from Maryland, (Mr. Cost Johnson) a sound Whig, and soon based on a proposition first offered by him (Mr. Wise). It was supported by all the Southern Whigs. The gentleman called on the administration to repeal the measure. I do not know what Mr. Adams means by the gentleman means by the administration. But if he means the Executive, I will say for him that he is utterly opposed to the discussion of abolition questions in this body; and if he means the whig majority here, I hope he will find them equally disposed to keep this fire-brand out of this House.

The gentleman complains that this rule oppresses the North, and excludes the petitions of the northern people. He asks a single petition except abolition petitions? Not a single petition except abolition petitions? No, Sir, instead of oppressing the North, this rule prevents the North from oppressing us of the South. With their schools, and books, and lectures, and associations, and friends, the abolitionists possess already ample means enough for annoying the South, and the only question is whether we shall allow them also the privilege of perpetually agitating the question in this Hall.

The gentleman complains that the right of petition is violated by the rule. But the right of petition is not the right of legislation begun. Congress had heard these petitions for forty years. Their petitions had been examined, discussed, reported on, and rejected, over and over again, for nearly half a century; more than a million of abolition petitions had been received. Was it not time to stop this face? Was Congress to be kept in a perpetual turmoil by these petitions? Was there, in this body, no such principle as *de facto*?

Mr. Wise commented, with much point, on the assertion of Mr. A. that the rule in question was the measure of the northern man with southern principles, and the southern man who brought it in made himself the tool of that northern man, or made that northern man his tool. Mr. Wise declared that there was no understanding, in the House or out of it, between the Whigs and Van Buren men who voted for that rule.

Mr. Adams said he would repeat what he had asserted the other day, that the mover of the rule was a tool of the administration, or that he made the administration men his tool. He had proved that the rule was made by the administration party; he had proved this, not by declaration, but he had demonstrated it, geographically and politically.

Mr. W. Cost Johnson went into the history of the rule, and showed that it was, in effect, acted on by the House, six or seven years, when by overwhelming majorities the House laid on the table the question of receiving these petitions. He read from the Journal passages showing the course formerly pursued. When petitions were presented, objections were made to their reception, and laid on the table, nearly the whole House uniting in this course, without respect to party. He brought forward the rule now in question, without concert with any one. He sustained it in a speech which went fully into all the considerations belonging to the subject, and if any gentleman of the party opposed to him supported the measure, it was because they were convinced that it was right. There was certainly no concert between the parties on the question.

The venerable gentleman from Massachusetts, in speaking of his participation in this rule, speaks from over-heated zeal and embittered prejudice,—but, in the recesses of his heart, he at this moment feels a conviction that I am incapable of becoming a tool in the hands of any party, or of any man.

Mr. Slade hoped the gentleman from Massachusetts would modify his proposition. It now reads as follows:—Except the 21st rule, which is hereby rescinded. It was sufficient to except the rule, and then the other rules would be adopted, dropping this; and, if, then, a resolution should be adopted, as he hoped there would be, limiting the action of the House, at this session, to the topics of the Message, there would be no necessity for pronouncing any judgment on the rule at this session. He read the passage in Tyler's message calling the attention of Congress to the continuance of the slave trade, which the President had increased of late, on account of the emancipation of negroes in the British islands, or some other cause. Whether the President means the foreign or the domestic slave trade, he did not say—but the latter would be the former. Mr. Slade also adverted to Mr. Van Buren's last message on the same subject, and his message to Congress, in which he called the attention of Congress to the continuance of the slave trade, which the President had increased of late, on account of the emancipation of negroes in the British islands, or some other cause. Whether the President means the foreign or the domestic slave trade, he did not say—but the latter would be the former.

Mr. Slade moved to strike out the words, 'and is hereby rescinded.'

The previous question was, after further debate, demanded, and acceded to. The House was in a tumultuous condition. The motion of Mr. Adams to do nothing with the House, any more than it was a mass meeting in the Park. There were no rules, yet every body quarrelled about the rules. Mr. Briggs tried to set the House right about the *lex parliamentaria* under which they now were. The fact is, they were called on to make. They all saw the political importance of the crisis, and the Locos availed themselves of it with great tact. The question was taken—shall the main question be now put—and it was rejected, 77 to 90. So the previous question was not ordered, and the effect of this vote was to postpone for another day the whole subject.

Correspondence of the Journal of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, Monday, June 7.

The House, to-day, resumed the consideration of Mr. Wise's motion to adopt the rules of the last House, and to appoint a committee to revise the rules, and to amend by excepting the 21st rule and rescinding the same.

Mr. Adams explained and read the Journal, showing that on the presentation of an abolition petition in 1836, its reception was refused, and that the question of receiving it was laid on the table, which was agreed upon by 176 yeas, 37 nays. Mr. John Q. Adams leading the list of yeas. The gentleman from Massachusetts,

had made various explanations of this vote, but he could not argue it off the record. The fact was, it was a vote of great public excitement. The President, in his message, had called the attention of Congress to the subject; and the Post Master General had asked for legislative aid to suppress the insurrectionary communications sent through the mail, and calculated to excite a servile war. It was these reasons which commanded so large a vote for the rejection of abolition petitions.

Mr. Adams contended, that the vote which he gave on the occasion alluded to, did not affect the subject of the petitions, for those petitions were subsequently received and referred to a committee. Mr. A. went on to say that he had no recollection of the first moment when he entered the House, expressed his opinion in opposition to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. He held that Congress had the constitutional power to abolish slavery in this District, but that it was not expedient to exercise it until the people of the District should themselves ask it. When that time came, if he should be here—he was certain he should not be—he would move to abolish slavery in the District. As to the remark on the subject of the slavery of the States, he was as much opposed to it as was the Secretary of State, whose declarations had been referred to. Let the States, if they please, maintain slavery as long as they can. When they can no longer maintain it without Northern aid,—when that conflict commences, as to which Mr. Jefferson says, the Almighty has no attribute that can take part with the slaveholder—it would be a question for the people of the non-slaveholding States to be decided, and the States to be decided. He had received petitions asking to be released from the necessity of opposing such a crisis, but he had not presented them.

Mr. A. viewed this question of the reception of petitions as infinitely more important than all the other questions that agitated the nation. While States and communities were agitated by questions growing out of slavery, this clause alone was debarred from entertaining any proposition on the subject. He would not ask for the source of the feeling in favor of the right of petition to be traced. He could tell them. They would find it in the motto and devise of the ancient Commonwealth of Virginia, which they represented liberty trampling on a tyrant—*Sic semper tyrannis*. Thus do we spurn and trample on this rule, because it is tyranny. Liberty is loved by the people in the non-slaveholding States, because they believe that the *solus rex* requires it; but, on the other hand, gentlemen at the South think that the *solus rex* requires the perpetuation of slavery. Certain it is, that the gentleman from Virginia thought so; but this was not the opinion during the revolution. Mr. Wise then interposed and remarked that the gentleman had no authority for saying that he held this opinion. This opinion was the property of the United States, who made the Constitution of the Union, were entitled to it by the people. The slaves were not a part of 'the people.'

Mr. Adams pursued the subject at great length, strongly contending for the reception of all manner of petitions that were conceded in proper terms.

Mr. Thomas B. King, of Georgia, followed in a speech opposed to Mr. A's remarks. He read various anti-slavery documents, showing the object of the abolitionists, their numbers, resources, &c., and the danger to be apprehended from their machinations. If we gave admission into this Hall to abolition petitions and discussions, the Southern members would be obliged to leave their seats.

Several members attempted to get the floor. Mr. Finmore succeeded in catching the speaker's eye, and he remarked that he had not risen to take part in the debate, but to arrest it. It was now eight days since the House commenced its session, and still it had not completed its organization. He hoped this subject would be decided, and that the House would pass to business. The public expectation was fixed upon us, and would be disappointed at these delays. He felt a strong desire to be allowed to reply to the gentleman from Georgia, but he would not do it now. He would do what he had never done before—move the previous question,—it being understood that, according to the decision of the chair, the main question would be on Mr. Adams's amendment. The main question was ordered to be put. Several motions were made to delay or avoid it—'Let it come'—'Let us have it'—'The question being taken, Mr. Adams's amendment was agreed to; yeas 112, nays 104.

So, the 21st rule was rescinded. Mr. Wise said he would now move to lay the resolution, as amended, on the table. He was opposed to acting on it—for his object was to do some business. No business could be done, if abolition petitions were to be received. He would resist the reception of every one of them, as they were opened.

Finally, the resolution, as amended, was adopted—123 to 91.

Thus ends this affair. Mr. Adams has carried his point. There will be no rule excluding abolition petitions. Perhaps none will be offered at this session.

Correspondence of the Journal of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, Wednesday, June 9th.

Mr. Ingersoll brought forward his motion to rescind the vote by which Mr. Adams's motion to except the 21st rule, when the rules were adopted, was agreed to. The motion of Mr. Ingersoll was objected to, and a long and very confused discussion took place on the order of proceeding. Finally, Mr. Ingersoll was allowed to speak in support of his motion. The members crowded near him, and he was listened to with the closest attention. He began by speaking of the importance of the subject, and the desire he had to make known the views before which he had given his vote the other day. The subject, he said, embraced three distinct questions—abolition of right of petition—and regulation—upon each of which he intended to say a few words. The point of these questions had long agitated this House and this country, and he had heard and read much that had been said in relation to it, by a respectable gentleman opposite him, whose public life for fifty years formed a great part of the history of his country, and whose private virtues adorned his public career. Even that illustrious individual, whenever he spoke of this subject, showed that he was a northern man with southern passions. Mr. Ingersoll went on to show that the abolition excitement was originally of English origin, and that it commenced in relation to the foreign slave trade. He read the passage in Tyler's message calling the attention of Congress to the continuance of the slave trade, which the President had increased of late, on account of the emancipation of negroes in the British islands, or some other cause. Whether the President means the foreign or the domestic slave trade, he did not say—but the latter would be the former. Mr. Slade also adverted to Mr. Van Buren's last message on the same subject, and his message to Congress, in which he called the attention of Congress to the continuance of the slave trade, which the President had increased of late, on account of the emancipation of negroes in the British islands, or some other cause. Whether the President means the foreign or the domestic slave trade, he did not say—but the latter would be the former.

Mr. Slade moved to strike out the words, 'and is hereby rescinded.'

The previous question was, after further debate, demanded, and acceded to. The House was in a tumultuous condition. The motion of Mr. Adams to do nothing with the House, any more than it was a mass meeting in the Park. There were no rules, yet every body quarrelled about the rules. Mr. Briggs tried to set the House right about the *lex parliamentaria* under which they now were. The fact is, they were called on to make. They all saw the political importance of the crisis, and the Locos availed themselves of it with great tact. The question was taken—shall the main question be now put—and it was rejected, 77 to 90. So the previous question was not ordered, and the effect of this vote was to postpone for another day the whole subject.

Correspondence of the Journal of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, Thursday, June 10th.

Mr. Ingersoll renewed his remarks in support of his motion to reconsider the vote omitting the 21st rule. He continued his strictures on the objects of the abolitionists. Their object, he said, was, by a short and simple alteration of the Constitution, to exclude the rights of the States from this Union. If this was not the object, he would like the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. Slade) to tell us what they are after. Do they merely wish to say to the South that slavery is a sin, and that the Almighty has the seal of his reprobation on it? All concede that slavery is wrong in the abstract. Do they mean nothing more? Then what is the use of all this clamor and all this machinery? Even the gentleman from Massachusetts admits that as respects the States, we have no right to interfere, and no reason. Has any good come from the agitation of the question—any improvement in the condition of the slave? None, whatever. Mr. I. came to the conclusion that there was a deep laid and extensive conspiracy in this country, connected with movements in Great Britain, against the peace and perpetuity of the Union.

After Mr. I. finished, there was a demand for the previous question. Mr. John C. Clarke. But, at the earnest request of Mr. T. P. Marshall, of Kentucky, who was desirous of speaking, Mr. Clarke withdrew the demand and yielded the floor. Mr. Marshall then spoke with great animation and eloquence, chiefly in reply to Mr. Adams.

Mr. Marshall is a young man and a new member. He is the nephew of the late Chief Justice Marshall, and brought with him a high reputation for his State, as a public speaker. His manner is dignified and his style original and striking. He had voted against the same amendment of Mr. Adams, omitting the 21st rule, but said he would now vote against the motion to reconsider, because he was desirous that the House should proceed to business. If abolition petitions should then be urged upon the House, and if they could not be avoided, he would be ready to meet the question full in the face, and settle it, in one way or another, and he listened to with the closest attention. He began by speaking of the importance of the subject, and the desire he had to make known the views before which he had given his vote the other day. The subject, he said, embraced three distinct questions—abolition of right of petition—and regulation—upon each of which he intended to say a few words. The point of these questions had long agitated this House and this country, and he had heard and read much that had been said in relation to it, by a respectable gentleman opposite him, whose public life for fifty years formed a great part of the history of his country, and whose private virtues adorned his public career. Even that illustrious individual, whenever he spoke of this subject, showed that he was a northern man with southern passions. Mr. Ingersoll went on to show that the abolition excitement was originally of English origin, and that it commenced in relation to the foreign slave trade. He read the passage in Tyler's message calling the attention of Congress to the continuance of the slave trade, which the President had increased of late, on account of the emancipation of negroes in the British islands, or some other cause. Whether the President means the foreign or the domestic slave trade, he did not say—but the latter would be the former. Mr. Slade also adverted to Mr. Van Buren's last message on the same subject, and his message to Congress, in which he called the attention of Congress to the continuance of the slave trade, which the President had increased of late, on account of the emancipation of negroes in the British islands, or some other cause. Whether the President means the foreign or the domestic slave trade, he did not say—but the latter would be the former.

Mr. Slade moved to strike out the words, 'and is hereby rescinded.'

The previous question was, after further debate, demanded, and acceded to. The House was in a tumultuous condition. The motion of Mr. Adams to do nothing with the House, any more than it was a mass meeting in the Park. There were no rules, yet every body quarrelled about the rules. Mr. Briggs tried to set the House right about the *lex parliamentaria* under which they now were. The fact is, they were called on to make. They all saw the political importance of the crisis, and the Locos availed themselves of it with great tact. The question was taken—shall the main question be now put—and it was rejected, 77 to 90. So the previous question was not ordered, and the effect of this vote was to postpone for another day the whole subject.

Correspondence of the Journal of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, Thursday, June 11.

In the House, the motion of Mr. Wise to reconsider the vote by which the rules of the House, with the exception of the 21st rule, were adopted, was taken up.

Mr. Wise took the floor, and commenced a speech in support of his motion. He spoke with unusual vigor and excitement, seeming to feel a deep interest in the question. His object was to show that the House could not be organized until the hydra of abolition was crushed. He would not consent that any business should be taken up until this paramount question was disposed of. If it was a question of such import to the North that no organization could be allowed until abolition petitions were admitted, it was to the South a question of great importance. It was a vital question—far surpassing in importance all the financial and currency questions of the day, to settle which this special session was convened, in so extraordinary a manner, and at so extraordinary a season of the year. He called upon gentlemen, therefore, to make their election—to choose between the business of the session and the business of abolition.

Mr. Wise went on to show that the abolition excitement was originally of English origin, and that it commenced in relation to the foreign slave trade. He read the passage in Tyler's message calling the attention of Congress to the continuance of the slave trade, which the President had increased of late, on account of the emancipation of negroes in the British islands, or some other cause. Whether the President means the foreign or the domestic slave trade, he did not say—but the latter would be the former. Mr. Slade also adverted to Mr. Van Buren's last message on the same subject, and his message to Congress, in which he called the attention of Congress to the continuance of the slave trade, which the President had increased of late, on account of the emancipation of negroes in the British islands, or some other cause. Whether the President means the foreign or the domestic slave trade, he did not say—but the latter would be the former.

Mr. Slade moved to strike out the words, 'and is hereby rescinded.'

The previous question was, after further debate, demanded, and acceded to. The House was in a tumultuous condition. The motion of Mr. Adams to do nothing with the House, any more than it was a mass meeting in the Park. There were no rules, yet every body quarrelled about the rules. Mr. Briggs tried to set the House right about the *lex parliamentaria* under which they now were. The fact is, they were called on to make. They all saw the political importance of the crisis, and the Locos availed themselves of it with great tact. The question was taken—shall the main question be now put—and it was rejected, 77 to 90. So the previous question was not ordered, and the effect of this vote was to postpone for another day the whole subject.

Correspondence of the Journal of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, Monday, June 7.

The House, to-day, resumed the consideration of Mr. Wise's motion to adopt the rules of the last House, and to appoint a committee to revise the rules, and to amend by excepting the 21st rule and rescinding the same.

Mr. Adams explained and read the Journal, showing that on the presentation of an abolition petition in 1836, its reception was refused, and that the question of receiving it was laid on the table, which was agreed upon by 176 yeas, 37 nays. Mr. John Q. Adams leading the list of yeas. The gentleman from Massachusetts,

had made various explanations of this vote, but he could not argue it off the record. The fact was, it was a vote of great public excitement. The President, in his message, had called the attention of Congress to the subject; and the Post Master General had asked for legislative aid to suppress the insurrectionary communications sent through the mail, and calculated to excite a servile war. It was these reasons which commanded so large a vote for the rejection of abolition petitions.

Mr. Adams contended, that the vote which he gave on the occasion alluded to, did not affect the subject of the petitions, for those petitions were subsequently received and referred to a committee. Mr. A. went on to say that he had no recollection of the first moment when he entered the House, expressed his opinion in opposition to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. He held that Congress had the constitutional power to abolish slavery in this District, but that it was not expedient to exercise it until the people of the District should themselves ask it. When that time came, if he should be here—he was certain he should not be—he would move to abolish slavery in the District. As to the remark on the subject of the slavery of the States, he was as much opposed to it as was the Secretary of State, whose declarations had been referred to. Let the States, if they please, maintain slavery as long as they can. When they can no longer maintain it without Northern aid,—when that conflict commences, as to which Mr. Jefferson says, the Almighty has no attribute that can take part with the slaveholder—it would be a question for the people of the non-slaveholding States to be decided, and the States to be decided. He had received petitions asking to be released from the necessity of opposing such a crisis, but he had not presented them.

Mr. A. viewed this question of the reception of petitions as infinitely more important than all the other questions that agitated the nation. While States and communities were agitated by questions growing out of slavery, this clause alone was debarred from entertaining any proposition on the subject. He would not ask for the source of the feeling in favor of the right of petition to be traced. He could tell them. They would find it in the motto and devise of the ancient Commonwealth of Virginia, which they represented liberty trampling on a tyrant—*Sic semper tyrannis*. Thus do we spurn and trample on this rule, because it is tyranny. Liberty is loved by the people in the non-slaveholding States, because they believe that the *solus rex* requires it; but, on the other hand, gentlemen at the South think that the *solus rex* requires the perpetuation of slavery. Certain it is, that the gentleman from Virginia thought so; but this was not the opinion during the revolution. Mr. Wise then interposed and remarked that the gentleman had no authority for saying that he held this opinion. This opinion was the property of the United States, who made the Constitution of the Union, were entitled to it by the people. The slaves were not a part of 'the people.'

Mr. Adams pursued the subject at great length, strongly contending for the reception of all manner of petitions that were conceded in proper terms.

Mr. Thomas B. King, of Georgia, followed in a speech opposed to Mr. A's remarks. He read various anti-slavery documents, showing the object of the abolitionists, their numbers, resources, &c., and the danger to be apprehended from their machinations. If we gave admission into this Hall to abolition petitions and discussions, the Southern members would be obliged to leave their seats.

Several members attempted to get the floor. Mr. Finmore succeeded in catching the speaker's eye, and he remarked that he had not risen to take part in the debate, but to arrest it. It was now eight days since the House commenced its session, and still it had not completed its organization. He hoped this subject would be decided, and that the House would pass to business. The public expectation was fixed upon us, and would be disappointed at these delays. He felt a strong desire to be allowed to reply to the gentleman from Georgia, but he would not do it now. He would do what he had never done before—move the previous question,—it being understood that, according to the decision of the chair, the main question would be on Mr. Adams's amendment. The main question was ordered to be put. Several motions were made to delay or avoid it—'Let it come'—'Let us have it'—'The question being taken, Mr. Adams's amendment was agreed to; yeas 112, nays 104.

So, the 21st rule was rescinded. Mr. Wise said he would now move to lay the resolution, as amended, on the table. He was opposed to acting on it—for his object was to do some business. No business could be done, if abolition petitions were to be received. He would resist the reception of every one of them, as they were opened.

Finally, the resolution, as amended, was adopted—123 to 91.

Thus ends this affair. Mr. Adams has carried his point. There will be no rule excluding abolition petitions. Perhaps none will be offered at this session.

Correspondence of the Journal of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, Thursday, June 10th.

Mr. Ingersoll renewed his remarks in support of his motion to reconsider the vote omitting the 21st rule. He continued his strictures on the objects of the abolitionists. Their object, he said, was, by a short and simple alteration of the Constitution, to exclude the rights of the States from this Union. If this was not the object, he would like the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. Slade) to tell us what they are after. Do they merely wish to say to the South that slavery is a sin, and that the Almighty has the seal of his reprobation on it? All concede that slavery is wrong in the abstract. Do they mean nothing more? Then what is the use of all this clamor and all this machinery? Even the gentleman from Massachusetts admits that as respects the States, we have no right to interfere, and no reason. Has any good come from the agitation of the question—any improvement in the condition of the slave? None, whatever. Mr. I. came to the conclusion that there was a deep laid and extensive conspiracy in this country, connected with movements in Great Britain, against the peace and perpetuity of the Union.

After Mr. I. finished, there was a demand for the previous question. Mr. John C. Clarke. But, at the earnest request of Mr. T. P. Marshall, of Kentucky, who was desirous of speaking, Mr. Clarke withdrew the demand and yielded the floor. Mr. Marshall then spoke with great animation and eloquence, chiefly in reply to Mr. Adams.

Mr. Marshall is a young man and a new member. He is the nephew of the late Chief Justice Marshall, and brought with him a high reputation for his State, as a public speaker. His manner is dignified and his style original and striking. He had voted against the same amendment of Mr. Adams, omitting the 21st rule, but said he would now vote against the motion to reconsider, because he was desirous that the House should proceed to business. If abolition petitions should then be urged upon the House, and if they could not be avoided, he would be ready to meet the question full in the face, and settle it, in one way or another, and he listened to with the closest attention. He began by speaking of the importance of the subject, and the desire he had to make known the views before which he had given his vote the other day. The subject, he said, embraced three distinct questions—abolition of right of petition—and regulation—upon each of which he intended to say a few words. The point of these questions had long agitated this House and this country, and he had heard and read much that had been said in relation to it, by a respectable gentleman opposite him, whose public life for fifty years formed a great part of the history of his country, and whose private virtues adorned his public career. Even that illustrious individual, whenever he spoke of this subject, showed that he was a northern man with southern passions. Mr. Ingersoll went on to show that the abolition excitement was originally of English origin, and that it commenced in relation to the foreign slave trade. He read the passage in Tyler's message calling the attention of Congress to the continuance of the slave trade, which the President had increased of late, on account of the emancipation of negroes in the British islands, or some other cause. Whether the President means the foreign or the domestic slave trade, he did not say—but the latter would be the former. Mr. Slade also adverted to Mr. Van Buren's last message on the same subject, and his message to Congress, in which he called the attention of Congress to the continuance of the slave trade, which the President had increased of late, on account of the emancipation of negroes in the British islands, or some other cause. Whether the President means the foreign or the domestic slave trade, he did not say—but the latter would be the former.

an end to the slave trade. In short, England, a country that has more deeply engaged in the slave trade than any other, has recently found that it is no sin.

The Speaker interposed, and resting the rule which the motion to reconsider related to, said the gentleman must not travel so far away from the subject. Several members cried out, the gentleman from Penn. is out of order, and cannot proceed.

Mr. Adams. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman will be allowed to proceed, and that I or some one may be permitted to answer him. (A laugh.)

Mr. Botta. There is no connection whatever between the slave trade and the rules of this House. The speaker is not in order.

The gentleman said he would not decide that the gentleman was out of order, but would admonish him of the propriety of adhering somewhat to the question.

Mr. Botta. I appeal from the decision. Mr. Wise. On what ground? Mr. Botta. Irrelevancy. Mr. W. C. Johnson said, the gentleman was indulged in the widest latitude of remark on the subject of the slavery of the States, after much conversation. Mr. Botta withdrew his appeal, and Mr. Ingersoll proceeded.

He went on to remark on the connection between abolition in England and abolition here, and said the South had never taken ground sufficiently high on this question. They were supported by nine-tenths of the people of the middle States in assuming higher ground. On the question of abstract slavery, all the people of Pennsylvania had been united in the act of Franklin, and they regretted that the existence of slavery any where, but they would never allow the South to be trampled on by fanatics. He had understood the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) to say that, in case of a servile war, it would be a question whether the northern people would aid the South.

Mr. Adams explained. He said no such thing. What he did say was, that if the people of the North should be called upon to aid the people of the South in their war against the South, they would be aiding the South, and asserting the power of interfering with southern slavery. If the people of the North were called upon to expend their blood and treasure in a cause in which, as Mr. Jefferson declared, God had no attribute that could side with the masters,—if, in that event, Congress sanctioned the sacrifice of the lives of the northern people,—then I say the cause itself may be brought under their legislative authority. The very fact of a war would justify interposition, and as the event of a war, when once undertaken, is uncertain, the treaty-making power may close it by agreeing to universal emancipation. But, said Mr. Adams, I wish to add one more declaration. Here there was so general a clamor that Mr. Adams paused. Many cried out, 'hear, hear, let's have it.' At length, curiosity prevailed, and the House listened to Mr. Adams's farther declaration, which was this: In my opinion, the decision of the House shall be in favor of retaining the present abolition petition, and if it should be received, it will, ipso facto, absolve all obligation on the part of the North, to obey any call to defend the institution of slavery. Here there was a general alarm, and much confusion, amidst which, Mr. Ingersoll proceeded. An adjournment was moved, however, and was carried by yeas and nays, about five o'clock.

Correspondence of the Journal of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, Thursday, June 10th.

Mr. Ingersoll renewed his remarks in support of his motion to reconsider the vote omitting the 21st rule. He continued his strictures on the objects of the abolitionists. Their object, he said, was, by a short and simple alteration of the Constitution, to exclude the rights of the States from this Union. If this was not the object, he would like the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. Slade) to tell us what they are after. Do they merely wish to say to the South that slavery is a sin, and that the Almighty has the seal of his reprobation on it? All concede that slavery is wrong in the abstract. Do they mean nothing more? Then what is the use of all this clamor and all this machinery? Even the gentleman from Massachusetts admits that as respects the States, we have no right to interfere, and no reason. Has any good come from the agitation of the question—any improvement in the condition of the slave? None, whatever. Mr. I. came to the conclusion that there was a deep laid and extensive conspiracy in this country, connected with movements in Great Britain, against the peace and perpetuity of the Union.

After Mr. I. finished, there was a demand for the previous question. Mr. John C. Clarke. But, at the earnest request of Mr. T. P. Marshall, of Kentucky, who was desirous of speaking, Mr. Clarke withdrew the demand and yielded the floor. Mr. Marshall then spoke with great animation and eloquence, chiefly in reply to Mr. Adams.

Mr. Marshall is a young man and a new member. He is the nephew of the late Chief Justice Marshall, and brought with him a high reputation for his State, as a public speaker. His manner is dignified and his style original and striking. He had voted against the same amendment of Mr. Adams, omitting the 21st rule, but said he would now vote against the motion to reconsider, because he was desirous that the House should proceed to business. If abolition petitions should then be urged upon the House, and if they could not be avoided, he would be ready to meet the question full in the face, and settle it, in one way or another, and he listened to with the closest attention. He began by speaking of the importance of the subject, and the desire he had to make known the views before which he had given his vote the other day. The subject, he said, embraced three distinct questions—abolition of right of petition—and regulation—upon each of which he intended to say a few words. The point of these questions had long agitated this House and this country, and he had heard and read much that had been said in relation to it, by a respectable gentleman opposite him, whose public life for fifty years formed a great part of the history of his country, and whose private virtues adorned his public career. Even that illustrious individual, whenever he spoke of this subject, showed that he was a northern man with southern passions. Mr. Ingersoll went on to show that the abolition excitement was originally of English origin, and that it commenced in relation to the foreign slave trade. He read the passage in Tyler's message calling the attention of Congress to the continuance of the slave trade, which the President had increased of late, on account of the emancipation of negroes in the British islands, or some other cause. Whether the President means the foreign or the domestic slave trade, he did not say—but the latter would be the former. Mr. Slade also adverted to Mr. Van Buren's last message on the same subject, and his message to Congress, in which he called the attention of Congress to the continuance of the slave trade, which the President had increased of late, on account of the emancipation of negroes in the British islands, or some other cause. Whether the President means the foreign or the domestic slave trade, he did not say—but the latter would be the former.

Mr. Slade moved to strike out the words, 'and is hereby rescinded.'

The previous question was, after further debate, demanded, and acceded to. The House was in a tumultuous condition. The motion of Mr. Adams to do nothing with the House, any more than it was a mass meeting in the Park. There were no rules, yet every body quarrelled about the rules. Mr. Briggs tried to set the House right about the *lex parliamentaria* under which they now were. The fact is, they were called on to make. They all saw the political importance of the crisis, and the Locos availed themselves of it with great tact. The question was taken—shall the main question be now put—and it was rejected, 77 to 90. So the previous question was not ordered, and the effect of this vote was to postpone for another day the whole subject.

Correspondence of the Journal of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, Thursday, June 10th.

In the House, the motion of Mr. Wise to reconsider the vote by which the rules of the House, with the exception of the 21st rule, were adopted, was taken up.

Mr. Adams explained and read the Journal, showing that on the presentation of an abolition petition in 1836, its reception was refused, and that the question of receiving it was laid on the table, which was agreed upon by 176 yeas, 37 nays. Mr. John Q. Adams leading the list of yeas. The gentleman from Massachusetts,

had made various explanations of this vote, but he could not argue it off the record. The fact was, it was a vote of great public excitement. The President, in his message, had called the attention of Congress to the subject; and the Post Master General had asked for legislative aid to suppress the insurrectionary communications sent through the mail, and calculated to excite a servile war. It was these reasons which commanded so large a vote for the rejection of abolition petitions.

Mr. Adams contended, that the vote which he gave on the occasion alluded to, did not affect the subject of

Letter from Samuel Osgood. When we mentioned the fact, a short time since, that the Massachusetts Abolition Society had substituted a Doctor of Divinity for a Deacon as its President...

To Wm. Lloyd Garrison. In the Liberator of June 4, you were pleased to remark upon the anniversary of the Massachusetts Abolition Society...

As to my own zeal in the cause of the suffering slave, I am free to confess it is not as pure and ardent as it should be...

P. S. If you decline publishing the whole of the letter, please send it to the Free American.

[12] What a lively interest in the cause of anti-slavery! If it were not for 'our rulers, and 'fasts,' and 'thanksgivings,' peradventure the Doctor would scarcely be able to know when to open his mouth for the suffering and the dumb in our land!

[13] We thank the Dr. for his good opinion of our indignation; though the prospect to his letter has as it were a little in doubt on that point.

[14] We are not disposed to 'reproach' any one as uncompromising abolitionists, unawed, uninfluenced by sectarian or party considerations; and who they are, or are not, we claim for ourselves the right to judge, and to express our mind freely, without respect to persons or titles.

[15] It is possible, Doctor, that all your anti-slavery labors, (giving you all the credit you claim,) you can gather only a 'small audience' in the population of Springfield to listen to the cries, and to give heed to the claims of the millions of slaves in this country, who are perishing for the bread of life...

[16] The Doctor has professed to be an abolitionist for several years; and during this protracted period, his meeting-house has actually been opened for the delivery of anti-slavery discourses; and once to a meeting of the county society! Well, we confess, it is better than we had supposed; and, in the name of justice, let due credit be given.

[17] This is a diversity thing from a Reverend Doctor, who knew that by the term 'our enterprise,' we meant precisely the legitimate anti-slavery movement, and nothing more—but who could not refrain from making a cavil of this kind in order to excite popular prejudice.

[18] It is not for those who indicate which way the wind blows to say how they will point when the wind changes! We are so far 'anti-sabbath' as to contend for the consecration of all time to works of righteousness;—so far 'anti-ministry' and 'anti-church,' as to deny the name of christian to those men, or bodies of men, who enslave human beings, or conspire to their enslavement;—so far 'non-resistance,' as to believe that all wars and fightings are wrong; and that carnal weapons are not such as can lawfully be wielded by the followers of the Prince of Peace; and so far 'no human government,' as to think that the government of Christ is adequate to meet all human exigencies, and will be far better for mankind than any of their own contrivance.

[19] Another magnanimous insinuation. No doubt that any uttering in my favor is as gall and wormwood to a corrupt priesthood; but the abuse, the opprobrium, the infamy, which is heaped upon me from all quarters of the land, is as honey to their ears. For the praise of men, I seek not; for their censures, I care not. My 'satellites' are those who do to thank, speak and act for themselves, whether an evil generation will bear or forbear.

[20] Another magnanimous insinuation. No doubt that any uttering in my favor is as gall and wormwood to a corrupt priesthood; but the abuse, the opprobrium, the infamy, which is heaped upon me from all quarters of the land, is as honey to their ears. For the praise of men, I seek not; for their censures, I care not. My 'satellites' are those who do to thank, speak and act for themselves, whether an evil generation will bear or forbear.

our rulers, as Fast and Thanksgiving. (12) I regularly pray for the abolition of slavery, in the sanctuary. We observe the monthly concert of prayer for the slave on the last Monday of every month. I suppose, however, you will probably regard this exercise as nothing but hypocrisy in all those who do not walk with your organization. (13) In addition to these services, I have delivered lectures in most of the towns in this vicinity, and sometimes to the satisfaction of men of the Garrison school. (14) I should be glad to do more for this cause, for I assure you it lies near my heart; but I have duties to perform as a minister of Jesus Christ, which I deem to be important, but which do not commend themselves to your judgment. (15) If I should live to see the time when your enterprise against the ministry shall be consummated; when you shall have persuaded the people that the office itself is useless, and all the incumbents are a set of hypocrites; if, I say, I should live to see that time, and I am not too old to perform labor, I will devote all the time I may have to the interests of the slave. (16) I hope, however, that, before that period arrives, slavery will be abolished.

But, seriously, Sir, let me ask, what you have gained for the cause of the slave, by the abuse which you have so liberally dealt out against the clergy? (17) And if you have gained nothing for the slave, what have you gained for your enterprise, against the office of the ministry? (18) Are you any nearer to the 'consummation devoutly wished' by you and others, (19) who 'wear the anti-slavery garb'? Have you detached any portion of the people from their ministers? Alas, Sir! I must believe that your vituperation has had no more disastrous influence upon our enterprise. (20) I know that you have an utter contempt for all those ministers who do not belong to your organization; (21) or I would affectionately urge you to desist from your attacks upon the clergy, as a body. (22) If you find any who uphold the system by words, (23) or sustain the relation of master to slaves, you may rebuke them. (24) But even in such cases, your hard names will not accomplish so much as 'speaking the truth in love' would effect. (25) I fully believe that you have lost ground, as an anti-slavery man, by your violence. (26) There are some in your own 'old organization,' who do not relish your course and overbearing attacks upon the clergy. If you do not desist from these, you will, ere long, lose their confidence. (27) They disapprove of the silence of their ministers, but they love them still; (28) and you cannot persuade them that they are heartless hypocrites. (29) Your remarks upon me will do me no essential injury. (30) I happen to be in good company, in this respect; for if you can rail (31) against such men as Birney, Stanton, Wright, Whittier, Goodell, Leavitt, Phelps, and a whole 'cloud of witnesses' in the cause of emancipation, because they differ from you, I need not fear lest you should bring suspicion upon my anti-slavery orthodoxy, by your attacks. Permit me to say that you seem to have placed yourself in the position of certain persons, who saw men casting out devils in the name of Jesus, and forbade them because they did not belong to their company. (32) You find fault with every person who has the independence of mind to differ from you, either in opinion or in measures. I have none but kind feelings towards you personally. I once esteemed you as a pure and disinterested friend of the slave. I hope you are still. I should rejoice to know that you have abandoned those enterprises which seem to have absorbed the energies of your mind, (33) and to have driven you against many of your former friends.

Yours, SAMUEL OSGOOD.

[12] What a lively interest in the cause of anti-slavery! If it were not for 'our rulers, and 'fasts,' and 'thanksgivings,' peradventure the Doctor would scarcely be able to know when to open his mouth for the suffering and the dumb in our land!

[13] We thank the Dr. for his good opinion of our indignation; though the prospect to his letter has as it were a little in doubt on that point.

[14] We are not disposed to 'reproach' any one as uncompromising abolitionists, unawed, uninfluenced by sectarian or party considerations; and who they are, or are not, we claim for ourselves the right to judge, and to express our mind freely, without respect to persons or titles.

[15] It is possible, Doctor, that all your anti-slavery labors, (giving you all the credit you claim,) you can gather only a 'small audience' in the population of Springfield to listen to the cries, and to give heed to the claims of the millions of slaves in this country, who are perishing for the bread of life...

[16] The Doctor has professed to be an abolitionist for several years; and during this protracted period, his meeting-house has actually been opened for the delivery of anti-slavery discourses; and once to a meeting of the county society! Well, we confess, it is better than we had supposed; and, in the name of justice, let due credit be given.

[17] This is a diversity thing from a Reverend Doctor, who knew that by the term 'our enterprise,' we meant precisely the legitimate anti-slavery movement, and nothing more—but who could not refrain from making a cavil of this kind in order to excite popular prejudice.

[18] It is not for those who indicate which way the wind blows to say how they will point when the wind changes! We are so far 'anti-sabbath' as to contend for the consecration of all time to works of righteousness;—so far 'anti-ministry' and 'anti-church,' as to deny the name of christian to those men, or bodies of men, who enslave human beings, or conspire to their enslavement;—so far 'non-resistance,' as to believe that all wars and fightings are wrong; and that carnal weapons are not such as can lawfully be wielded by the followers of the Prince of Peace; and so far 'no human government,' as to think that the government of Christ is adequate to meet all human exigencies, and will be far better for mankind than any of their own contrivance.

[19] Another magnanimous insinuation. No doubt that any uttering in my favor is as gall and wormwood to a corrupt priesthood; but the abuse, the opprobrium, the infamy, which is heaped upon me from all quarters of the land, is as honey to their ears. For the praise of men, I seek not; for their censures, I care not. My 'satellites' are those who do to thank, speak and act for themselves, whether an evil generation will bear or forbear.

[20] Another magnanimous insinuation. No doubt that any uttering in my favor is as gall and wormwood to a corrupt priesthood; but the abuse, the opprobrium, the infamy, which is heaped upon me from all quarters of the land, is as honey to their ears. For the praise of men, I seek not; for their censures, I care not. My 'satellites' are those who do to thank, speak and act for themselves, whether an evil generation will bear or forbear.

[21] We do not expect much of any one who is a 'satellite' of his title of 'clergyman.'

language, and says, also, 'Stand by, for I am holier than thou—thou heretic—thou no government man!' [33] This is amusing. The Doctor is apprehensive that we are becoming cold and lukewarm, as an abolitionist! It grieves him (ardent man!) to think that other enterprises have absorbed the energies of our mind! Now, we meet all this trumpery by declaring that we have never perverted more of our time to the anti-slavery movement than we have for the last three years. We are literally 'absorbed' in that movement. We have yet to deliver our first public lecture on 'the church,' 'the sabbath,' or 'the ministry,' or even on 'non-resistance.' We have been nominally one of the editors of the Non-Resistant for a period of two and a half years; and, during that time, we have not devoted half a day to the writing of editorial matter for its pages!

Letter from James C. Jackson. The following letter was written for our private perusal; but the personal interest which is felt in his case by many in New-England is our excuse for laying it before our readers. It is gratifying to learn that he is convalescent, and in good spirits. We are happy to chronicle the friendly and benevolent acts of Gerrit Smith and family towards our brother, manifested under the most trying circumstances.

PETERBORO, June 8th, 1841. MY DEARLY BELOVED GARRISON: Once more am I able to grasp my pen, though my fingers are feeble, and my hand unsteady. God has been very good to me, and I feel not destitute of gratitude to Him and my friends for my partial convalescence. You are aware what my disease has been. I have been thought at no time dangerous; but then, you know, the disease itself is pregnant with dread always, if not with death. I have heard of pestis created in neighborhoods by a case of the SMALL POX, but it never was my lot to witness any thing of the kind before. Over village has been at the climax of alarm from the first declaration of the nature of my disease. Except a few of my staunch friends, friends indeed, consternation and avoidance have seated themselves upon every brow. Over-cautiousness in such cases is quite as foolish as rashness. However, I do not feel inclined to blame the people for when they imagine death is in the reward of small pox, it tests their readiness to die; and preparation for death may be ranked among the 'rarities.' How or where I could have been imprisoned is a mystery to me. I have not heard of a case of the disease any where; and know of no spot in Christendom troubled with the infection; and yet, two days after my arrival, was prostrated with it. It is all mystery. But I can now account for the feelings I possessed during the annual meeting. My extreme lowness of spirits at times, my indisposition to take part in the discussions, my fatigue and extreme lassitude of body, and pain in my lower limbs, all these are explained to me now. My case has been a severe case of varioloid, if you use that technicality; or a moderate case of small pox. I have suffered much from the establishment of a 'cord-sanitaire' immediately upon the appearance of the pustules upon my face. My friends, with one or two exceptions, were all precluded from seeing me; and I even was shut out from beholding the face of my wife and children for thirty-six hours. Such an arrangement, however wise and salutary it might be, was by no means soothing to my 'adhesiveness,' which raved and stormed very lustily. Now I know of nothing which affects my peace of mind so seriously as exclusion from communion with those I love. I have always said, that death would be preferable to solitary imprisonment; and I now know what sort of torture is solitary imprisonment for two weeks. The small pox and the solitary imprisonment plan will henceforth rank with me in the same category. I can only say that my sickness has been severe—for a light attack of this disease is far from being a light evil; and that I hope no ill consequences may ensue to the village of P. As yet, there are no symptoms of any successor to my position. Should there be no one, we should be extraordinarily favored.

I cannot forbear expressing to you how kind and loving to me and mine, Mr. and Mrs. Smith and family have been; and also, Mr. Dana, Mr. Smith's clerk, and others of my neighbors and friends. But no kindness, no sacrifice, no effort, which they could put forth, have been omitted. Deep as have been my obligations for a long while to Mr. and Mrs. Smith, faithful and generous as have been their love, I must say, that they have doubled their claim to my regard, and have proved themselves again, as in numerous instances before, among my dearest friends. May God bless them for their friendship and affection.

Amid my happiest thoughts has been that of reflecting and knowing that I was at home. However desirable in any illness it may be to be at home, it is much more so, I assure you, in this case; for if at home, in one's own house, and in one's village, this disease blanches the cheek and makes the heart flutter, as though approximation to one was rushing into the jaws of death; it is no exaggeration to assert, that it would require a stout friendship to be assured of good care and watchfulness through the course of this disease away from home. How glad am I, then, that I reached my own home ere I was taken sick! Circumstances, not necessary for me to detail in my family, have added much to our hardships and inconvenience; but, in them all, the Lord has been very good; and I will bless him for all his benefits.

I have thought much, during my sickness, of you all. How rich and generous in their love, how noble and trusting in their affections, have my Massachusetts friends been to me since our acquaintance! How deep in my heart they lie treasured up, none can tell. No where, among my friends, have I those I love better. May their hearts be strong for freedom always.

Your New-England Convention was a good one. I was with you in spirit. Every day I am becoming more and more interested in our progress; more satisfied that our basis is that of truth, and not of bigotry; more rejoiced that my lot is cast with old organization; and more dissatisfied and disgusted with the narrow-mindedness and lordliness of the new school. Letters from the Western part of the State inform me that our last winter's labors have done great good; and that they anxiously wait for another visit.

Your most truly, J. C. JACKSON.

Not Guilty. We publish the following reply, in a style as emphatic as italic can make it—the writer deeming it important that his marks should be exactly imitated. Having brought sundry groundless and defamatory charges against the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society and its Board of Managers, without attempting to sustain them by a shadow of proof, he thinks he has 'discharged his duty in this matter.' This is a novel view of duty. We are sorry to see him willing to act the part of cat's-paw for another, of whom we shall not allow ourselves to speak as to his mischief-making propensities. As to what others are ready to do, we understand what this means; but 'the game is not worth the candle.'

Mr. Garrison's remarks upon my letter of resignation, you have not only denied the truth of my statements, but strangely misrepresented my views. To a candid mind all conversant with the facts, the truthfulness of my reasons must appear too obvious and palpable to need a reply. Having discharged my duty in this matter, I feel no disposition to engage in a controversy with you in their defence.

Others, however, entertaining a different opinion, believe that justice requires a full discussion of this subject, and are ready and willing to prove the truth of my main positions. Therefore, if you desire the proofs, they will be forthcoming; provided you will open the columns of the Liberator for the presentation of such evidence, and pledge yourself that a full hearing can be had.

The question of veracity between us will then, among other things that will arise, be fully settled to the satisfaction of all candid readers.

Yours for the right and the truth, G. ADAMS.

INDEPENDENCE DAY.

Ann—Said Lang Syc.

The bells are ringing merrily, The cannon loudly roar, And thunder-shouts for liberty Are heard from shore to shore; And countless banners in the breeze Their stars and stripes display— What call for sights and sounds like these? 'Tis Independence day!

Our fathers spurned the British yoke, Determined to be free; And fold of might they rose and broke The chains of slavery! O! long they toiled, with zeal unfeigned, And kept their foes at bay, Till by their valorous deeds they gained Our Independence day!

They fought not for themselves alone, But for the rights of ALL, Of every caste, complexion, zone, On this terrestrial ball: To God they made their high appeal, In hope, not in dismay; For well they trusted He would seal Their Independence day!

Their creed how just—their creed how grand! 'ALL MEN ARE EQUAL BORN!' Let those who cannot understand This truth, be laughed to scorn! Cheers for the land in which we live, The free, the fair, the gay! And hearty thanks to Heaven we'll give, For Independence day!

O God! what mockery is this! Our land, how lost to shame! Well may all Europe jeer and hiss At mention of her name! For, while she boasts of liberty, 'NORTH SLAVERY'S' iron sway Three millions of her people lie, On Independence day!

She may not, must not, thus rejoice, Nor of her triumph tell; Hushed be the cannon's thundering voice, And muffled every bell! Dissolved in tears, prone in the dust, For mercy let her pray, That judgments on her may not burst On Independence day!

Lo! where her sterner banner waves, In many a graceful fold— There toil, and groan, and bleed her slaves, And men, like brutes, are sold! Her hands are red with crimson stains, And bloody is her way; She wields the lash, she forges chains, On Independence day!

Friends of your country—of your race— Of freedom—and of God! Combine oppression to efface, And break the tyrant's rod: All traces of injustice sweep By moral power away; Then a glorious jubilee we'll keep On INDEPENDENCE day!

WM. LLOYD GARRISON. Boston, June 17, 1841.

Report of the Abolition Society.

If powers divine Bihold our human actions, (as they do) I doubt not, then, but innocence shall make False accusation blush, and bigotry Tremble at pityance.

The second annual report of the Massachusetts Abolition Society occupies almost the entire number of the 'Free American,' of the 10th inst. It is the joint production of AMOS A. PHELPS and CHARLES T. TORREY—men (since their treacherous abandonment of the anti-slavery platform) desperate in spirit, unscrupulous in the use of weapons, and self-convinced as lovers of their own narrow sectarianism more than lovers of Humanity or of God. I did not suppose that they could sink themselves any lower in the estimation of all that is honorable, magnanimous, just, but, in the 'lowest depth' of their degeneracy, they have succeeded in finding a 'lower deep,' into which they have frantically plunged like tormented spirits, ever seeking rest, but finding none. As they were prominent among the ring-leaders who caused the division which has taken place in the anti-slavery ranks in this Commonwealth and elsewhere, they have attempted, in this Report, to justify that division—partly in the vain hope of extricating themselves from an infamous position, and partly in order to gratify their malign feelings towards certain prominent abolitionists, who could neither be trampled by sectarian influence, nor intimidated from making a faithful application of their anti-slavery principles in all cases whatsoever, come what might to any order or body of men. How much of this really pitiful document was read to the meeting, and so intelligently adopted, I do not know; but as it is published in the name of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, that Society must, of course, be held responsible for it, from the beginning to the end. As it is merely a repetition of the stale and foolish accusations against the friends of old organization, which have been a thousand times made by the defamatory spirit of the new, (apparently on the principle, that a falsehood tenaciously adhered to is as good as the truth,)—which have been as often demonstrated to be without any foundation, and in relation to which no further light is needed by those who have eyes to see, to enable them to come to an intelligent decision,—I shall spare myself the task of preparing, and my readers the task of perusing, an elaborate reply to it. It is a ludicrous as well as a malicious production, and shows as plainly that the accusers from the Massachusetts and American Anti-Slavery Societies have no excuse for their schismatical conduct, as the noon-day sun reveals the objects of crenation.

Even-handed justice Commends the ingredients of their poisoned chalice To their own lips.

Want of room precludes further strictures upon the Report in the present number.

INDEPENDENCE DAY. A little book, of 72 pages, has been published from the office of the Sabbath School Monitor, New-York, entitled, 'The Fourth of July Book; containing Plans for a Juvenile Observance of the National Festival, with Hymns, Patriotic Songs, and Recitations, adapted to such occasions,—by 'A Sunday School Man.' It contains some very excellent sentiments, both in relation to Freedom and Temperance, expressed in prose and verse; and also other sentiments, in one opinion, by no means in harmony with the teachings of Christ, or the spirit of the gospel. The spirit of war is too strongly infused into its pages, under the guise of 'patriotism,' to suit our fraternal peace views. Copies have been left for sale at 25, Cornhill, where persons can call and decide for themselves as to its merits. Price 8 Cts. single.

CASE OF TORREY. We have copied, by request, the letter of CHARLES T. TORREY, (see our last page,) addressed to the Grand Jury for Suffolk County, in relation to the case of Torrance.

Free Americans.

It seems to be extremely difficult to find an editor for this paper, who will remain at his post for any length of time. It has been printed a little more than two years, and during that brief period has been edited by H. B. Stanton, Eliazur Wright, Jr. A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, S. S. Smith, &c. By the American of this week, it appears that Mr. Wright is again its editor; and our worst wish is, that he may conduct it in a much better manner than he did when it was formerly under his guidance. New organized as he is, he cannot be what he might be on the old basis; but, though a cripple, he can nevertheless make progress, if he will. By the way, he has not yet taken any notice of the spirited letter of his old friend, Beriah Green, addressed to him some time since, calling upon him to state whether he is ready to endorse certain abominable pro-slavery doctrines which were published in editorial form, in the Free American, by his immediate predecessor. The time has been when such an appeal, coming from such a source, would not have remained unanswered one hour; or, rather, when Beriah Green would not have deemed it necessary to make such an appeal to Eliazur Wright, Jr. Why this silence? Does he intend by it to give his consent to the soundness of the heresies alluded to? He is 'of age,' and we hope will soon 'answer for himself' on this point.

'Alluding to the base conduct of the Presbyterian General Assembly, (old school,) in refusing to read petitions from several Presbyteries on the subject of slavery, Mr. Wright uses the following plain and wholesome language, in the style of 'the olden time':

'We are not disposed to deny that there are multitudes of honest and pious men and women connected with that body; they will soon be seen escaping from it with more alacrity than was displayed by Lot and his family on their way out of Sodom.'

N. B. The following editorial fling of Mr. Wright is very pitiful: 'Leaders in that (New-England) Convention, who were brave enough to call the clergy in the lump a brotherhood of thieves, were afraid (!!!) to call President Tyler a man-stealer.'

'Going Down.'

A correspondent of the Boston Atlas, writing from Hartford, and giving a sketch of the proceedings of the Legislature of that State now in session, says that the Judiciary Committee have reported a bill for the abolition of the remains of slavery in Connecticut. Only ten or a dozen aged slaves, under an old statute, now survive in that State; but the writer very justly remarks that, 'at their advanced stage of life, freedom can confer but few blessings beyond the satisfaction of dying free; yet the honor and moral influence of the State seems to demand the passage of the bill now before the Legislature.' That bill will undoubtedly pass. He further adds, that numerous petitions have been presented, praying for an alteration of the Constitution of the State, so as to admit the colored people to the right of suffrage. Though the prevailing opinion is, that the committee, to whom these petitions have been referred, will report favorably, yet he thinks it doubtful whether any definite action will be had this year. 'The unenviable distinction of being the only New-England State which disfranchises her colored citizens,' he says, 'will not, I trust, be long retained by the land of steady habits.' Such sentiments being promulgated, and silently endorsed, by a leading political journal in Boston, is certainly a very significant 'sign of the times.' It is a fact, as undeniable as it is cheering, that, if we look at the bearings of the anti-slavery enterprise either upon the religion or the politics of the country, the clearest indications are seen, thickening day by day, demonstrating that abolitionism is rapidly growing in majesty and strength, and 'going down' into the hearts and consciences of the people. Let not abolitionists deem themselves justified in relaxing their efforts, in view of this hopeful state of things; but let their blows fall upon slavery with the rapidity of lightning until the jubilee, when all the people may enjoy their rest, with none to molest or make afraid.

Look at them, Posterity!

The following are the names of the persons composing the present Grand Jury of Suffolk, who have violated a most solemn oath, despised the legal authority of the Commonwealth, trampled under foot the Bill of Rights, and connived at the kidnapping of a human being innocent of crime in the eye of the law, by refusing to bring to trial Benjamin Higgins, the circumstances of whose arrest and discharge were related in our last number:

- Robert C. Hooper, Isaac Jackson, James Kidder, Jr., Lewis T. Bailey, Jacob D. Barry, Thacher Bell, Richard Brackett, Thomas Chamberlain, John C. Cook, David Easton, W. D. Bass, John P. Thordike, Christopher C. Gore, John Goodwin, John C. Tappan, Calvin Hurd, Joseph C. Hicks, John Williams.

Old Essex Awake!

We confidently expect to see a large gathering of 'died in the wool' abolitionists at the annual meeting of the Essex County Anti-Slavery Society, to be held in Lynn on Tuesday and Wednesday next. We look for the arrival of our bro. Collins every hour from England, and therefore anticipate his presence at the Lynn meeting. Rally all!

LET US BE AT IT. A petition from the Chartists of England has recently been presented to the House of Commons, signed by one million three hundred thousand persons! What mighty object called forth an effort so prodigious, so unparalleled? The release of Frost, Williams and Jones, transported for seditious movements, and a general pardon to all imprisoned political offenders in England and Wales. Three millions of Americans are now pining on our soil in abject slavery. Friends of freedom and humanity! resolve that, at the next session of Congress, you will send to that body a petition larger than that of the indefatigable Chartists, for the accomplishment of an object incomparably more grand and beneficent than theirs! Now for 'a long pull, a strong pull, and a PULL ALL TOGETHER!'

WILLIAM LADD. The Advocate of Peace, for June, contains the Eulogy delivered by George C. Beckwith on William Ladd, the late President of the American Peace Society. It is an admirable tribute to the memory of a veteran philanthropist, and, as a whole, worthy of much commendation. Speaking of the fate of reformers, Mr. Beckwith says—

'He may do for the world far more than the idols of its fond admiration ever did, and still may they curse him for his unbidden, unwelcome kindness. Give to slaves their mother cotton-gins, and they will land you to the skies; but urge upon them a panacea for slavery, worse to them more than all the inventions of all the Whitneys, and Fulton, and Arkwrights, in the world, and the chivalry of the South is up in wrath to hoot and hunt you from the land.'

The same is true in regard to all other reforms of magnitude.

IMPORTANT. We do not stop the press to state, that, in a letter published in the Friend of Man of the 15th inst., the writer, (Mr. J. P. Bishop, of this city,) defines his position as follows:—'I have withdrawn entirely my countenance and support from the old organization, as such.—Stand for under!'

GLORIOUS TRIUMPH. By the indefatigable efforts of Mr. Adams, the odious gag law has been repealed by the U. S. House of Representatives. In the preceding page will be found a synopsis of the discussion which ensued upon his motion. To get rid of the difficulty arising from the reception of anti-slavery petitions, the House has decided that during this session, all petitions presented, and not relating to the subjects of the Message, shall be considered as objected to, and the question of their reception shall lie on the table.

FREE UTTERANCE. On our last page we have placed a communication from a female friend, whose goodness of heart we do not doubt, but who, it will be seen, cherishes some peculiar views in regard to the various reforms of the age, and the means by which they are prosecuted. Some of her charges are nothing better than mere caricature.

BOSTON VIGILANCE COMMITTEE. It is unfortunate for the prosperity of this Committee, that one so decidedly objectionable as is Charles T. Torrey to so large a portion of the abolitionists of this Commonwealth, should be its Secretary and Agent. The name of Francis Jackson, we understand, as chairman of the Committee, has been used without his knowledge.

CHANGE OF TIME. The members and friends of the Old Colony Plymouth County Anti-Slavery Society are hereby informed, that the time for holding the annual meeting of that Society is postponed from the 5th to the 14th of July.

BAPTIST INFAMY. Read the doings of the northern and southern abettors of slavery at the late Baptist Triennial Convention in Baltimore, as given in the 'Refuge of Oppression.' They require a volume of comments.

Correspondence of the Journal of Commerce.

PHILADELPHIA, June 12, 1841. Thomas Albright, one of the clerks in the U. S. Bank, committed suicide last night at his lodgings. He was a single man about 43 years of age, and was a native of Lancaster, in this State, where he has high respectable connections. The fatal purpose was consummated by a heavy dose of morphia, which he took about 11 o'clock, on retiring to bed. When discovered this morning, he was entirely dead. Connected with the U. S. Bank, as he was, the city course is rife with rumors of defalcation, and the various other crimes that so thickly dot the last year's history of banking and bankers. In this instance, however, I believe they are wholly unfounded, and that the real cause of the rash act was a diseased mind.

It is with great pain that I announce to you the death of WILLIS GAYLORD CLARK, Esq. the editor of the Philadelphia Gazette, on this evening at 10 o'clock.

The Mahan Case. Readers will recollect, that the Rev. John B. Mahan, a citizen of Sardinia, Ohio, was given up by Gov. Vance three years ago to the Kentucky authorities, on a charge of having enticed away two of the slaves of Mr. William Greenhouse, near Mayfield, Ky. He was put upon his trial by the Kentucky authorities, but escaped being sent to the Penitentiary, for want of jurisdiction in the Court. A civil suit for the value of the two men enticed away, was commenced against Mahan by Greenhouse, and at the late term of the Circuit Court, a judgment for \$1500, the value of the two slaves, was obtained against Mahan.—Cleveland Herald.

A lad about 12 years of age, son of Mr. Ebenezer Akin, of Fairhaven, was instantly killed last evening, on the railroad depot in New Bedford. He attempted to gain a footing on the outside of a car, when the train was going at a diminished rate, just before its arrival at the car house, but fell on the track, and the whole train passed over his body, causing instant death.

The steambot Duncan McKee burst her boiler on the 8th inst., in the Savannah river, about four miles below Johnson's Landing. Two negroes were killed, and the Captain and three men wounded. The boat sunk in seven feet water—cargo all lost.

Atrocious Attempt to Murder.—We learn from the Stockbridge (Mass.) Visitor, that an atrocious attempt was made to take the life of a young lady in Green River, last week. She visited the house of a Mrs. Lane, when she was persuaded to drink a cup of beer in which corrosive sublimate had been mixed, and notwithstanding the immediate use of the stomach pump, and other active remedies, the effect of the poison was so powerful, that her life is despaired of. The motive attributed to Mrs. Lane for this diabolical conduct, is a desire to remove the young lady poisoned, that her daughter might marry a young man to whom the other was engaged. Mrs. Lane and her daughter are both in jail.

Found Drowned.—The body of a man, apparently between 30 and 40 years old, was found yesterday in the water at Sargent's wharf. He had on a blue broadcloth coat, black cravat, neck, black and neck, light colored cravat, pantaloons, and boots that had been recently half-soiled. He had hair in the water some time. There was the appearance of a wound in the breast.—Post.

Fatal Accident.—While Mr. Jotham Webber, of Prospect, aged 24 years, was aloft on board the schr. North Branch, of Boston, at work scraping the mast, this morning, the rope gave way by which he was tied, and he fell from the main-top on to the deck. He survived but a few minutes, having broken his back in the fall.—Bangor Wig.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY.

The annual meeting of the Plymouth County Anti-Slavery Society will be held at Plymouth on Monday, July 14th, 1841, in the P. M. meeting-house. Rev. Mr. Parkman, of Dover, N. H., will deliver the annual address. The meeting of the Society will be opened at 10 o'clock, A. M., and the Executive Committee are requested to meet one hour previous at the same place. The interests of the cause now more than at any former period, demand that there should be a full delegation from every town in the county, of faithful abolitionists.

WM. T. BRIGGS, Secretary.

ESSEX COUNTY A. S. SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the Essex County Anti-Slavery Society will be held at the Christian Chapel in Lynn, on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 22d and 23d of June. The meeting will commence at 9 o'clock, on the morning of Tuesday, when a full delegation may be present from all parts of the county—and friends of the cause from the neighboring counties are invited to encourage us by their presence on this occasion. [?] Ample accommodations, without expense, will be provided for all who may desire to attend. Per order of the Board of Managers, JAMES D. BLACK, Rec. Sec. Danvers, May 17, 1841.

BOSTON VIGILANCE COMMITTEE.

Communications for the Secretary may be left at 25 Cornhill, or 32 Washington-Street. Donations received by the Treasurer, J. SORTWICK, 14 Blackstone-Street, or the Secretary, Chestnut-Street, near Brattle's Bath. CHARLES T. TORREY, Sec'y. June 18.

WANTED.

In this city, June 6, by Rev. G. H. Black, Mr. Edward Pope to Miss Charlotte Williams. June 10, Mr. Benjamin Kelley, to Mrs. Matilda Moody; all of Boston.

DIED.—In this city,

POETRY

Sonnets from a new and meritorious volume of Poems by Wm. H. Burleigh.

DEDICATORY SONNET.

To CHARLES C. BURLEIGH. A wreath of flowers, not scented all nor wild, Though few may challenge the fastidious eye...

SOLITUDE.

The ceaseless hum of men—the dusty streets, Crowded with multitudinous life—the din Of life and traffic—and the woe and sin...

FAITH.

The spirit of prayer, oh God! thy spirit is, Burning upon the altar of the heart, And struggling upward to Thy throne, who art Sole Arbitrator of human destinies...

SUMMER.

Wreaths on her brow, and blossoms in her hand, Music, and sunshine, and the fragrant breath Of the voluptuous wind from the South land...

WAR.

The vulture hovers o'er the reeking plain, Called to the feast of Death, by Glory spread— A cannibal mass of dying and dead...

CONTINUED.

How long, oh Lord! how long shall Carnage reign, And mad Ambition and Demonic rage, With sway despotic, o'er Thy heritage?

PEACE.

The prayer is heard. A light is faintly gleaming Through clouds that long have darkly brooded o'er Benighted Earth—and soon on us shall pour Divine radiance from the heavens streaming...

From the New-Bedford Morning Register.

THE TEN HOUR BELL.

What sound is that which wakes on mine ear, And floats on the evening air? Why starts this brown Laborer, to put on his gear?

COMMUNICATIONS.

Organizations—Money! CENTREVILLE, MS, 18, 1841.

While reading the last part of a letter from J. N. Bufum, in the Liberator, I was somewhat struck. It was this: "We collected in this tour, while passing rapidly from place to place, in small sums for the American Society, \$240. When we can do thus, I cannot believe our cause is going down, &c."

And here I would quote what Samuel Beman said in his book, entitled, 'The Kingdom of God at hand,' for it exactly corresponds with my view. He says—'The primitive system of propagating the gospel cried to God for the Holy Ghost: the modern system cries to man for money, and therefore it is that the church aged to think that nothing but money is wanting wherewith to convert the world.'

I want to see some George Foxes raised up, (in male or female, it makes no difference to me which, for I believe they are one,) who will come right to the work as he did. He did not forever dwell on one thing, in order to bring about other things; but he had a regulator, which was the Holy Ghost, that directed him where to go, and what to say when he got there.

I have often said that the slaves of the South will be liberated, but God will do it in such a way as to get the glory to himself. I feel indeed he do it with the present means that are using, there would be many to take the glory to themselves.

Another thing, the minister is a hireling, and he is the governor of all the church. What he says must be obeyed. You must pray when he says, if you do not want to; and make remarks, whether the Lord wants you should or not.

It appears to me that there are a host of reasons why we should leave the churches. They are corrupt—sectarian—confusion—which is Babylon; and the voice is, 'Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and receive of her plagues.'

Now I believe if individuals would give themselves up to God fully to be led by him in all things, regardless of consequences, they would be living epistles, read and known of all men.

Let the fair daughters of our country draw lessons from the industrious matrons of the past. The companions of those who fought in the revolution were inured to hardships, and accustomed to unceasing toil.

Burning of the National Theatre, N. Y. We learn from the New York papers of 29th ult. that at about half-past six, on the morning of that day, the National theatre was discovered to be on fire, and before the flames were arrested, the whole building was destroyed.

Foreign Obituary. Died—Gen. Sir Rufane Shawe Donkin, M.P. and K. C. B. by suicide; April 24th, 1841. James R. Carr, D. D. Bishop of Worcester; 29th, Luke Hansard, printer to the House of Commons, in the 81st year of his age; Admiral Sir Charles Paget; Admiral Sir Lawrence W. Halstead; Dr. James Brown, of Edinburgh; At Rome, April 3d, James Johnson, Esq. a native of Pennsylvania, aged 67.

ance of the gospel of Christ. I feel that there is a famine in the land—not so much for bread and water, but for the word of the Lord—the living word, the gospel, which is the power of God. Some talk about supporting this power of God with money—this gospel—and you must support the gospel. O, what a shocking delusion! And here comes the anti-slavery gospel; and their cry is, 'Money! money!' And the non-resistant reply; and their cry is, 'Money! &c. &c. If souls would trust fully in God, and depend on him, we should have less said about money.

Things for liberty, OLIVE BEARSE. We regret to learn the melancholy news of the death of Dr. Amasa Townbridge, Jr. of Waterbury, who was instantly killed on Thursday of this week, by coming in contact with a team which had broken loose and was running in Factory street, in that village.

We have not been entirely sensible of the departure from this little scene of care and turmoil, of this beloved friend, till our return home from the anti-slavery journey on which we first heard news of her death. We realize it now, and the morning only at our annual meeting in New Bedford, and she is no longer to be seen animating it by her presence, and encouraging it by her counsels.

One More Riper Navigated by Steam. The St. Louis papers are rejoicing at the fact that the steamboat Leander has returned from a successful trip of 300 miles up the Ohio river. This was the first attempt since the late disastrous fire, to navigate the river once in a run of 600 miles, and to make the channel. The Leander is a medium sized boat, and carried full freight.

The Government Express, which brought on the President's message, left Washington at three minutes before 12 o'clock, M. on Tuesday, and arrived here at half past nine in the evening of the same day. Time 9 hours and 33 minutes; distance, 225 miles; being at the rate of near 24 miles an hour. The distance between the two places as never run in so short a time before.

The London Dispatch says, the steamer President cost \$90,000. The commander, Lieut. Roberts, R. N. was a married man, and had five children, who reside in London. He was a native of the county of Cork, and was distinguished by putting an end to the slave trade in the West of Africa, when he commanded a brig of war.

The fare on the Boston and Norwich route to New York is now set at \$30. The new boat, the Worcester, on the Norwich line, is said to be not only a splendid but an excellent sea-boat, and can accommodate five hundred passengers.

The Paris National says—A wonderful discovery has just been made in the South of France. It consists of a coal mine 100 square leagues in extent. The coal obtained from this mine is found to be superior to that of the coal from the most celebrated collieries in existence.

Among the emigrants lately arrived in Nova Scotia, we notice the Margaret Follock, at Prince Edward's Island, from Belfast, with six hundred and sixty-eight passengers. Twenty-six children under 5 years of age, died on the passage out, and of those on board 14 were sick with the measles when she arrived.

Foreign Obituary. Died—Gen. Sir Rufane Shawe Donkin, M.P. and K. C. B. by suicide; April 24th, 1841. James R. Carr, D. D. Bishop of Worcester; 29th, Luke Hansard, printer to the House of Commons, in the 81st year of his age; Admiral Sir Charles Paget; Admiral Sir Lawrence W. Halstead; Dr. James Brown, of Edinburgh; At Rome, April 3d, James Johnson, Esq. a native of Pennsylvania, aged 67.

The Illegal Conduct of the Grand Jury for Suffolk County Exposed! The Laws of Massachusetts prostrated at the Footstool of Southern Slavery! A LETTER To the Grand Jury for the County of Suffolk: GENTLEMEN—Constrained by the voice of duty to the violated laws of our Commonwealth, I take the liberty of addressing you in relation to a case submitted to your notice last Saturday; and in which, your refusal to find an indictment against the man who had been wrongfully retained as a slave, by the officers of the public, by the counsel employed, by the officers of the law, nay, by the counsel for the prisoner, and the guilty parties themselves!

THE MAR—JOHN TORRENCE. About three weeks since, the schooner WELLINGTON, J. S. HIGGINS, Master, owned by Donn & Snow, 53 Commercial street, and chartered to Donn & Snow, North Carolina, bound for this city. She was consigned to Kidder & Smith, as it is understood.

THE NATURE OF JOHN TORRENCE. He was a native of North Carolina, a man not far from 30 years of age; in the respect of a slaveholding disposition, do not doubt; though I shall remind you more than once, before I have done, that you, gentlemen, had no legal evidence, nor even a legal presumption of the fact, to justify your conduct!

By a subsequent agreement with his tyrant, John was to have his freedom for a certain sum; of which he had paid over all but \$400. Sick at heart, on account of his long separation from his wife, and despairing of gaining his freedom, so as to see her again in this side of the water, he had either will or without concurrence with the officers and crew, on board the schooner Wellington, for the North.

THE REASONS FOR IT. You had no excuse, valid in law! I speak, indeed, when I say this. The District Attorney, S. D. Parker, Esq., has openly declared that he instructed his view of the law, and that he was not to be guided by the views of the Grand Jury, or by the views of the public, or by the views of the court, or by the views of the people, or by the views of the Legislature, or by the views of the Executive, or by the views of the Judiciary, or by the views of the Council, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of the House of Representatives, or by the views of the President, or by the views of the Vice-President, or by the views of the Cabinet, or by the views of the Supreme Court, or by the views of the State Courts, or by the views of the Federal Courts, or by the views of the Congress, or by the views of the Senate, or by the views of