

THE LIBERATOR IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY. NO. 46, WASHINGTON STREET, BY GERRISON AND STAMP. WM. LOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

TERMS. \$7 Dollars per annum, advance payable IN ADVANCE. All letters and communications must be post paid.

SLAVERY. [From the National Intelligencer.] ABOLITION DEBATE IN CONGRESS. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. Jackson, of Mass. presented a memorial from sundry inhabitants of the town of Wrentham, Mass. praying that Slavery be abolished in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Hammond (from South Carolina) moved that the petition be not received. The large majority for several days had been very gratifying to him, and he had no doubt but was very gratifying to the whole South.

Mr. Hammond begged the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Grant) to withdraw his motion to lay upon the table, that we might have a direct vote upon this matter.

Mr. Mercer (from Virginia) remarked, that if he was not much mistaken, the gentleman from the House on the occasion said by the gentleman from North Carolina, as whether it was the petition of the House I receive a petition from citizens of a foreign country.

The Chair stated that this petition was presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and by him referred to the committee on the petition.

Mr. Bell (from Tennessee) said the motion to reject is not one that is a rule of the House, and it seemed to him to be the safest course for the House to let the petition lie over its table.

Mr. Poyton said the gentleman from New York said that he was willing to be satisfied with the motion to lay upon the table, but he thought it was not the motion to lay upon the table.

By rule, it must lie over one day. When it was taken up, he was willing to reject it. Mr. Beardsley (from New York) said, this petition was for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and looked to that object alone.

Mr. Williams said, he understood the Chair to decide that the motion to reject was not in order. The Speaker said he did not feel himself authorized to refuse to entertain that motion.

Mr. Beardsley hoped, he said, that the House would decide now. He should make the consideration of the petition, in order to obtain an immediate decision. The appeal was withdrawn.

The consideration of the petition was moved and debated in the following manner. Mr. Beardsley said, that the motion to lay upon the table had been withdrawn, he would now re-consider it.

Mr. Beardsley was willing, he said, to extricate the House from the embarrassment in which it was involved. There was but one sentiment on the general subject of abolition; and we were bound to respect it.

Mr. Mason (from Virginia) said, that no benefit could result from this course; for the right of petition being a constitutional right, no vote could be given to the motion to lay upon the table.

The question was, "Shall the petition be considered?" The House, after receiving it, might pass it, or might reject it, or might refer it to a committee.

Mr. Thomas (from Maryland) said, these petitions had been pouring in upon us every day for some years past, and we should have to dispose of them every day this session.

Mr. Beardsley said, the difficulty arose from a misunderstanding of the question. The right of petition cannot be taken away by a motion to lay upon the table, and acting on the principle that constituents have a right to petition, he was willing to see that the motion to lay upon the table was not in order.

Mr. Beardsley said, the difficulty arose from a misunderstanding of the question. The right of petition cannot be taken away by a motion to lay upon the table, and acting on the principle that constituents have a right to petition, he was willing to see that the motion to lay upon the table was not in order.

Mr. Poyton said, the gentleman from New York said that we cannot deny the right of petition. I have a right to say, write, and send what we please throughout the country, and is there no power to prevent it?

Mr. Poyton resumed, that he had called attention to the right claimed and exercised of sending incendiary papers through the mail, and recommended to us measures to prevent the future exercise of this right.

The Chair called the gentleman to order, remarking that without the support of the House, he could not restrain gentlemen in the debate.

Mr. Ripley said a few words which the reporter could not catch. Mr. Thomas, in reply to the gentleman from New York, (Mr. Beardsley) said, when the question of consideration came up he would vote in support of the motion to refer to the Select Committee.

Mr. Wise contended against the right of petition to say that it was a "land pirate" (this is a phrase in the petition, applied to sellers and buyers of slaves) and that it was a "land pirate" which will I give to the House, said Mr. W. that the Chairman of the Convention, would have been with us on this question.

Mr. Wise did not wish, he said, to add to the embarrassment of the Chair. The gentleman from New York (Mr. Beardsley) said, he could not repeat the memorial as read in the House, and he would not repeat it in any other place.

The Chair decided that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Mason) should be out of order. He meant to say that it was important for the South to know the opinion of Congress on this subject.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

On the contrary, it was his purpose to exclude this in its importance of the rules of the House, he had taken it for granted, that his motion was which would enable it to protect its own dignity, and the feelings of those who had a seat on this floor.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

petition now; he begged the House not to consider him as discussing it; he did not desire to discuss it at all, but if compelled to do so, he promised to probe it to the bottom; to anatomize and hold it up in its nakedness before the country.

It had been said that to reject a petition was to deprive a people of their constitutional right. By no means; the people had a right to petition, but the House has, surely, an equal right to reject their petitions.

The gentleman from Maryland had said, that he would vote to refer this petition to a committee. It was an elaborate report might be prepared which would arrest all further interference with the South upon this subject.

Mr. Beardsley thought, he said, there was no use in spending another day on this subject. If the petition was laid on the table, it would be null and void, and every succeeding petition would be disposed of in the same way.

Mr. Vanderpool (from New York) said he was surprised at the range which the debate had taken upon the question now before the House. He believed that the true object of the petition was to secure the true objects of those who were opposed to the mischievous doings of the modern abolitionists.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

then, were we disputing about forms? We must search directly to the point upon which the true enemies of abolitionists would agree? Refuse to consider the petition, and you do what would be done, and that in the most prompt manner.

Mr. V. said he could not but repeat his surprise that any gentleman could conceive that the interests of a South could be advanced by the retraction of this debate. He had flattered himself that the vote that was given, a few days ago, upon the memorial presented by the honorable gentleman from Maine (Mr. Fairfield) had given this exciting subject its quietus for the session.

He believed that the gentleman here meant what they meant, and he trusted that he cherished none himself. He had supposed that common charity, but what they solemnly pledged by their votes that they meant, and he trusted that he cherished none himself.

It would be, probably, a recollection of some of the honorable gentleman from Maine (Mr. Fairfield) because of this circumstance. An honorable colleague of his own (Mr. Granger) had introduced the petition moved to lay it on the table, and upon receiving an affirmative response the Chair, he replied, "Amen to the prayer of the petitioners; and we will do our best to secure the passage of the bill."

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.

Mr. Harner, Will it be competent then to move its rejection? The Chair replied, Yes. It was a trap, he had intended by his motion to throw a fire-brand into this House.





LITERARY.

[From the Boston Belcaster.]
The following poem is from the pen of a well known poet and Philanthropist...

TO GEO. HARGROVE, ESQ.
Author of the "Horrid Democratic Address."
Friend of the poor—Go on!
Speak for the Truth and Right!

ABOLITION DEBATE IN CONGRESS.

(Continued from last page.)

For one, he (Mr. P.) while he would be the last to infringe upon any of the sacred rights given to the people, was prepared to stand with disapproval, in the case of an ineffectual vote, the whole movement on his part without.

Mr. P. said he would not resume his subject until yesterday to gentlemen from Virginia (Mr. Mason), just and generous as he always was, his acknowledgments for the admission frankly made...

and, Mr. Thomas,) should be disposed of, then the motion to lay on the table, made by those who desire to avoid the subject will be all that will be left to debate.

Mr. Hamer doubted, he said, whether the House was in a frame of mind to vote on the question, moved that the House adjourn.

Mr. Howard moved for the motion of his colleague (Mr. Thomas) on the table, which was agreed to, 113 yeas and 98 nays.

Mr. Hammond then moved that the petition be rejected.

Mr. Hunt [from New-York] rose and said: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking any part in the present debate...

Mr. Beardsley said it would enable the House to end the agitation of the subject, he had no objection to modify his motion, and to move that the petition be not further considered...

Mr. Mason suggested this course. "The House having considered the petition, reject it."

Mr. Pickens, of S. C. said that, as this debate had taken a much wider range than he had anticipated, and as topics had been thrown out in discussion of high import, he desired the indulgence of the House...

Mr. P. asked if he was right? when Mr. Mason suggested, "As other gentlemen had indulged in considerable latitude of debate, Mr. P. hoped that he would like indulgence to him."

Mr. Beardsley had claimed that this petition received, under the Constitution, Mr. P. admitted this right, as fully as any member on his side.

Mr. P. said that the citizens of this District have their rights in this species of property secured under the act extending jurisdiction to the United States Government, by the State of Virginia.

Mr. P. said, he did not propose to go into the argument now in all its bearings, but would beg leave to refer merely for the consideration of the House at present, the third section of the act of session.

Mr. P. continued, He said he merely indulged these remarks now, as the debate had been extended much further by other gentlemen, but would now confine himself to reply to certain tenets which had fallen from the gentleman from New-York.

Mr. P. said, that certain fanatics of the South, as well as of the North were interested together in agitating and discussing those topics. Mr. P. said, if that gentleman meant by this to insinuate that those who were in the House had been misled in these discussions by any sinister motives for party purposes and party effect, he would throw back the insinuation with scorn and contempt.

Mr. P. said, he had understood before that the same insinuations had come from a higher quarter than from the gentleman from New-York, and he (Mr. P.) would take this opportunity, standing in his place before the country, to pronounce them a base, foul and infamous calumny, and those who uttered them knew well to be such at the time they made them.

Mr. P. said, true, we do not avoid discussion, because we believe we have been wronged. He had the honor, in part, to represent a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people.

Mr. P. said, he had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people.

Mr. P. said, he had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people.

Mr. P. said, he had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people.

Mr. P. said, he had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people.

Mr. P. said, he had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people.

Mr. P. said, he had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people.

Mr. P. said, he had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people.

Mr. P. said, he had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people; they had no fears of a free and gallant people.

the consideration of the expediency of prohibiting the circulation of incendiary publications by mail; the House resolved to discuss the question.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

Mr. Sutherland [from Pennsylvania] believed, he said, that there was no man in the House who had not been called upon to give his own opinion on the subject that his own; but he was not quite satisfied with the feeling exhibited in some quarters of the House.

the petition for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade, in the District, presented by Mr. Baines of New-York.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.

Mr. Granger, of New-York, took the floor, and briefly protested against the manner in which the petitioners had been confounded with the abolitionists of the North, and the right to petition, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right; and the abolitionists who sustained the petition for the abolition of slavery, as a constitutional right.