

LIBERATOR
EVERY FRIDAY MORNING,
— AT THE —
SLAVERY OFFICE, 21 CORNHILL.
HERBERT P. WALLCUT, General Agent.
TERMS—Two dollars and fifty cents per an
in advance.
Copies will be sent to one address for two
if payment be made in advance.
All remittances are to be made, and all letters
sent to the publishers, and not to the printer.
Advertisements making less than one square in-
crease times for 75 cents—one square for \$1.00.
The Agents of the American, Massachusetts,
Ohio and Michigan Anti-Slavery Socie-
ties are authorized to receive subscriptions for this
paper.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, Editor.
VOL. XXVII. NO. 12.

REFUGEE OF OPPRESSION.

THE CASE OF DRED SCOTT.

Chief Justice Taney, in delivering the opinion of the Court, said that this case, after argument at the Court, was directed to be reargued at the present term, owing to differences of opinion existing among members of the Court, and in order to give opportunity for more mature deliberation.

There were two leading questions—first: Had the Circuit Court of the United States in the District of Missouri jurisdiction in the case? and if it had, was its decision erroneous or not? The defendant in error, by plea in abatement, the Circuit Court of the United States, on the ground that the plaintiff is a negro of African descent, his ancestors were of pure African blood, and were brought into this country and sold as slaves, and therefore the plaintiff is not a citizen of the State of Missouri. To this plea the defendant demurred, and the Court sustained the demurrer. Thereupon the defendant pleaded over, and admitted the fact of his being a negro slave, and a state of facts, agreed to by both parties, was read into the record.

The Chief Justice having stated the facts in the case, proceeded (in a tone of voice almost inaudible) to say, in substance, that the question first to be decided was, whether the plaintiff was entitled to sue in a Court of the United States, and if so, whether the Court had jurisdiction of the case, and it was the duty of the Court to decide it. The question was simply this: Can a negro, whose ancestors were imported into this country, and sold as slaves, become a member of the political community formed and brought into existence by the Constitution of the United States, and, as such, be entitled to all the rights and immunities of a citizen of the United States? In answering this question, we must not confound the rights of a citizen which a State may confer within its limits, with the rights of a citizen within the limits of the United States. No one can be a citizen of the United States, unless under the provisions of the Constitution; but it does not follow that a man, being a citizen of one State, must be recognized as such by every State in the Union. He may be a citizen in one State, and not recognized as such in another. Previous to the adoption of the Constitution, every State might confer the character of a citizen, and endow a man with all the rights pertaining to it. This was confined to the boundaries of a State, and gave him no rights beyond its limits. Nor have the several States surrendered this power by the adoption of the Constitution. Every State may confer the right upon an alien, or upon any other class or description of persons, to hold real and personal property, to sue in the courts of the United States, and to be a witness in the courts of the United States. He would not thereby become a citizen of the United States, and, therefore, could not sue in any court in the United States, nor could he enjoy the immunities of a citizen in the other States. His rights would be confined strictly to his own State. The Constitution gives Congress the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization; consequently, no State can naturalize an alien, or confer upon him the immunities of a citizen of all the States under the Federal Government. It is very clear, therefore, that no State can, by any act, introduce a new member into the political Union created by the Constitution. The question then arises, whether the provisions of the Constitution of the United States in relation to personal rights to which a citizen of a State is entitled, embraced negroes of the African race, who were brought into this country, and sold as slaves, and whether it is in the power of any State to make such a one a citizen of the State, and endow him with full citizenship in any other State without their consent? Does the Constitution of the United States act upon him, and clothe him with all the rights of a citizen? The Court think the affirmative cannot be maintained; and, if not, the plaintiff could not be a citizen of Missouri within the meaning of the Constitution, and consequently could not sue in the Circuit Court.

It is true that every person, and every class and description of persons at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, regarded as citizens of the several States, became citizens of this new political body, and none other. It was formed for them and their posterity, and for nobody else; and all the rights and immunities were intended to embrace only those of State communities, or those who became citizens according to the principles on which the Constitution was adopted, and the union of those who were members of the political communities, whose power, for certain specified purposes, extended over the whole Territories of the United States, and gave each citizen rights outside his State which he did not before possess, and placed all rights of persons and property on an equality.

It becomes necessary, therefore, to determine who were citizens of the several States when the Constitution was adopted. In order to do this, we must recur to the Constitution when they separated from Great Britain, formed new communities, and took their places among the family of nations. They who were recognized as citizens of the States declared their independence of Great Britain, and defended by the force of arms. Another class of persons, who had been imported as slaves, or their descendants, and who were not recognized or intended to be included in the political community—the Declaration of Independence. It is an instrument which realizes the state of public opinion respecting that unfortunate class, with the civilized and enlightened portion of the world, at the time of the Declaration of Independence, and the adoption of the Constitution; but history shows they have for more than a century been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and unfit to associate with the white race, either socially or politically, and had no rights which white men were bound to respect; and the black man might be reduced to slavery, bought and sold, and treated as an ordinary article of merchandise. This opinion, at that time, was fixed and universal with the civilized portion of the white race. It was regarded as an axiom in morals, which no one thought of disputing, and every one habitually acted upon it, without reflecting for a moment the correctness of the opinion. And in no nation was this opinion more fixed and universally acted upon than in England, the subjects of which Government were only united them on the Coast of Africa, but took them as ordinary merchandise, to which they could make a profit on them. This opinion thus entertained was universally impressed on the Colonists this side of the Atlantic; accordingly, negroes of the African race were regarded by them as property, and held, and bought, and sold, as such in every one of the thirteen Colonies which united in the Declaration of Independence, and afterwards formed the Constitution. The doctrine of which we have spoken was strikingly evidenced by the Declaration of Independence. It be-

gins thus: "When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitles them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation;" and then proceeds: "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted—among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," &c. The words before quoted would seem to embrace the whole human race, and if used in a similar instrument at this family would be so understood. But it is too clear for dispute that the enslaved African race was not intended to be included; for, in that case, the distinguished men who framed the Declaration of Independence would be flagrantly against the principles which they asserted. They who framed the Declaration of Independence were men of too much honor, education and intelligence, to say what they did not believe; and they knew that in no part of the civilized world were the rights of freemen, by common consent, admitted according to the practices, doctrines and usages of the day. That unfortunate race was supposed to be separate from the whites, and was never thought or spoken of except as property. These opinions underwent no change when the Constitution was adopted. The preamble sets forth for what purpose and for whose benefit it was formed. It was formed by the people—such as the members of the original States—and the great object was to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. It speaks in general terms of citizen and people of the United States when providing for the powers granted, without defining what description of persons should be included, or who should be regarded as citizens. But two classes of the Constitution point to the negro race as separate, and not regarded as citizens, for whom the Constitution was adopted. One clause reserves to the States import slaves until 1808, and in the second the States pledge themselves, one to another, to preserve the right to their respective Territories. By the first clause, the right to purchase and hold this property is directly sanctioned and authorized by the persons who framed the Constitution, for twenty years; and the States pledged themselves to uphold the right of the master as long as the Government then formed should endure. And this shows conclusively that the other provisions of the Constitution, which were not intended to confer upon them or their posterity the blessings of liberty so carefully conferred upon the whites. None of this class ever emigrated to the United States voluntarily. They were all articles of merchandise. The number emancipated was few as compared with those who were held in slavery, and not sufficiently numerous to attract public attention as a separate class, and were regarded as a part of the slave population, rather than as citizens.

It cannot be supposed that the States conferred citizenship upon them; for all those States at that time established police regulations for the security of themselves and families, as well as of property. In some minor cases there were different modes of trial, and it could not be supposed that those States which abolished this right, and took from them the safeguards essential to their own protection. They have not the right to bear arms, and appear at public meetings to discuss political questions or urge measures of reform which they might deem advisable. They cannot vote at elections, nor serve as jurors, nor appear as witnesses where whites are concerned. These rights are secured in every State to white men. It is impossible to believe that the men of the slaveholding States, who took so large a share in the formation of the Constitution, could be so regardless of themselves, and the safety of those who trusted and confided in them.

Every law of naturalization confers citizenship to white persons. This is a marked separation from the blacks. Under the Confederation, every State had a right to decide for itself, and the term "free inhabitant," the generality of form, certainly excluded the African race. Laws were framed for the latter especially. Under the Constitution, the word "citizen" is substituted for "free inhabitant." After further elaboration on this point, the Chief Justice said, from the best consideration, we are of opinion that the African race, who came to this country as slaves, were not intended to be included in the Constitution for the enjoyment of any personal rights or benefits; and the two provisions which point to them treat them as property, and make it the duty of the Government to protect them as such. Hence, the Court is of opinion, from the facts stated in the plea in abatement, that Dred Scott is not a citizen of Missouri, and is not, therefore, entitled to sue in the United States Courts. The following facts appear on the record:—

In the year 1834, the plaintiff was a negro slave belonging to Dr. Emerson, who was a surgeon in the army of the United States, and was stationed at Fort Snelling, on the west bank of the Mississippi River, in the territory known as Upper Louisiana, acquired by the United States from France, and situated north of the latitude of 36 deg. 30 min. north, and north of the State of Missouri. Said Dr. Emerson held the plaintiff in slavery at said Fort Snelling until the year 1838.

In the year 1838, Harriet (who is named in the second count of the plaintiff's declaration) was the slave of Major Taliaferro, who belonged to the army of the United States. In that year (1838) said Major Taliaferro took said Harriet to said Fort Snelling, and she there as a slave until the year 1836, and then sold her there as a slave at Fort Snelling unto said Dr. Emerson, hereinbefore named; and said Dr. Emerson held said Harriet in slavery at said Fort Snelling until the year 1838.

In the year 1838, the plaintiff and said Harriet, with the consent of said Dr. Emerson, who then claimed to be their master and owner, intermarried, and took each other for husband and wife. Eliza and Lizzie, named in the third count of the plaintiff's declaration, are the fruit of that marriage. Eliza is about 14 years old, and was born on board the steamboat Gipsy, north of the north line of the State of Missouri, and upon the Mississippi River; Lizzie is about seven years old, and was born in the State of Missouri, at the military post called Jefferson Barracks.

Emerson sold and conveyed the plaintiff, said Harriet, and Lizzie, to the defendant, as slaves, and the defendant claimed to hold each of them as slaves. At the time mentioned in the plaintiff's declaration, the defendant, claiming to be owner as aforesaid, laid his hands upon said plaintiff, Harriet, Eliza and Lizzie, and imprisoned them; doing in this respect, however, no more than what he might lawfully do if they were of right his slaves at such time.

The Chief Justice proceeded to examine the statement, assuming that this part of the controversy presented two questions.

Firstly—Was he (Scott) and all his family free in Missouri?—If not, were they free by reason of their removal to Rock Island, Illinois. The act of Congress on which the plaintiff relies contains the clause that slavery and involuntary servitude, except for crime, shall be forever prohibited in that part of the Territory acquired by treaty from Louisiana, and not included within the limits of the State of Louisiana. The difficulty which meets us at the threshold is, what law under the powers granted to it by the Constitution? The plaintiff dwells much on the clause which gives Congress power "to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property of the United States." But this provision has no bearing on the present controversy. The power there given is confined to the Territory which then belonged to the United States, and which had no influence on Territory which was then under foreign Government. The Justice then referred from foreign Government to land by Virginia and other States, saying the only object was to put an end to the existing controversy, and to enable Congress to dispose of the lands for the common benefit. Undoubtedly the power of sovereignty and eminent domain was vested in the act. This was proper to make it essential. There was then no Government in existence with enumerated powers. What were called the States were thirteen independent Colonies, which entered into confederation for mutual protection. It was the duty of Congress of Embassadors, which all had a common concern. It was this Congress which accepted the cession from Virginia. They had no right to do so under the articles of the Confederation, but they had a right, as independent powers, to accept the land for the common benefit; and it is clear, having no superior to control them, they had a right to exercise absolute dominion, subject only to the restrictions which Virginia imposed. The ordinance of 1787, and among other provisions, that slavery or involuntary servitude should be prohibited, except for crime.

This was the state of things when the Constitution was formed. The Territory ceded by Virginia belonged to the several confederate States as common property. The States were about to dissolve the Confederation, and surrender a portion of their power for the formation of a new Government, and the language used limited for specified objects to be accomplished. It was obvious that some provision was necessary to give the new Government the power to carry into effect every object for which the Territory was ceded. It was necessary that the lands should be sold to pay the war debt, and that power should be given to protect the citizens who might emigrate, with their rights of property, arms, military stores, (as well as ships of war,) were the common property of the States existing in their independent character, and they had no right to take their property to the Territory, without the authority of the States. The object was to place these things under the guardianship of a new Government, which gives Congress the power "to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property of the United States." It applied only to property held in common at the time, and not with reference to any property which the sovereignty might subsequently acquire. It applied to the Territory then in existence, and known as the Territory of the United States, then in the minds of the framers of the Constitution. It refers to the sale or raising of money. This is different from the power to legislate over the Territories. With the words "to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory," are coupled the words "and other property of the United States." And the concluding words render this construction irresistible: "And nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

It is obvious that the Congress, under the new Government, regarded the above clause as necessary to carry into effect the principles and provisions of the Ordinance of 1787, which they regarded as an act of the States in the exercise of their political power at the time; and these representatives of the same States under the new Government did not think proper to depart from any essential principle, and did not attempt to undo anything that was done. As to Territory acquired without the limits of the United States, it remains Territory until admitted into the Union. No power is given in the Constitution to acquire Territory to be held and governed in that character; and, consequently, there cannot be found in the Constitution any definition of power which Congress may lawfully exercise before it becomes a State. The power to acquire Territory until it is in a condition to become a State on an equal footing with the other States cannot rest on some act of the Government to administer the laws of the United States for the protection of personal rights and property therein.

Whatever Territory is acquired is for the common benefit of the people of the United States, which is but a trustee. At the time that Territory was obtained from France, it contained no population to be admitted as a State, and it therefore became necessary to hold possession of it until settled and inhabited by a civilized community, capable of self-government, and ready to protect the inhabitants in their personal and property. The power to acquire carries with it the power to preserve. The form of government necessarily rests on the discretion of Congress. It is their duty to establish the best suited for the United States, and that must depend on the number of its inhabitants, and the character and situation of the Territory. What Government is the best must depend on the condition of the Territory at the time, to be continued until it shall become a State, and it can never be a mere discretionary power. But there can never be a mere discretionary power over persons and property. These are plainly defined by the Constitution. The Constitution provides that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, &c. Thus the rights of prop-

erty are united with the personal rights, and this extends to the Territories as well as to the States. Congress cannot authorize the Territories to do what it cannot do itself; it cannot confer on the Territories power to violate the provisions of the Constitution.

It seems, however, that there is supposed to be a difference between slaves and other property. The people, in the formation of the Constitution, delegated to the General Government certain enumerated powers, and forbade the exercise of others. It has no powers over persons and property of citizens, except those enumerated in the Constitution. If the Constitution recognizes the right of master and slave, and makes no difference between slaves and other property, no tribunal acting under the authority of the United States can draw such a distinction, and deny the provisions and guarantees secured against the encroachment of the Government. As we have already said, the right of property in a slave is expressly conferred in the Constitution, and guaranteed to every State. This is in language too plain to be misunderstood; and no words can be found in the Constitution giving Congress greater power over slaves than over any other description of property.

It is, therefore, the opinion of this Court that the Act of Congress which prohibits citizens from holding property of this character north of a certain line is not warranted by the Constitution, and is therefore void; and neither Dred Scott nor any one of his family were made free by their residence in Illinois. The plaintiff was not a citizen of Missouri, but was still a slave, and therefore had no right to sue in a Court of the United States.

The dangers apprehended from the organic tendencies of the Supreme Court to engross the legislative power of the federal government, which Jefferson foresaw, and so often warned his countrymen against, are no longer imaginary. They are upon us. The decision rendered by that body on Friday, in the case of a Missouri negro who had appeared to it for assistance in asserting his right to slavery. Hereafter, if this decision shall stand for law, slaves instead of being what the people of the slave States have hitherto called it, their peculiar institution, is a federal institution, the common patrimony and shame of all the States, those who laud with the title of free, as well as those which accept the stigma of being the Land of Bondage; hereafter, wherever our jurisdiction extends, it carries with it the chain and the scourge—wherever our flag floats, it is the flag of slavery. If so, that flag should have the light of the stars and the straws of running red drawn from it; it should be dyed black, and its device should be the whip and the fetter.

Are we to accept, without question, these new readings of the Constitution—to sit down contentedly under this disgrace—to admit that the Constitution was never before rightly understood, even by those who framed it—to consent that hereafter it shall be the slaveholder's instead of the freeman's Constitution? Never! Never!

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the recent decision of the Supreme Court. The grounds and methods of that decision we have expounded elsewhere; and we now turn from them to contemplate the great fact which it establishes, and which is the subject of our present consideration, that the Supreme Court, shall reverse this wicked and false judgment, the Constitution of the United States is nothing better than the bulwark of inhumanity and oppression. It is most true that this decision is bad law; that it is based on false historical premises and wrong interpretations of the Constitution; that it does not at all represent the legal or judicial opinion of the nation; that it is merely a Southern sophism clothed with the dignity of our highest Court. Nevertheless, there it is, the final action of the National Judiciary, established by the founders of the Republic to interpret the Constitution, and to embody by the ultimate legal conclusions of the whole people—an action proclaiming that, in the view of the Constitution, slaves are property. The inference is plain. If slaves are recognized as property by the Constitution, of course no local or State law can either prevent property being carried through an individual State or Territory, or forbid its being held as such wherever its owner may choose to hold it. This is all involved in the present decision; but let a single case draw from the Court an official judgment, that slaves are to be held and protected under National law, and we shall see men buying slaves for the New York market. There will be no legal power to prevent it. At this moment, indeed, any wealthy New York jobber connected with the Southern trade can put in his next orders: "Send me a negro cook, at the lowest market value! Buy me a waiter! Balance my account with two chambermaids and a truckman! Excepting the interference of the Transportation Railway, and the fact that there will be nothing to stop this. But then, these underhand efforts for stealing property must, of course, be checked by our police. Mr. Matzell will have no more right to allow gentlemen's servants to be spirited away by burglarious Abolitionists than gentlemen's spoons. They are property under even stronger pledges of security than mere lifeless chattels. The whole power of the State of New York, the Courts and the militia, to protect each New York slave-owner from the robbery or burglary of his negro. If they are not sufficient, why then the United States army and navy can be called on to guard that singular species of property which alone of all property the Constitution has specially recognized. Slaves can be kept in Boston; Mr. Toombs can call the roll of his chattels on the slope of Bunker Hill; auctions of black slaves may be held in front of Faneuil Hall, and the slave-ship, protected by the guns of United States frigates, may land its dastard cargo at Plymouth Rock. The free hills of Vermont, the lakes of Maine, the valleys of Connecticut, the city where the ancient Oak of Liberty has wisely fallen, may be traversed by the gangs of the negro-driver, and enriched by the legitimate commerce of the slave-pen. Are we told that public opinion will prevent this? What can public opinion do against the Supreme Court and all the power of the United States? Shall not a citizen of this Union have the right to take and hold his property, his horses, his oxen, his dogs, his slaves wherever it seems to him good? According to the law now established, the free-State men of Kansas are robbers, for they attack the constitutional and inalienable rights of property. The bogus laws of which they presume to complain, but which the mild and paternal punishment of death is now to protect from infraction, are just and necessary laws for the safety of the sacred rights. The number of free Soil men in that Territory can make no difference hereafter, as it has made none hitherto. Slavery is there, as the ownership of horses or land is there, by supreme national law. Of what use, then, to contend for such a shadow as the difference between a free and a slave Constitution? Or what sense in that old fiction of State Rights? The States have no rights as respects freedom; their rights consist only in establishing and strengthening slavery—nothing more. Another most pregnant change is wrought by this decision, in respect of Northern people. We have

been accustomed to regard slavery as a local matter, for which we were in no wise responsible. As we have been used to say, it belonged to the Southern States alone, and they must answer for it before the world. We can say this no more. Now, wherever the stars and stripes wave, they protect slavery and represent slavery. The black and cursed stain is thick on our hands also. From Maine to the Pacific, over all future conquests and annexations, wherever in the islands of western seas, or in the South American Continent, or in the Mexican Gulf, the flag of the Union, by just means or unjust, shall be planted, there it plants the curse, and tears, and blood, and unpaid toil of this institution! The Star of Freedom and the stripes of bondage are henceforth one. American Republicanism and American Slavery are for the future synonymous. This, then, is the final fruit. In this, all the labors of our statesmen, the blood of our heroes, the life-long cares and toils of our forefathers, the aspirations of our scholars, the prayers of good men, have finally ended! America the slaveholder and slaveholder!

The Commercial Advertiser is waking up to the tremendous and far-reaching consequences of the Supreme Court's decision in the Dred Scott case. The following statement is frank and lucid:— "Now, there is no concealing the fact, that under this decision the rights which the free States have all along believed themselves to possess, are denied, and can no longer be recognized. They have supposed that it was their prerogative to prohibit manumission, and carry out their declaration, that a slave brought voluntarily by his owner within their borders should thereby be freed from bondage, especially when they met the requirements of the Constitution by surrendering fugitive slaves, and the requirements of good brotherhood by publicly announcing that any slaveholder bringing his slave or slaves into their territory would do so much contrist. They believed they had just as much constitutional right to say, 'You shall not bring your slaves into our State,' as to say, 'We will return your slaves if they escape into our State.' According to the decision now made, all this has been wrong. New York has no such power. The Federal Constitution requires not only that she shall return the fugitive slave who seeks refuge in her territory, but that if a slaveholder brings into any of her cities or towns a whole retinue of slaves, she shall protect him in his ownership of them, as she would in the ownership of so many horses or oxen. Unless we have mistaken the tenor and extent of the decision, and we do not think we have, any of the following consequences may result from it: A. B., from Louisiana, may bring his family to New York city, with as many slaves to wait upon him as he chooses. He may stay with them a month, a year, or five years, so long as he is always about to return; or he may himself pass to and fro, retaining his residence in Louisiana. C. D., may also come from South Carolina under similar circumstances, and settle in the city, and to be protected and otherwise treated as property, may be indefinitely increased. Then A. B. may sell a part of his slaves to C. D. Or C. D. and himself, disagreeing about the price, he may advertise that he has such slaves for sale to any gentleman from either of the slave States, and where they may be seen; for the right of property involves these rights. And if under this decision it may still be within the constitutional power of a State to prohibit its own citizens from selling slaves, (which may be doubted so far as any practical assertion of such power is concerned,) yet under that decision slaveholders in transitu might thus convert this Empire City into a slave mart."

The Commercial may rest assured that the people of the free States will find some way to protest against this monstrous usurpation, and to make that protest effectual. It is bad enough that we are made slave-catchers against our will; we will not consent in like manner to be made slaveholders. The conscience and the self-respect of the free States will vindicate themselves, in spite of the recent decision and a dozen like it.—*Ibid.*

This, then, becomes the creed of the Buchanan administration, and the party that upholds it. The Democratic party has been gradually but rapidly tending to these doctrines for the last dozen years, or ever since, indeed, they first sprang from the brain of their originator, John C. Calhoun, in 1847. It has never dared openly to avow them, it cringes, it hesitates, it wavers, it is obliged them, in order to save itself from utter overthrow in the hands of the free States; but now, held in the secure possession of the government for four years, and backed by the Supreme Court, it will probably no longer hesitate, but fling them forth in defiance of all history and the public sentiment of the free States.

The originality and modernness of these doctrines, that now spring forth, fall from, from the Supreme Court and the great Democratic party, will strike everybody at all familiar with our political history. They are found nowhere in the political, secular or judicial discussions of the country previous to 1840. The entire course and practice of the government, in all its departments, was against them down to 1850. Washington, the Adamses, Jefferson, Monroe, Madison, Jackson, Calhoun himself, Webster, all our Presidents, statesmen and jurists, until within these last dozen years, have upheld and defended the opposing principles. Their introduction now, under such circumstances, constituting them at once the ruling doctrines of a nation, and shows to what a fatal extent the interests of a false system of labor and of society have possessed themselves of all the departments of government.—*Springfield Republican.*

The U. S. Supreme Court. The recent extraordinary decision of the Supreme Court of the United States will be better understood and appreciated, when the thoroughly partisan character which it has been gradually made to assume is regarded. The veneration which that august tribunal accorded for itself when its decisions were made and its judgments pronounced by such Justices as Jay, Rutledge, Ellsworth, Marshall, Story, and others—men whose ability, disinterestedness and patriotism were universally conceded in no man's estimation—has been a signal shock, and the suspicion is beginning to be entertained that our high justices, who were supposed to be beyond the reach of reproach, are quite as fallible as public men in inferior positions and under greater temptations. The truth is, the Court has been wholly revolutionized. The sleepless vigilance of the Slave Power has been constantly watching its opportunity to invade the temple of justice, from time to time insinuating upon the opinions of advocates of its most obvious decisions, until now the tribunal is apparently its own, ready to sustain the most ultra Southern ground.—*Salem Register.*

THE OPINION OF JUDGE CURTIS IN THE DRED SCOTT CASE.

The Boston Courier publishes a full report of the able and irrefutable Opinion of Judge Curtis, dissenting from the Opinion pronounced by Chief Justice Taney and a majority of the Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case. It would occupy one entire number of THE LIBERATOR, in ordinary type. We can only give an extract from it this week, in which Judge Curtis takes up the subject of citizenship as regards a person of African descent. He remarks—

I cannot, therefore, treat this plea as containing an avowal that the plaintiff himself was a slave at the time of the act brought; and the inquiry recurs whether the facts that he is of African descent and that his parents were once slaves, are necessarily inconsistent with his own citizenship in the State of Missouri within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

In Gassies vs. Ballou, 6 P. 761, the defendant was described on the record as a naturalized citizen of the United States, residing in Louisiana. The Court held this equivalent to an avowal that the defendant was a citizen of Louisiana; because a citizen of the United States, residing in Louisiana, is, for the purpose of jurisdiction, a citizen of that State. Now the plea to the jurisdiction in this case does not controvert the fact that the plaintiff resided in Missouri at the date of the writ. If he did then reside there, and was also a citizen of the United States, no provisions contained in the Constitution or laws of Missouri can deprive the plaintiff of his right to sue citizens of States other than Missouri, in the courts of the United States.

So that, under the allegations contained in this plea, and admitted by the defendant, the inquiry is whether any person of African descent, whose ancestors were sold as slaves in the United States, can be a citizen of the United States. If any such person can be a citizen, this plaintiff has the right to the judgment of the Court that he is so; for no cause is shown by the plea why he is not so, except his descent and the slavery of his ancestors.

The first section of the second article of the Constitution uses the language, "the citizens of the United States, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution," and one mode of approaching this question is to inquire who were citizens of the United States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution.

Citizens of the United States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution can have no other than citizens of the United States under the confederation. By the articles of confederation a government was organized, the style whereof was: "The United States of America." The government was in existence when the Constitution was framed and proposed for adoption, and was to be superseded by the new government of the United States of America, organized under the Constitution. When, therefore, the Constitution speaks of citizenship of the United States, existing at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, it must necessarily refer to citizenship under the government which existed prior to and at the time of such adoption.

Without going into a question concerning the powers of the confederation to govern the Territory of the United States out of the limits of the States, and consequently to sustain the relation of government and citizen in respect to the inhabitants of such Territory, it may safely be said that the citizens of the several States were citizens of the United States under the confederation. That government was simply a confederacy of the several States possessing a few defined powers over subjects of general concern, each State retaining every power, jurisdiction and right not expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled. And no power was transferred to the government of the confederation, to act on any question of citizenship or to make any rules in respect thereto. The whole matter was left to stand upon the action, and to the natural consequence of such action, that the citizens of each State should be citizens of that confederacy into which that State had entered, the style whereof was "the United States of America."

To determine whether any free persons, descended from Africans held in slavery, were citizens of the United States under the confederation, and consequently at the time of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, it is only necessary to know whether any such persons were citizens of either of the States under the confederation at the time of the adoption of the Constitution.

Of this there can be no doubt. At the time of the ratification of the articles of confederation, it is a fact beyond the reach of the most ingenious doubts, that all free, native born inhabitants of the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, and North Carolina, though descended from African slaves, were not only citizens of those States, but such of them as had the other necessary qualifications possessed the franchise of electors on equal terms with other citizens.

The Supreme Court of North Carolina, in the case of the State vs. Dev. and Bat. 20, has declared the law of that State to be, in terms which I believe to be as sound in law, in the United States which I have enumerated as it was in North Carolina. "According to the laws of this State," says Mr. Justice Gaston, in delivering the opinion of the Court, "all human beings within it who are not slaves, fall within one or two classes. What distinctions may have existed in the Roman laws between free and slave inhabitants, they are unknown to our institutions."

Before our Revolution, all free persons, born within the Kingdom of Great Britain, whatever their color or complexion, were native born British subjects; those born out of its allegiance were aliens. Slavery did not exist in England, but it did in the British colonies. Slaves were not, in legal parlance, persons, but property. The moment the incapacity—the disqualification of slavery—was removed, they became persons, and were then either British subjects or not British subjects, according as they were or were not born within the allegiance of the British King. Upon the revolution, no other change took place in the laws of North Carolina than was consequent on the transition from a colony, dependent on an European king, to a free and sovereign State. Slaves remained slaves. British subjects in North Carolina became North Carolina freemen. Foreigners, until manumitted here, became aliens. Slaves, manumitted here, became freemen; and therefore, if born within North Carolina, are citizens of North Carolina; and all free persons born within the State are born citizens of the State. The Constitution extended the elective franchise to every freeman who had arrived at the age of twenty-one, and paid a public tax; and it is a matter of universal notoriety, that under it, free persons, without regard to color, claimed and exercised it until it was taken from free men of color a few years since by our amended Constitution.

An argument from speculative premises, however well chosen, that the then state of opinion in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was not consistent with the natural rights of those people who were born on that soil, and that they were not by the constitution of 1780 of that State admitted to the condition of citizens, would be received with surprise by the people of that State, who know their own political history. It is true, beyond all controversy, that persons of color, descended from African slaves, by that constitution, made citizens of the State, and that such of them as have had the necessary qualifications, have held and exercised the elective franchise, as citizens, from that time to the present. (See Com. vs. Aves, 18 Pick. R.)

The constitution of New Hampshire conferred the elective franchise upon every inhabitant of the State having necessary qualifications, of which color or descent was not one. The constitution of New York gave the right to vote to every male inhabitant who shall have resided a year, making no discrimination between free colored persons and others. That of New Jersey to all inhabitants of this colony of full age, who are worth £50 proclamation money, free, clear estate.

New York, by its constitution of 1820, required colored persons to have some qualifications, and required for voting, which white persons need not possess. And New Jersey, by its present constitution, restricts the right to vote to white male citizens. That these changes can have no other effect upon the rights of inquiry, except to show, what indeed is indisputable, that before they were made, no such restrictions existed; and colored persons in common with white persons, were not only citizens of the States, but entitled to the elective franchise on the same qualifications as white persons; as they now are in New Hampshire and Massachusetts.

The fourth of the fundamental articles of the confederation was as follows: "The free inhabitants of each of these States, paupers, vagabonds and fugitives from justice excepted, shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States."

The fact that free persons of color were citizens of some of the several States, and the consequence of that, is the fourth article of the confederation, which has the effect to confer on such persons the privileges and immunities of general citizenship, were not only known to those who framed and adopted those articles, but the evidence is decisive, that the fourth article was intended to have that effect, and that more restricted language, which would have excluded such persons, was deliberately and purposely rejected.

On the 25th of June, 1778, the articles of confederation being under consideration by the Congress, the delegates from South Carolina moved to amend the fourth article, by inserting after the word "free," and before the word "inhabitants," the word "white," so that the privileges and immunities of general citizenship would be secured only to white persons. Two States voted for the amendment, eight States against it, and the vote of one State was divided. The language of the article stood unaltered, and both, by its terms of inclusion, "free inhabitants," and by its terms of exclusion, "paupers, vagabonds and fugitives," who alone were excepted, it is clear, that under the confederation, and at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, free colored persons, of African descent, might be, and, by reason of their being inhabitants of certain States, were entitled to the privileges and immunities of general citizenship of the United States.

Did the Constitution of the United States deprive them of their descent and citizenship? The Constitution was ordained and established by the people of the United States through the action, in each State, of those persons who were qualified by its laws to act thereon in behalf of themselves and all other citizens of that State. In some of the States, as we have seen, colored persons were not only included in the body of "the people of the United States," by whom the Constitution was ordained and established, but, in at least five of the States, they had the power to act, and, doubtless did act, by their suffrages, upon the question of its adoption. It would be strange if we were to find in that instrument anything which deprived of their citizenship, any part of the people of the United States who were among those by whom it was established.

I can find nothing in the Constitution which, *proprio rigore*, deprives of their citizenship any class of persons who were citizens of the United States at the time of its adoption, or who should be native born citizens of any State after its adoption; nor any power enabling Congress to deprive persons born on the soil of any State, and entitled to citizenship of such State by its Constitution and laws. And my opinion is, that under the Constitution of the United States, every free person, born on the soil of a State, who is a citizen of that State, by force of its Constitution or laws, is also a citizen of the United States.

Every person, born on the soil of a State, who is a citizen of that State, by force of its Constitution or laws, is also a citizen of the United States.

The first section of the second article of the Constitution uses the language, "a natural born citizen," thus assuming that citizenship may be acquired by birth. After elucidating this point, Mr. Curtis proceeds to consider other clauses of the Constitution which, upon the question, and upon the clause, "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States," he remarks—

Nowhere else in the Constitution is there any thing denoting a general citizenship; but here, privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, under and by force of the United States compact, are granted and secured. In selecting those who are to enjoy these national rights of citizenship, how are they described? As citizens of each State. It is to them these national rights are secured. The qualification for them is not to be looked for in any provision of the Constitution or laws of the United States. They are to be citizens of the several States, and, as such, the privileges and immunities of the Constitution are to be enjoyed and guaranteed by the Constitution as to the United States from the action of the federal government, this was an occasion for referring to them. It cannot be supposed that it was the purpose of this article to confer the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States upon persons not citizens of the United States, and if it was intended to secure these rights only to citizens of the United States, how has the Constitution here described such persons? Simply as citizens of each State.

Laying aside, then, the case of aliens, concerning which the Constitution of the United States has provided, and confining our view to free persons born within the several States, we find that the Constitution has recognized the general principle of public law, that allegiance and citizenship depend on the place of birth; that it has attempted, practically, to apply this principle by designating the particular class of persons who should or should not come under it; that when we turn to the Constitution for an answer to the question, "who are persons born within the several States, the only answer we can receive from any of its express provisions is, the citizens of the several States are to enjoy the privileges and immunities of citizens in every State, and their franchise as electors under the Constitution depends on their citizenship in the several States. Add to this that the Constitution was ordained by the people of the United States; that they were "the people of the United States," for whom and whose territory the government was declared in the preamble of the Constitution, to be made; that each of them was a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, within the meaning of those words in that instrument; that by them the government was to be and was in fact organized; and that no power is conferred on the government of the Union to discriminate between them, or to discriminate against any of them; the necessary conclusion is, that those persons born within the several States, who, by force of their respective Constitutions and laws are citizens of the States, are thereby citizens of the United States.

And it must be borne in mind, that the difficulties which attend the allowance of the claims of colored persons to be citizens of the United States are not avoided by saying that though each State may make them its citizens, they are not thereby made citizens of the United States; because the privileges of general citizenship are secured to the citizens of each State. The language of the Constitution is: "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States." If each State may make such persons its citizens, they become, as such, entitled to the benefits of that article if there be a citizenship of the United States, distinct from the native born citizenship of the several States.

Judge Curtis cites numerous acts of legislation on the part of Congress as going to show that in the apprehension of their framers, color was not a necessary qualification of citizenship. "It would be strange," he says, "if laws were found on our statute book to that effect, when, by solemn treaties, large bodies of Mexican and North American Indians have been admitted citizenship of the United States."

Mr. Curtis sums up his conclusions on this point as follows:—

1st. That the free native born citizens of each State are citizens of the United States.

2d. That as free colored persons born within some of the States are citizens of those States, such persons are also citizens of the United States.

3d. That every such citizen, residing in any State, has the right to sue and is liable to be sued, in the federal courts, as a citizen of that State in which he resides.

4th. That as the plea to the jurisdiction in this case shows a fact, except that the plaintiff was of African descent, and his ancestors were sold as slaves; and as these facts are not inconsistent with his citizenship of the United States, and his residence in the State of Missouri, the plea to the jurisdiction was bad, and the judgment of the Circuit Court overruling it was correct.

I dissent, therefore, from that part of the opinion of the majority of the Court in which it holds that a person of African descent cannot be a citizen of the United States.

Mr. Badger of North Carolina, whose distinction as a lawyer entitles his judgment to more ordinary value, said at the conclusion of Judge Curtis's opinion, that it was the most clear, compact and conclusive piece of judicial reasoning, from first to last, that he had ever heard or read.

Mr. Badger of North Carolina, whose distinction as a lawyer entitles his judgment to more ordinary value, said at the conclusion of Judge Curtis's opinion, that it was the most clear, compact and conclusive piece of judicial reasoning, from first to last, that he had ever heard or read.

Mr. Badger of North Carolina, whose distinction as a lawyer entitles his judgment to more ordinary value, said at the conclusion of Judge Curtis's opinion, that it was the most clear, compact and conclusive piece of judicial reasoning, from first to last, that he had ever heard or read.

Mr. Badger of North Carolina, whose distinction as a lawyer entitles his judgment to more ordinary value, said at the conclusion of Judge Curtis's opinion, that it was the most clear, compact and conclusive piece of judicial reasoning, from first to last, that he had ever heard or read.

Mr. Badger of North Carolina, whose distinction as a lawyer entitles his judgment to more ordinary value, said at the conclusion of Judge Curtis's opinion, that it was the most clear, compact and conclusive piece of judicial reasoning, from first to last, that he had ever heard or read.

Mr. Badger of North Carolina, whose distinction as a lawyer entitles his judgment to more ordinary value, said at the conclusion of Judge Curtis's opinion, that it was the most clear, compact and conclusive piece of judicial reasoning, from first to last, that he had ever heard or read.

The Liberator.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS. BOSTON, MARCH 20, 1857.

THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.

Judge WILLIAM JAY has just published, in a pamphlet of 88 large octavo pages, "A Letter to the Committee chosen by the American Tract Society, to inquire into the proceedings of its Executive Committee, in relation to Slavery." It is another valuable contribution to the many he has made to the Anti-Slavery cause, and makes its appearance at a very timely period. His appeals to the Committee of Inquiry, to be faithful to the solemn trust committed to them, are earnest and cogent. Their duty, he tells them, is very plain. Their functions are not those of a jury, for there is no issue of fact to be tried, inasmuch as the acts of the Executive Committee of the Tract Society which have given offence, and which have led to their appointment, are admitted and justified. Their province is to collect the arguments for and against those acts, and to express their opinion of their relative weight; and herein "is found the stupendous responsibility involved in their commission."

This Committee consists of fourteen—only four of whom are laymen—at the head of which stands the Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, whose hunkerism is well known to the whole country. It has a difficult task to perform—not to please God, but to make a report that shall satisfy the increasing Anti-Slavery sentiment of the North, and at the same time not excite the pro-slavery ruffianism of the South. We expect nothing from it toward pleasing God, and feel just as confident it will fail to reconcile elements which are morally antagonistic. We shall look to one of its members, at least, to give an explicit utterance against the cowardly, selfish, and anti-Christian course pursued by the Tract Society on the subject of slavery—namely, the Rev. Dr. Wayland—possibly seconded by the Rev. Albert Barnes or the Rev. Dr. Hayes.

Judge Jay reviews the defence of the Society on the part of its President, and shows it to be as hypocritical as it is worthless. To the plea that, by the words of their charter, the tracts published were to be such as are "calculated to receive the approbation of all evangelical Christians;" and as there are churches of every denomination called evangelical, scattered all over the Southern States, the great mass of whose members would denounce any tract condemnatory of slavery, ergo, the Society should remain dumb on that subject, and cannot be justified in law or conscience in discussing it; Judge Jay keenly replies, that if the President had taken the trouble to read the charter which plays such an important part in his defence, he would have seen that "this famous charter, this shield of human bondage, is a very brief act of the New York Legislature, passed May 26th, 1841, incorporating, in the usual terms, 'all such persons as now are or may hereafter become members of the American Tract Society, formed in the city of New York, for the purpose of printing and circulating religious publications.' This is all it says about a specific object by prescribed means." Not a word about evangelical Christians, or indeed Christians of any sort or kind! "The charter," says Judge Jay, "contains not the most distant allusion to either slavery or tobacco-chewing; yet Tract Society logic deduces from it a legal prohibition to censure the one, and a legal warrant to denounce the divine displeasure against the other!"

By the first article of its constitution, the object of the Tract Society is declared to be, "to diffuse the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of sinners, and to promote the interests of vital godliness and sound morality, by the circulation of religious tracts calculated to receive the approbation of all evangelical Christians." Hence, says the President, "if these Southern churches remain evangelical churches, and Southern Christians are still evangelical Christians," it is the duty of the Society "to abstain from publishing *even truths*, the publication of which they would not approve." And though a portion might approve of these truths, no matter—no truth may be published, not accepted and approved by ALL!

"If this be, indeed, the just and literal meaning of the constitution," says Judge Jay, "then is the American Tract Society burdened with a constitution unparalleled for its stupidity and absurdity; a constitution giving to each individual among the evangelical Christians in this and other countries, a veto on every tract and book offered for publication to the Society. If such be the constitution, its framers were as subjects for a lunatic asylum." But they were "wise as well as good men," and this construction has been practically repudiated and rejected by the Society from its first organization to the present day.

As to who are evangelical Christians, within the meaning of the Constitution, Judge Jay correctly replies—"Unquestionably, such as belong to a church or denomination holding certain doctrines respecting the trinity, the atonement, the influence of the Holy Spirit, and justification by faith, &c. Yet nothing more was or could be intended than that the tracts published should contain nothing to which an evangelical Christian, as such, could object—that is, the doctrines held by his church should not be impugned. Hence, whether a tract was or was not calculated to receive the approbation of all evangelical Christians, was to be determined, not by the opinion of an individual Methodist or Baptist, but by an appeal to the creeds and confessions of faith of the different evangelical churches." Now, in what creed or confession is the right to enslave, or to traffic in human flesh, recognized as essential to an evangelical profession of faith, and Abolitionism set forth as a heresy?

One of the most important objects of the Society is the promotion of sound morality. But Judge Jay observes, with great significance—"Sound morality is not tested by evangelical doctrines, but by the precepts of Scripture, and the dictates of reason and of conscience." And he adds—"Innumerable are the amusements, occupations and practices denounced by the Society, which are vindicated and countenanced by multitudes of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, &c. &c. Probably the great mass of Evangelical Christians in this and other countries indulge in the use of intoxicating liquors, and maintain that their moderate use is lawful and Christian. Yet the Executive Committee, perfectly oblivious of the first article of the constitution, and utterly regardless of the disapprobation of whole multitudes of evangelical distillers, retailers and drinkers, have again and again launched its denunciations against the use of all intoxicating liquors." So, too, millions of evangelical Christians, and doubtless a great majority of the male members of the American Tract Society, daily indulge in the use of tobacco, and have no belief that such indulgence is unchristian. But the Executive Committee, careless of their approbation, have poured forth a tremendous counterblast to tobacco! Yet it is now discovered that nothing may be said against slavery, which is not calculated to receive the approbation of all evangelical slaveholders, traders, and breeders! What arrant hypocrisy!

Judge Jay refers, in terms of righteous indignation, to that indecorably wicked work by Rev. Nehemiah Adams, D. D., entitled "A South-Sea View of Slavery." He styles it an "unblest book"—a laborious vindication of American slavery, excusing and extenuating each of its abominations, and in its concluding, jecting tone, highly insulting to such of his fellow-Christians as had been zealous in exposing the iniquity of the slave system." And yet Dr. Adams, as one of the Publishing Committee of the Tract Society, exercises an absolute and irresponsible veto on every sentence of every tract offered for publication!

"No repentance will be deemed sincere," on the part of the Tract Society, says Judge Jay, "so long as the Rev. Nehemiah Adams, D. D., as the sentinel of the Slave Power, keeps watch and ward over the Tract press. . . . By his deplorable book, rendered still more irredeemable by his position in a great religious institution, he is a stumbling-block and rock of offence to many." He must be taken out of the way, or the supplies cut off.

For this faithful and unanswerable Letter, Judge Jay deserves the thanks of the friends of freedom, and of true religion throughout Christendom; but we are not a little surprised that he says, "I well has it been said by the Rev. Albert Barnes, the outward progress of liberty among the nations will compel the advances, if they would save the world from infidelity, (1) to detach themselves from slavery." How can those bodies which are so corrupt and cowardly as to need to be compelled, by an outward pressure, to go forward in a right direction, save the world from any of its crimes, or be in any sense the churches of Him who came to set the captive free? And why this fling at "infidelity," as though it (and not these churches) were the prop and bulwark of popular iniquity? Again—when he tells the Committee of Inquiry, "Your report will do much, either to reconcile the Northern Church to bondage and all its inseparable abominations, and thus to expose her to the scoff of the infidel;" &c., he certainly pays a marked tribute to infidelity as true to the cause of the oppressed, and therefore true to God; otherwise, it would not "scoff" at what is in accordance with his own spirit. We respectfully submit to Judge Jay, that the term "infidel" is a surer proof of honesty of purpose and goodness of heart, in this degenerate age and country, than that of Christian; that its invidious use is wholly unbecoming a true Protestant; that no man is an infidel who is true to his own convictions of duty, whatever he may think or say theologically; and that no human being is competent to wear the robes of infidelity.

Aside from this, we hail the appearance of this Letter, and trust it will be required for by all who take an interest either in the welfare of the American Tract Society, or, what is incomparably more important, in the utter and eternal overthrow of slavery in this guilty land.

THE ERA OF GOOD FEELING.

In August, 1856, Rev. Dr. Orville Dewey made a speech to his neighbors under the 'old elm tree' in Sheffield, Mass., in which he ventured to say something about slavery. In the October following, a characteristic and decidedly uncomplimentary letter from Charleston, S. C., complaining of the 'elm-tree' oration, and signed 'Some of your former friends,' was sent to Dr. Dewey. In February, 1857, Dr. Dewey arrived, through many uncertainties, at the point of deciding to reply to that letter through the New York Evening Post; and in the number of the Independent issued next thereafter, a comment upon that reply appears, entitled 'Moral Cosmetics,' from the pen of Henry Ward Beecher.

It must be admitted that saints have this great advantage over sinners—that, being well stocked with that charity which not only 'hath all things, but believeth all things, and never faileth,' they can always meet the charge, against themselves or others, of having done a bad thing, by the assumption that it was done with the best intentions. The contrast between these two classes of men appears most vividly in the correspondence above-mentioned. The prejudice and unreasonableness shown in the slaveholders' letter is so glaring that they themselves shrink from signing their names to it; and it was manifestly so open to replication (if Dr. Dewey had taken it in anger instead of in sorrow) that even Mr. Garrison could not deny it a 'refuge' on the first page of THE LIBERATOR, Dec. 19, 1856.

The fact is, that Dr. Dewey has been so intent upon fulfilling his Scriptural obligations, (we can't stop here to refer, by chapter and verse, to the precepts upon which his life has been modelled, but they are the well-known passages which speak of punctual eye-service to two masters, and remembrance of those who give good dinners as dining with them,) his demeanor to both North and South had been so obviously suited to elicit smiles, thanks and rose-water from both parties, that when this hail-storm rattled upon him from what had seemed till then the clear, blue sky of the South, no wonder that his tongue clave to the roof of his mouth, and that, for the space of three and a half months, he was astounded, and wist not what to say or do. But when he recovered the power of speech, and the mellifluous flow of his customary dialect, what can be more touching, to one who has the least softness of heart or head, than his complaint that the 'imputation of base and unworthy motives' proceeding from 'the generous and beautiful hospitality of the South' is 'very hard measure' for him. It must be! But he proceeds to display the ample ground for self-justification which his case affords, so patently as if he were addressing a jury of saints like himself, possessed of that fellow-feeling which makes men 'wondrous kind.' Hear him!

"I have firmly resisted the extreme measures of the Southern Abolitionists; . . . I am not an extremist on this slavery question; . . . I did not like Mr. Sumner's speech; . . . I thought Mr. Stowe did injustice to the slaveholder's character; . . . I did not note for Mr. Fremont; . . . I did not like the air of hostility to the South which his party presented; . . . I do not, as I never did, hold any extreme ground on this slavery question; . . . my address was a remonstrance with the South, not an address of war, but as determining never to let them go—as endeavoring to legitimate, perpetuate and extend the slave system. With this view, I said, first, that the system began in a monstrous wrong; and that what began so—what our government and the whole civilized world had pronounced to be piracy—the selling of a man as an article of commerce—ought not to be ennobled as an excellent and admirable thing. . . . I spoke of an institution, as persons whom I warmly regarded, I spoke of them with warm admiration and interest. . . . Do Southern men—I still seriously ask—do they deny that slavery is originally a wrong? Do they deny that the buying and selling of a man as an article of commerce? I did not say 'fearful,' and I did not say 'wicked,' as I said 'painful.' . . . And when I said that there are serious exposures to the character in plantation life—and I did not say it without agreement—that an incredible thing, or an unpardonable wrong in its origin, and my view was that slavery was a good thing, that it ought not to be now regarded as a 'good thing,' an excellent thing—an admirable system.' . . . It might do far more harm than good. I did not comfort myself with the thought that I was doing wrong; the plain and manifest purpose of my observations was, to reiterate, not against the sin of holding slaves, but against what I deemed the disastrous error of holding up slavery as an excellent and unobjectionable institution. . . . I said in my address that dealing in slaves had never been and was not now a respectable business, and certainly a very striking, tact concession; and certainly I never said that there was no doubt about the fact. The letter-writer says, 'Your assertion is an insult to the Southern States.' Now, what is meant by 'brokers,' in this connection, I do not know. There may be men that are interested in the traffic whose position is not compromised in either case, they could hardly be called 'dealers' in slaves. Was it not obvious that I meant to refer to the active agent—to the actual go-between—in this traffic? I think so; I certainly meant so; and I do not think that the gentlemen whom he gratuitously charges with insulting them with their air for confounding and compromising them with that traffic, I never suspected that what I said was to wound my friends at the South. . . . I know them better than to return scorn for scorn. I honor their virtues. I know in them some of the best people that I know any where. God bless them. I have no unkind word to say of them.

How like is this conclusion to the parting words—and tone—of St. Samuel, surnamed Pecksniff, as recorded by Mr. Dickens—

"I am not angry," observed Mr. Pecksniff. "I am hurt, Mr. Chuzzlewit; wounded in my feelings; but I am not angry, my good sir."

"But, rather than seeing, that the old man now pointed to the door, he raised his eyes, picked up his hat, and thus addressed him."

"Mr. Chuzzlewit, sir! you have partaken of my hospitality."

"And paid for it," he observed.

"Thank you, that savor," said Mr. Pecksniff, taking out his pocket-handkerchief, "of your old familiar frankness. You have paid for it. I was about to make the remark. You have deceived me, sir. Thank you again. I am glad of it. To see you in the possession of your health and faculties, on any terms, is, in itself, a sufficient recompense. To have been deceived, implies a trusting nature. Mine is a trusting nature. I am thankful for it. I would rather have a trusting nature, do you know, sir, than a doubting one!"

The fact is, Dr. Dewey's heart is so tender, and so saturated with the milk of human kindness, that when he is confronted by any white representative of 'the dignity of human nature' (white outside, mind you), who can look him in the eye, and say somewhat, no matter what, in his own defence, he cannot bring himself to believe that that man ever voluntarily does wrong. He probably pictures to himself the first slave-traders with horns, hoofs and claws, and of course does not trouble himself to hunt up any possible good intentions which may have actuated them in that business. But if the merchant who fitted out one of the slave-trading vessels from New York in the year just finished should walk into his study, and say, 'Sir, did you refer to me in that fanatical elm-tree speech, or in that impertinent letter?'—Dr. Dewey would probably reply—'My dear sir, how could you suppose such a thing? Was it not obvious that I meant to refer to the active agent? to the actual go-between in this traffic? I think so; I certainly meant so.'—And then, if the captain of the same slave-ship should step forward from behind the door, and say—'Sir, did you refer to me?'—would not Dr. Dewey say, with a countenance more in sorrow than in anger—'My dear sir, this is very hard measure for me! Your haste (very natural, no doubt, and excusable, under the circumstances) has made you overlook the particular expressions I used. I was speaking of slavery when it began; of what it was originally; what I said was this—that slavery was wrong in its origin. I did not say 'fearful,' I said 'painful'; I did not say 'mother,' I said 'brother.' Gentlemen, do me the favor to introduce me, each to the other.' (Dr. Dewey, Capt. Rough; Dr. Dewey, Mr. Ready.)

'Now, my dear friends, I never suspected that what I said was to wound you. I know you better than to return scorn for scorn. I honor your virtues. I know in you some of the best people that I know any where. God bless you! I have no unkind word to say of you.' Eminent ones.

Now, Mr. Henry Ward Beecher did not, by original constitution, possess such a sweetness of disposition, such an enlarged tolerance, as we have described. But good feeling is contagious; and by the very act of thinking of Dr. Dewey, Mr. Beecher caught enough of this cleaginous influence to remove all unpleasant friction from the approaching critical contact with his professional brother. He took up the pen to laugh at Dr. Dewey; but, ere he is aware, he subsides into the following tender strain, which presently widens to the inclusion of other professional brethren within the same soothing circle—

"No man that knows Dr. Orville Dewey but knows him to be a thoughtful, honest-hearted, and good man. No one, we presume, doubts his sincerity, his candor, or his Christian patriotism. In all matters of better and nobler character than his, he is a better speaker than I am. We think of our other Doctors in New York; not of sundry not good men, but that they have gone beyond their depth in venturing upon public questions in our day. They are not willing to strike earnestly nor strongly, and aggressive evils in the very bones and marrow, with a mauling and mauling mallet. They do not discriminate nor understand, apparently, that candor is sometimes kinder than opiates, and that peace is not always the child of peacefulness."

Next, Mr. Beecher makes the following ingenious statement of recent events—

"When the Kansas troubles came upon us, the eyes of thousands were opened. Dr. Dewey, in a mild and very gentle manner, gave his views. It was this that enraged his Southern friends. They regarded him as a traitor. They understood his previous course, as Abolitionists did, as favorable to the South.—When he changed his voice, they regarded it as going over to the other side.

And after giving us the delightful information that 'the time is come when men must be for or against slavery; the lines are drawn; neither side wants lukewarm friends; the poisonous days of evasions and compromises are gone; he proceeds to give the following eulogatory quotation from Dr. Dewey—

"May I be permitted to say, that the imputation conveyed by this letter is very hard measure for me. I have firmly resisted the extreme measures of the Northern Abolitionists, and, in consequence, my name has been a butt and a by-word in their pamphlets, speeches, and public meetings for a good many years. I have been called 'the traitor of the North,' (I am reminded.) I equally resisted the extreme opinion of the South, and the consequence is this letter. Do such a course look like time-serving, or trimming to suit any party or people?"

Most people would answer—'It looks like that, because it is that. But Mr. Beecher, still in rapport with the charitable Doctor, genially and heartily exclaims—

"I will accept the plea. We exonerate the Doctor from trimming or time-serving. He meant well, but was not wise enough to do well. He could have employed his judgment for his own guidance. But when he assumed to lead others, and led them into quicksands, and into a precipitous descent, he was not to be excused. Effects follow good causes, not good intentions."

Mr. Beecher then proceeds to put his finger upon the error—the one thing yet lacking—with Doctors Dewey and South-side Adams. If any one has hitherto been so uncharitable as to suppose—merely on the evidence of their evil fruit—that they are corrupt trees, let him henceforth sit corrected.

The error with Dr. D., and the whole school which he represents, is an unqualified sympathy that does not help, but prevents, decision. "In every case, his antagonistic side, they see some truth. There are those who know instinctively that there can be no agreement here. There are two sides and no middle ground in real life. There are men who vibrate between the two—cautious, timid, conscientious, anxious to be true, swayed by the sense of truth both ways, and they have not full hearts for either. They break down in their gentle attractions and sympathies, like a judge that cries to both sides of a plea, and ends by deciding that he wishes that the case had been a little different from what it is!"

THE EARNEST WORKER. A new, reformatory paper, with the above title, is to be published weekly in Boston, commencing in May next, if a sufficient number of subscribers offer to warrant the undertaking. It will be of small size, in conformity to its price, one dollar per year, but will consist entirely of reading matter, publishing no advertisements. It appeals expressly to the friends of reform, and proposes to be a vehicle for free speech, and the independent expression of opinion, upon such changes as are needed for the improvement of society in the religious, moral, social, mental and physical departments. The editor, Isaac C. Gray, of East Boston, invites those who are aware of the pressing need of a paper conducted on such principles to interest themselves at once in obtaining subscribers for it, and he also desires contributions to its columns from those unpromising reformers who, printing truth more than policy, are thereby denied admission to the columns of the daily press, and still more, to those of the newspapers which call themselves 'religious.' We bespeak a cordial welcome and an active support to 'The Earnest Worker.' C. X. W.

LETTER FROM CASSIUS M. CLAY. Among others who were officially invited to the Festival in Faneuil Hall, Jan. 2, to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Massachusetts S. Society, was CASSIUS M. CLAY, Esq. The following is his letter, which took place on the 21st ult., in Faneuil Hall.

Nothing would have given me more pleasure than to have been present on that interesting occasion. You well remark that this is the most glorious beneficent movement of the 19th century, for the benefit of it, or rather, the end which it proposes, all our experience, sufferings and aspirations of all the earth are in vain—our civilization—our art—our science—and in vain our hopes of the future! Anything that end, should be the best means of accomplishing my testimony to the self-sacrifice, the manliness, the patriotism of the Anti-Slavery pioneers who have refused by treachery to burn the Lacedaemonian flag. Was he not rather the trustful, unscrupulous warrior justice is a surer safety to a people than arms? Let not, then, as noble to make sacrifices to repair a wrong, or to refrain from its infliction? If this be good logic, reward, have for a quarter of a century battled for the justice of their country?

Nor should the fear of the taint of 'Disunion' deter me from doing justice to those who, in struggling for others' weal, so neglect their own. I am for the Union, or any other government

A CHAPTER FOR ENGLISH READERS—REV. P. I. JOHNSON AND AMERICA SLAVERY.

Mr. Johnson has seen fit to brand as superficial writers and speakers those who charge upon the M. E. Church North the sin of slavery. We ask, could he have been at the late Conference, and remained ignorant that slavery was in the Church, and that the Conference refused to cast it out? That a portion of the Conference from free States, where slavery is prohibited by law, desired its removal, but were not able to carry their point, does not relieve the Church of the stigma. The case at the North is simply this: The law of the State prohibits slavery, while the law of the Church allows and sanctions it. Thus we find the State in advance of the Church on a question of morals so plain that neither can err, unless wilfully blind.

We would not have taken any notice of Mr. Johnson or his misrepresentations, were it not that we desire that the English friends of the Anti-Slavery movement should know the exact truth, and understand the difficulties the abolitionists here have to contend with, the chief of which is the influence of ecclesiastical bodies. We desire their sympathy, hence we wish them to have correct information. We here repeat that the American churches are the bulwarks of American slavery—one of the principal hindrances to the progress of Abolitionism; by throwing their protection and sanction over slaveholders, and over the institution of slavery.

Yours, for the cause of God and the slave, OBSERVER. New York, Feb. 24, 1857. FROM AN ENGLISH CORRESPONDENT. ENGLAND, Jan. 20, 1857. MY DEAR GARRISON: It is many, many years since I last wrote to you. At that time, the Anti-Slavery spirit of Scotland was in a lively state. "SEND BACK THE MONEY" was the war-cry of freedom. The money has never been sent back, and therefore, in certain folks' opinion, freedom has had the worst of it. The Free Church has kept its thousands of pounds, its divines having doubtless doctored away the blood-stains of the coins.—(Pity they lived not in the days of Blue Beard, for the sake of Blue Beard's wife!) Tradition tells us that the ancients knew the secret of writing with blue juice, and the things so written appeared in legible characters upon the moon. That secret has been lost; but in its stead, humanity has acquired the knowledge, that Earth keeps no secret; that its daily deeds are photographed on the pages of the eternal record; and could we but gain access to the Artist's studio, we should find on the outside the notice—"Dull weather no disadvantage." We look not to the moon to read our passing history; faith tells us it is recorded by the invisible hand. The will of the slave rises above the prayer of the pharisee. Humanity looks on the "ill gotten gain" of the Free Church and says, "Here is the smell of the blood still." Those who pretend to be privy councillors of the Almighty might say that the suicide of Hugh Miller was sent as a judgment on the church that took the money wrung from the agony of the slave. I dare not say so; but I grieve to think that Miller, one of the most intellectual men in connection with that body, should have taken away his own life. He had just finished an elaborate work on Geology and Revelation, and without exceeding the bounds of truth, the last page was scarcely dry, when the hand that penned it was stiff in death. Self-destruction has increased to an ominous extent in this country. Cases are occurring daily, without any known motive. Indeed, I may say, society seems diseased. Every day exhibits some new symptom of the disorder; a bubble bank bursts; a well-tried servant betrays his trust; a man who for long years has been respected, and whose income is lordly, commits forgery; and yet, so usual is the occurrence of such things, that they produce no great stir.

James Martineau lately preached a sermon on "Commercial Morals," and as I believe his words will be unwelcome to you, I quote from the discourse: "Whether, in the ethics of commerce, the former times were better than these, I would not venture to pronounce. If any one wishes to show from the annals of fraud, that in England, every article of traffic was always adulterated, and an equal per centage of bankers and merchants, directors and clerks, were always knaves and unmake right and wrong, and it were easy to invent our own laws, instead of interpreting and applying God's. This is the root of all our ill."

The principal actors in the great dust robbery have received their sentences. Their trial has revealed schemes of villainy so calmly and patiently wrought out, that our humanity will shudder at when it gets leisure to do so. Various points in connection with the case are still before the courts. Redpath, the railway forger, is to be transported for life. Robson, the Crystal Palace forger, has become insane, and is to be sent to Bethlem Hospital as a criminal lunatic. Verger, the assassin of the Archbishop of Paris, has been condemned to death. Nothing was elicited on the trial to show that he was influenced by any personal motives. I do not mean to give you an epitome of our domestic and foreign news. My great object is to put you in the immediate possession of the following case, which I hope will be made to bear strongly on the laws for the imprisonment of colored seamen, which I see are under debate at present in the South Carolina Legislature. On Monday last, about 10 A. M., the noise of firing was heard proceeding from the American vessel J. L. Bogart, (Conway, commander,) at present lying in the Mersey, on the Birkenhead shore. Capt. Conway, who was on shore at the time, applied to the American Consul, and procured the aid of the police, who made eighteen of the crew prisoners. They are, with one exception, men of color, who allege, as the principal reason of revolt, that they had shipped for a voyage to New York, and that since they had gone on board, the vessel had cleared for Mobile, to which port they refused to go, asserting that they would be seized on arriving there. I will forward along with this paper containing the fullest account of this case at its present stage. Mr. Campbell, who appeared for the colored men at the investigation before the magistrates, made the remark, that 'he was sorry to say, that this is not the only American vessel in which violence to the men has been resorted to. It is the habit of the officers of almost all American ships to beat and ill-use the men, especially if the men belong to the colored population.' This remark referred principally to the death, by cruelty, of a sailor belonging to the American ship Guy Mannering (Dallou), a full account of which I may send.

This communication of mine will appear to you wonderfully like a series of extracts from the 'Newgate Calendar.' I hope to have something more pleasant to write about in my next. I must close this abruptly, as the 'Baltic' is getting up its steam. Yours, sincerely, RICHARD THURLOW. LETTER FROM ILLINOIS. BIRMINGHAM, Peoria Co., Ill., March 8, 1857. MR. GARRISON: I am glad to see THE LIBERATOR that Mr. Foss is at work in this State, and hope he will not fail to come to Elmwood. Under his labors in Massachusetts, I grew in grace and in the knowledge of the truth. He will remember the good time and the hard knocks we enjoyed in Cheshire. There are but few in this city who are ready, without life or soul,

to claim manhood and freedom for the slave; but give us Mr. Foss as a 'breaking team,' and C. C. Burleigh to sow the good seed, and in due time we will give you a bountiful harvest in Illinois. Prejudice against color seems to be more bitter here than in the West. You will often hear Republicans say to the 'Pro.' 'We don't like niggers any better than you do.' The effect of slavery on free labor is the main argument used against the institution. Colored lecturers can do much towards removing the stumbling-block of prejudice, and I am glad to hear that Wm. W. Brown is coming westward. The Disunion Convention at Worcester, if it had done nothing more than to have drawn out Gen. Wilson's letter, would have merited our grateful remembrance. In other days, when Gen. W. was the life of the 'unholy coalition,' I heard him make a speech at Northampton, in which he said, 'It is often asked what we propose to do if we succeed. I will tell you. We will abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. We will secure freedom to the Territories. We will prohibit the internal slave trade. And what then? Why then, sir, we will agitate, agitate, agitate! till the fetters fall from the last slave in America.' I think he would hardly say as much to Inquirer Brown in Congress. After all, we must not forget the many noble things that Senator Wilson has said and done for freedom. Truly, E. R. B.

JUSTICE TO THE PIONEERS. FRIEND GARRISON: I entirely agree with your Detroit correspondent, 'C. E. C.' as to the injustice done to C. C. BURLEIGH and others who have, with unequalled self-sacrifice and devotion, thrown themselves into the service of the cause of Freedom, and 'prepared the way' for some of those others who are now selected and advertised as the Herald of Freedom. Others have felt and spoken of the same sacrifice of principle to popularity, on the part of picture vendors, and they, with 'C. E. C.' will be glad to learn that our friend William C. Nell has in preparation a capital print, with the faces of S. S. FOSTER, A. C. FOSTER, PARKER, PILLSBURY, C. L. REMOND, and C. C. BURLEIGH, with GARRISON and PHILLIPS, who have been already put in the array of HERALDS OF FREEDOM, but cannot be spared from this sheet, to be entitled 'THE PIONEERS,' and to be mottoed, 'Prepare ye the way.' Excellent likenesses of Burleigh, the Fosters, Pillsbury, &c., have been procured, and in a few weeks it is expected that it will be complete, and ready for the patronage of the friends of freedom; and that it will be done in a style worthy their patronage, I need only say that these heads are to be taken off by that unequalled executioner, GROELIER. II.

CHARLES SUMNER ON THE KANSAS APPROPRIATION.—Just as the steamer Fulton was to leave for Europe, Hon. Charles Sumner (who took passage in her) transmitted the following letter to Boston: 'ON BOARD STEAMSHIP FULTON, March 7, 1857. 'MY DEAR SIR.—I trust that you and our friends will not be disappointed in efforts for Kansas, which must still be done, or the night of slavery will settle down on that beautiful territory. Surely, the Legislature of Massachusetts will feel the inspiration of a great cause, and pledge itself by a generous appropriation to its support. I hear of constitutional impediments, but I believe that all men will be found to have their foundation in the lukewarm hearts of objectors, rather than in the Constitution. There are some who think that any thing for slavery is unconstitutional, but nothing for freedom. With some, the opposite is true, and they will support any constitutional impediment, but I believe that all men will be found to have their foundation in the lukewarm hearts of objectors, rather than in the Constitution. I trust, also, that the people of Kansas will stand firm, and if need be, that they will know how to die for freedom. There are many who sigh for a Territory. They have it not in Kansas, but there is to be fought the great battle between freedom and slavery. I trust, by the ballot-box, I trust; but I do not forget that all who destroy the ballot-box madly invoke the carriage-box. With a farewell to my country, as I now seek for a new one, hoping for health long deferred, I give my last thoughts to suffering Kansas, and also my devout prayers that the ruffian usurpation which now trends her down may be peacefully overthrown, and that she may be lifted into the enjoyment of freedom and peace. Ever, faithfully yours, CHARLES SUMNER. P. S. I entrust this to the pilot, and hope it may reach you. JAMES REDPATH, Esq.

EXCITEMENT IN DELAWARE.—UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPT TO CAPTURE FUGITIVE SLAVES. On Sunday morning last, our town was thrown into considerable excitement in consequence of an almost successful attempt to capture eight runaway slaves, for which reward is offered of three thousand dollars. It seems that some time ago Monday, a man came to Sheriff Green with the information that he had two or three runaway negroes, and had made arrangements to have them in Dover that night, the negroes supposing they were to be concealed in town until the next night, and then send them away. Accordingly, at 4 o'clock on Tuesday morning, the Sheriff and the constable, and other officers, while the Sheriff was dressing, they all entered the jail, went up stairs, (in the dark,) found an open room, and went into it, but there being no fire, they came out into the entry. By this time, the Sheriff had dressed, and followed them up stairs, supposing that he would find them in one of the rooms, and that all he would have to do would be to close and bolt the door. On discovering that they were all in the entry, the Sheriff returned to his room for his revolver. The negroes, anxious to get to a fire, followed him down, and were all in the entry, when the Sheriff fired, and the children were asleep, before he could see his revolver. By this time, the suspicions of one of the negroes were aroused, and with the exclamation, 'He didn't like de looks ob de place; I see gwine out o' dis—'he bolted for the window. The Sheriff seized the negro by the throat, and another window, where he escaped, first scattering the fire over the floor, then standing trembling in the door like the veriest heart-ventured coward. The Sheriff, alarmed by his family and the fire, let go the negro, supposing that when in an instant he bounded through the window, and was gone. Thus all escaped. Six of them were taken to a house in Camden, but the officers could not enter for the want of sufficient warrant, which the magistrates said they had no power to give. On Tuesday night, it is reported, the six were conveyed to the house of a friend near Willow Grove, whence they were forwarded up the country, and either by road or rather on the underground railroad. The other two were seen, shortly after the escape from the jail, going out of Dover in a northerly direction. The fault of the escape is attributable entirely to the hoggishness of the man who told the negroes to get out, and to get the whole reward, he would not permit a small force to share it with him, and he got none. The negroes were all armed with cudgels and pistols. The rewards offered for their apprehension vary from \$300 to \$400 each.—Dover (Del.) Reporter, 18th Inst.

TERRIBLE RAILROAD DISASTER.—A most distressing and fatal accident occurred at Hamilton, Canada West, on the line of the Great Western Railway, on Thursday afternoon of last week. The train from Toronto, when passing over the bridge across the Des Jardines Canal, and two passenger cars, were plunged, a distance of sixty feet, into the canal, which, at that spot, is 18 feet deep. The number of passengers was estimated at from 75 to 100, of whom only fifteen were taken out, and five of these have since died. But three persons escaped with only trifling injuries. Among the killed were Samuel Zimmerman, of Niagara Falls, an eminent railroad contractor, and the wealthiest man in the canal; Isaac Buecher, of Hamilton, Vice President of the road; and Capt. Twomey, a regular commander on Lake Ontario. The cause of the accident has not yet been discovered, but the coroner's inquest will perhaps throw some light upon it. The funeral of Mr. Zimmerman took place at Niagara Falls on Monday evening, and was unusually impressive, 15,000 persons being present.

Hon. D. T. Disney, formerly member of Congress from Ohio, died in Washington on Saturday morning, of pneumonia. Gen. Felix Houston died, few days ago, at Washington, Mississippi, in the 67th year of his age.

WENDELL PHILLIPS'S ORATORY. How does he look? The man who stands out for the slave amid the hisses of multitudes, the exciter of mobs, the agitator, the radical reformer, the fanatic philanthropist—what form has God given to the clay in which dwells such a spirit? He is passing up the aisle, through a crowded audience, to the lecturer's platform, in the first Baptist church in Andover—and I see him for the first time. Am I surprised at his appearance?—Can this be the fiery reformer? The florid complexion; the light hair and eyes; the negligent, much at home, quietly social attitude in conversation; the cheeks, large and full; the slight tendency to corpulence, and heaviness of countenance; and then, that fatherly, bland look, that I believe to be the result of his long and arduous labors, of fire, or even of severity, though not of fierceness! Can this be the rank agitator? But look more closely—his head is bald, and mark what a physiologist or physiologist might say of him. It would be noticed that his whole brain is large, very round, and well developed, and behind, and above, will be benevolence, conscientiousness, self-appreciation, courage, and the reasoning faculties, are immense; independence and benevolence, with large intellectual and executive powers, leading off his developments. These are the signs, in a man placed amid private or national affairs, in a man placed amid private or national affairs. Mark, also, that this large and strong brain is placed upon a body fully able to sustain it,—a full, strong physical organization, that can endure long and largely, and yet retain its vigorous health. He rises to speak, and comes forward to the side of the stage, without notes, there is much manliness in his strong, broad chest, his well-set figure, and head carried erect,—not in pride, but in a little carelessness—or positive ungrainliness, perhaps in the disposition of his arms and lower extremities, and of a sort of common-people honesty in his air.—I am one of you,—I say this sincerely and truthfully, an honest man, that loves his neighbor, and can tolerate the good of you all, and of the world; and can tolerate no mock show or false dignity;—and I wish you to hear my words soberly, with candor and charity, yet with independence; and judge ye of the truth; like men;—but, before you do, be very careful and logical in every thing,—fearless, and kind, and entirely in earnest; think, go slow and sure,—let us weigh our words, and not be carried away with passion, or prejudice, or vanity, or hissing; but steadily look, fully let us know, boldly let us examine; and there let us see, with courage, and patience, and good will,—and what compromise, or expediency, or that, that was what his countenance, his gestures, his tones, his whole delivery said, all along, from first to last. Moderation, calmness, clearness, force, benevolence, dignity,—were in all his movements. Indeed, it might be called somewhat soft, and wanting in vigor, like a man whose physical frame, but like that, it has breadth, and only needs to be exercised to display its full masculine power. Its tones were such as he speaks,—I do not wish to be harsh; I wish to be kind to all; I wish to be careful, logical, true, and calm; but I must carry out what I see to be duty, and as man shall say me from my course. I pretend to be above no man; I venerate law, and old customs, and great names; but duty, man's good, and the truth, more; I can not stand by old ways unless compelled, for the truth's sake, to do so; be ye kind and patient, and reasonable with me,—let us all carry out the truth!—that was the language of his tones. Wendell Phillips has been called the model orator of New England, and it was difficult to mark the man's gestures, after he had proceeded for half an hour in his subject,—the Philosophy of Reform,—and was drawing, by his logical, calm style, and, apparently, deep conviction, all the attention of his audience to a theme of which his own life was at once the origin and the commentary. But I marked the grace which, after all, was revealed throughout all the motions of his heavy form; the logical balance of his head and body; the bringing of the fingers of his left hand across the palm of the right; the pointed, pungent finger; the expansion of the swelling, veined, and arched, and stretched to heaven, calm, and serene; the sense of bombast, affectation, or attempts either at oddity or conformity to any standard; nothing but calm, reasonable, honest, solid Anglo-Saxon,—uttered with a carefulness, candor, conscientious good-will, yet with a simple, all-mastering firmness and independence. And the more I saw of him, the more with which he stood up in those days of the memorable excitement concerning Anthony Burns,—in those days and on that night, in old Faneuil Hall, calmly addressing the people;—and thus solemnly and logically to command respect every where. What a model to correct the bombast, hysterical bombast of spirit-ed youths in declamation and debate! Now he sits down. I see solemn faces among the young of his audience. At the bottom of their hearts, do they believe? Has the man passed before them whom the next century will yet glorify in recalling, and who will yet be independent. And the more I saw of him, the more with which he stood up in those days of the memorable excitement concerning Anthony Burns,—in those days and on that night, in old Faneuil Hall, calmly addressing the people;—and thus solemnly and logically to command respect every where. What a model to correct the bombast, hysterical bombast of spirit-ed youths in declamation and debate! Now he sits down. I see solemn faces among the young of his audience. At the bottom of their hearts, do they believe? Has the man passed before them whom the next century will yet glorify in recalling, and who will yet be independent. And the more I saw of him, the more with which he stood up in those days of the memorable excitement concerning Anthony Burns,—in those days and on that night, in old Faneuil Hall, calmly addressing the people;—and thus solemnly and logically to command respect every where. What a model to correct the bombast, hysterical bombast of spirit-ed youths in declamation and debate! Now he sits down. I see solemn faces among the young of his audience. At the bottom of their hearts, do they believe? Has the man passed before them whom the next century will yet glorify in recalling, and who will yet be independent.

THE CASE OF DRED SCOTT. The Springfield Republican has a letter from Dr. Chaffee in regard to the publication of his family with this case. We copy the material portion thereof: 'In the case of Dred Scott, the defendant was and is the only person who had or has any power in the matter, and never has been, or will be, a member of my family, and never have been, or will be, a member of the existence of that suit after it was noticed for trial, when we learned it in an accidental way,—and I agree with you, that if I had been possessed of any power or influence in the case, and failed to use it, then I should have been guilty of treason to my professions, and a betrayal of the confidence of my constituents.' But possessed of no power to control,—refused all that influence the course of the defendant in the case,—and in the fullest sympathy with Dred Scott and his family, in their efforts to secure their just rights to freedom,—no man in this land feels more deeply the intense wrong done, not only to him, but the whole people, by the monstrous decision of the majority of the U. S. Supreme Court. And if, in the distribution of the estate, of which this decision affirms these human beings to be part, it appears that I or mine consents to receive the thirty pieces of silver, then and not till then,—let the popular judgment, as well as the public press, fix on me the mark of a traitor to my conscience, as well as to the true rights of our common humanity. I believe, under the Constitution and laws of this Union, these colored persons have become not only free men, but citizens, and I stand ready to rally with the rest of the people under the banner which proclaims and promises to vindicate their rights. I remain, respectfully, C. C. CHAFFEE. Springfield, March 14.

Mr. Buchanan's Cabinet is composed as follows:—Lewis Cass, of Michigan, Secretary of State; Howell Cobb, of Georgia, Secretary of Treasury; John P. Floyd, of Virginia, Secretary of War; John Forsyth, of Connecticut, Secretary of the Navy; Jacob Thompson, of Mississippi, Secretary of the Interior; Judson Black, of Pennsylvania, Attorney General; Aaron V. Brown, of Tennessee, Postmaster General. A turkey disappeared from a farmer's yard in Manchester, N. H., on the 27th of January, and was found in a deer hole on the 4th of March, alive and in moving condition, though she had been thirty-seven days without food or water, being unable to extricate herself. Five—Three Lives Lost!—On Monday night, the house of Mr. John Nichol, a few miles from this village, was burned to the ground, and, sad to relate, three of his children, two girls aged 8 and 11 years, and a boy of 12, were burned to death. Mr. Nichol and his wife were absent. A son aged 16 made his escape.—Delhi Gazette. The Cry for Blood.—Within twelve hours after the House of Representatives concurred with the Senate in the great remedial measure for the crime of man-stealing, viz., the bill to repeal the law giving a year's probation to convicted murderers, a man was shockingly murdered within sight of the State House. Washington, March 15. Maj. Benj. McCulloch, of Texas, has been tendered the Governorship of Utah, but declined. The President received, late evening, a telegraphic despatch, dated St. Louis, from Gov. Geary, informing him that he had resigned the Governorship of Kansas, to take effect the last of this month. The Committee of the Legislature on Federal Relations will give a hearing to the petitioners for the removal of Edward G. Loring from the office of Judge of Probate, on Tuesday afternoon next, at 3 o'clock, in the Representatives' Chamber. TO CORRESPONDENTS. In answer to an inquiry, we would say, that Miss F. E. WATKINS is now, or was lately, in Pennsylvania, and communications for her may be sent to the care of J. MILLER McKIM, 31 North Fifth Street, Philadelphia. NOTICE. The Post Office address of Mrs. Lucy STONE will be, for the present, No. 140 Fulton street, New York, care C. M. SAXTON & Co. NEW HAND-BOOK FOR HOME IMPROVEMENT.—BY MAIL. HOW TO WRITE; A NEW POCKET MANUAL OF COMPOSITION AND LETTER-WRITING. A popular Hand-Book, embracing hints on Penmanship, choice of Writing Materials, Practical Rules for Literary Composition in general, and Epistolary and Newspaper writing, PUNCTUATION and PROOF-CORRECTING in particular; with Letters of Business, Relationship, Friendship, and Love; illustrated by numerous examples of genuine epistles, from the pens of the best writers; including Forms for Letters of Introduction, Notes, Cards, &c., and a collection of Poetical Quotations. Price, in paper, prepaid by mail, 30 cents; muslin, 60 cents. The following, in press, will be issued as soon as possible: HOW TO TALK; or, Hints toward a Grammatical and Graceful Style in Composition and Debate. 30 cents. HOW TO BEHAVE; A Manual of Etiquette, and Guide to Correct Personal Habits; with Rules for Debating Societies and Deliberative Assemblies. Price, 30 cents; muslin, 50 cents. HOW TO DO BUSINESS; A Guide to Success in Practical Life, and Hand-Book of Legal and Commercial Forms. Same. One dollar will pay for the four works, in paper, and \$1 75 in muslin. They will be sent to subscribers, postage prepaid, as fast as issued, by FOWLER, WELLS AND CO., 142 Washington St., Boston.

ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION IN MILLTOWN, N. Y.—An Anti-Slavery Convention, under the auspices of the American Anti-Slavery Society, will be held at MILLTOWN, (Ulster Co.) N. Y., on SATURDAY afternoon, and Sunday, March 21 and 22. OLIVER JOHNSON, SCAM B. ANTHONY, and AARON M. POWELL will be in attendance. CONVENTION AT POUGHKEEPSIE.—A Convention, under the auspices of the American Anti-Slavery Society, will be held at POUGHKEEPSIE, on TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, March 24th and 25th. PARKER PHILLIPS, ISAAC B. ANTHONY, AARON M. POWELL and OLIVER JOHNSON will attend. PROVIDENCE, R. I.—PARKER PHILLIPS and HENRY C. WRIGHT will speak in Providence on Sunday next, March 22, morning, afternoon and evening, in the course of Anti-Slavery meetings. PARKER PHILLIPS, an Agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, will speak at Greenwich, Washington Co., N. Y., Friday, March 27, and Sunday, " 29. WILLIAM C. NELL will deliver an anti-slavery lecture at Feltown, on Wednesday evening, March 25.

TESTIMONY OF GOV. GEARY. St. Louis, March 17.—The Democrat publishes a statement relative to the affairs of Kansas, given by Gov. Geary. From it, it appears that the cause of the Governor's resignation was the failure of President Pierce to fulfill the pledges made at the time of his (Geary's) appointment. These pledges were to supply the public treasury, if he had a surplus of revenue, with the aid he had paid \$15,000 out of his own pocket. The administration refused military support under the most urgent circumstances, while he was under the judiciary of the territory in every particular. The Governor states that fifty men were under oath, that they had entered the country, to assassinate him, provided he refused the country did not meet their approbation. He regrets the step he had been obliged to take, but feels content that had the promised assistance been rendered, he could have administered the affairs of the territory in a manner creditable to his honest and patriotic sides. In relation to outrages committed by pro-secessionists, he says one half has not yet been told. He pronounces the murder of Buffum by Hays the most cold-blooded and atrocious affair ever witnessed. His report of the Sheriff's affair is similar to that already reported. He says that the report published in the Republic, over the signature of Price, is a tissue of falsehoods. The Governor complains bitterly of the obstructions and mutilation of correspondence. He says the mail-bags were constantly opened, and is a matter to or from him extracted. The Governor thinks the establishment of a Slavery Constitution inevitable.

THE PSALMS OF LIFE. A COMPILATION OF PSALMS, HYMNS, ANTHEMS, CHANTS, &c., embodying THE SPIRITUAL, PROGRESSIVE, and REFORMATORY SENTIMENT OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. BY JOHN S. ADAMS. This Work is adapted to Public and Private Religious Worship, Social Gatherings, Board Meetings, Special Occasions, and the Family Circle. It is a 'Hymn Book' and 'Music Book' combined, containing upwards of 500 Psalms, Hymns, &c., and nearly 200 Tunes. The former comprise the best lyrical productions of the old writers, among whom are Whittier, Longfellow, Lowell, Tennyson, Mackay, Dana, Swain, Massie, Eliza Cook, Alice and Phoebe Carey, Mrs. Osgood, Mrs. Sigourney, and many others. It has been prepared with special reference to the already large and rapidly increasing demand for a volume that should express the sentiments and views of advanced minds of the present time. It is entirely free of all sectarianism, is prefaced with a very full and complete Index, giving First Lines, a Classification of Subjects, Tunes, and Metres, contains 262 pages, library style, and is handsomely and durably bound in cloth, embossed and lettered in Gilt. Price, \$1.00, in leather, gilt-edged sides and lettered. Price, \$1.50. Copies will be forwarded by Mail; and Societies or Individuals purchasing in quantities will be allowed a discount from the above prices. Published by OLIVER DITSON & CO., 115 Washington Street, BOSTON, Feb. 27.

'It is not Good for man to be Alone.' 'The Old Physician' Again. HIS NEW WORK IS NOW READY, THE MORAL PHILOSOPHY OF COURTSHIP & MARRIAGE. Designed as a companion to that excellent book, THE PHYSIOLOGY OF MARRIAGE, BY THE SAME AUTHOR. The following is the Table of Contents of the first Part of this unique book:— CHAP. I. Is Marriage a Duty? II. Nature and Design of Marriage. III. How the ends of Marriage are to be secured, or Rational Courtship. IV. The Philosophy of being in Love. V. At what Age should we marry? VI. On Equality in Marriage. VII. Are Second Marriages desirable? VIII. The Perpetuity of Marriage. Part II. contains 32 chapters under the general head of PROPER QUALIFICATIONS FOR MARRIAGE, treated in the inimitable style for which 'The Old Physician' is justly celebrated. In one vol. 18 mo. Price, 75 cents. PUBLISHED BY JOHN P. JEWETT & Co., BOSTON, HENRY P. B. JEWETT, CLEVELAND, OHIO. The Book that Sells. VIOLET; OR, THE CROSS AND THE CROWN. BY MARIA J. MCINTOSH. The Tenth Thousand of this most charming book is ready this morning. JOHN P. JEWETT & COMPANY, Publishers. IOWA AND MINNESOTA. PARKER'S Handbooks of these States, With new MAPS. Each volume complete in itself. Price, 75 cents each. Every traveller to the West should purchase these admirable Handbooks. JOHN P. JEWETT & Co., Publishers, Boston. HOPEDALE HOME SCHOOL, For Children & Youth of both Sexes. THIS School is located in the pleasant and quiet village of Hopedale, Milford, Mass., within two hours' ride from Boston, Worcester and Providence, a place admirably fitted for an Educational Institution which is designed to combine with intellectual training proper attention to the physical health and comfort, and a watchful regard to the moral and social culture of those who may share its privileges and opportunities. Its success, since it has been under the superintendence of its present Principals, together with their former experience, and general qualification for the position they occupy, increases the hope and the belief that they may prove themselves worthy of the confidence and patronage, not only of their friends, but of the friends of a true and comprehensive education, and of the public at large. The design of this School is to educate in the highest and best sense of the term; to exalt substance above appearance, being above accomplishment, merit above pretence, and to make neither of these, nor of the formation of a symmetrical, harmonious, substantial character; to fit its pupils for any truly honorable calling, and for useful usefulness in life. Hence, the superlatives, mockeries, and shams, that so often characterize popular and fashionable boarding schools, will be studiously avoided, and thoroughness rather than extent—quality rather than quantity—will be carefully regarded. Parents and Guardians desirous of finding a pleasant and comfortable HOME for their children or wards well cared for, and kindly treated—where they will be removed from the temptations of common society, and from the corrupting power and support of wickedness—where they will be nurtured in the truest and purest religion, will find here an unusually favorable opportunity of realizing their wishes. As this Institution is thoroughly reformatory and progressive in its purpose, and spirit, it must necessarily rely to a very great extent upon the friends of Reform and Progress for its prosperity and support. To all such, its claims and merits are respectfully and confidently submitted. To those desiring it, the names of persons who have had children or wards at the School, and of others competent to judge in the matter, will be given, on application, for purposes of reference and particular information. The next—Summer Term,—of this Institution will commence on Wednesday, April 15, 1857, and continue twelve and a half weeks. For further information and particulars, see large Circular—to be obtained by addressing either of the Principals, Hopedale, Milford, Mass. WILLIAM S. HAYWOOD, } Principals. ABIE HAYWOOD, } March 15. DR. ALCOOT'S NEW BOOK The Laws of Health, Sequel to 'The House I Live In.' THIS is unquestionably one of the most complete and valuable Physiological works ever written. It is designed by the venerable author not only as a book for the family, but for the school-room, and is a well worn ten times its cost, to any family in the land. The Author and publisher are daily receiving the strongest testimonials in favor of this excellent work. President Hopkins, of Williams College, writes thus to the author: WILLIAMS COLLEGE, Dec. 22, 1856. DR. ALCOOT—DEAR SIR.—You have been a public benefactor, a pioneer in a great work, and I have no doubt have prevented untold suffering. A wide circulation of the 'Laws of Health' cannot fail of being greatly useful. Sincerely yours, MARK HOPKINS. John D. Philbrick, Esq., Superintendent of the Public Schools, Boston, speaks as follows: DR. ALCOOT—MY DEAR SIR.—I have read your 'Laws of Health' with great satisfaction, and I say to my friends, 'Go and do likewise.' I have just put a copy in the hands of a college student, and with a copy of it might be put into the hands of every student in every college, seminary and school in the land. Most respectfully yours, JOHN D. PHILBRICK. The work is comprised in one handsome 12mo volume. Price \$1. JOHN P. JEWETT & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS, 117 Washington Street, Boston. DENTIST. DR. MANN, M. D., Surgeon Dentist, formerly of 13 Avery Street, and attends to those who wish for his services. For the convenience of invalids and others, who may not conveniently visit a Dentist's Office, Dr. Mann will attend at the residence of those who desire it. J. B. YERRINGTON & SON, PRINTERS, 21 Cornhill, Boston.

THE MORAL PHILOSOPHY OF COURTSHIP & MARRIAGE. HIS NEW WORK IS NOW READY, THE MORAL PHILOSOPHY OF COURTSHIP & MARRIAGE. Designed as a companion to that excellent book, THE PHYSIOLOGY OF MARRIAGE, BY THE SAME AUTHOR. The following is the Table of Contents of the first Part of this unique book:— CHAP. I. Is Marriage a Duty? II. Nature and Design of Marriage. III. How the ends of Marriage are to be secured, or Rational Courtship. IV. The Philosophy of being in Love. V. At what Age should we marry? VI. On Equality in Marriage. VII. Are Second Marriages desirable? VIII. The Perpetuity of Marriage. Part II. contains 32 chapters under the general head of PROPER QUALIFICATIONS FOR MARRIAGE, treated in the inimitable style for which 'The Old Physician' is justly celebrated. In one vol. 18 mo. Price, 75 cents. PUBLISHED BY JOHN P. JEWETT & Co., BOSTON, HENRY P. B. JEWETT, CLEVELAND, OHIO. The Book that Sells. VIOLET; OR, THE CROSS AND THE CROWN. BY MARIA J. MCINTOSH. The Tenth Thousand of this most charming book is ready this morning. JOHN P. JEWETT & COMPANY, Publishers. IOWA AND MINNESOTA. PARKER'S Handbooks of these States, With new MAPS. Each volume complete in itself. Price, 75 cents each. Every traveller to the West should purchase these admirable Handbooks. JOHN P. JEWETT & Co., Publishers, Boston. HOPEDALE HOME SCHOOL, For Children & Youth of both Sexes. THIS School is located in the pleasant and quiet village of Hopedale, Milford, Mass., within two hours' ride from Boston, Worcester and Providence, a place admirably fitted for an Educational Institution which is designed to combine with intellectual training proper attention to the physical health and comfort, and a watchful regard to the moral and social culture of those who may share its privileges and opportunities. Its success, since it has been under the superintendence of its present Principals, together with their former experience, and general qualification for the position they occupy, increases the hope and the belief that they may prove themselves worthy of the confidence and patronage, not only of their friends, but of the friends of a true and comprehensive education, and of the public at large. The design of this School is to educate in the highest and best sense of the term; to exalt substance above appearance, being above accomplishment, merit above pretence, and to make neither of these, nor of the formation of a symmetrical, harmonious, substantial character; to fit its pupils for any truly honorable calling, and for useful usefulness in life. Hence, the superlatives, mockeries, and shams, that so often characterize popular and fashionable boarding schools, will be studiously avoided, and thoroughness rather than extent—quality rather than quantity—will be carefully regarded. Parents and Guardians desirous of finding a pleasant and comfortable HOME for their children or wards well cared for, and kindly treated—where they will be removed from the temptations of common society, and from the corrupting power and support of wickedness—where they will be nurtured in the truest and purest religion, will find here an unusually favorable opportunity of realizing their wishes. As this Institution is thoroughly reformatory and progressive in its purpose, and spirit, it must necessarily rely to a very great extent upon the friends of Reform and Progress for its prosperity and support. To all such, its claims and merits are respectfully and confidently submitted. To those desiring it, the names of persons who have had children or wards at the School, and of others competent to judge in the matter, will be given, on application, for purposes of reference and particular information. The next—Summer Term,—of this Institution will commence on Wednesday, April 15, 1857, and continue twelve and a half weeks. For further information and particulars, see large Circular—to be obtained by addressing either of the Principals, Hopedale, Milford, Mass. WILLIAM S. HAYWOOD, } Principals. ABIE HAYWOOD, } March 15. DR. ALCOOT'S NEW BOOK The Laws of Health, Sequel to 'The House I Live In.' THIS is unquestionably one of the most complete and valuable Physiological works ever written. It is designed by the venerable author not only as a book for the family, but for the school-room, and is a well worn ten times its cost, to any family in the land. The Author and publisher are daily receiving the strongest testimonials in favor of this excellent work. President Hopkins, of Williams College, writes thus to the author: WILLIAMS COLLEGE, Dec. 22, 1856. DR. ALCOOT—DEAR SIR.—You have been a public benefactor, a pioneer in a great work, and I have no doubt have prevented untold suffering. A wide circulation of the 'Laws of Health' cannot fail of being greatly useful. Sincerely yours, MARK HOPKINS. John D. Philbrick, Esq., Superintendent of the Public Schools, Boston, speaks as follows: DR. ALCOOT—MY DEAR SIR.—I have read your 'Laws of Health' with great satisfaction, and I say to my friends, 'Go and do likewise.' I have just put a copy in the hands of a college student, and with a copy of it might be put into the hands of every student in every college, seminary and school in the land. Most respectfully yours, JOHN D. PHILBRICK. The work is comprised in one handsome 12mo volume. Price \$1. JOHN P. JEWETT & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS, 117 Washington Street, Boston. DENTIST. DR. MANN, M. D., Surgeon Dentist, formerly of 13 Avery Street, and attends to those who wish for his services. For the convenience of invalids and others, who may not conveniently visit a Dentist's Office, Dr. Mann will attend at the residence of those who desire it. J. B. YERRINGTON & SON, PRINTERS, 21 Cornhill, Boston.

THE PHYSIOLOGY OF MARRIAGE. HIS NEW WORK IS NOW READY, THE MORAL PHILOSOPHY OF COURTSHIP & MARRIAGE. Designed as a companion to that excellent book, THE PHYSIOLOGY OF MARRIAGE, BY THE SAME AUTHOR. The following is the Table of Contents of the first Part of this unique book:— CHAP. I. Is Marriage a Duty? II. Nature and Design of Marriage. III. How the ends of Marriage are to be secured, or Rational Courtship. IV. The Philosophy of being in Love. V. At what Age should we marry? VI. On Equality in Marriage. VII. Are Second Marriages desirable? VIII. The Perpetuity of Marriage. Part II. contains 32 chapters under the general head of PROPER QUALIFICATIONS FOR MARRIAGE, treated in the inimitable style for which 'The Old Physician' is justly celebrated. In one vol. 18 mo. Price, 75 cents. PUBLISHED BY JOHN P. JEWETT & Co., BOSTON, HENRY P. B. JEWETT, CLEVELAND, OHIO. The Book that Sells. VIOLET; OR, THE CROSS AND THE CROWN. BY MARIA J. MCINTOSH. The Tenth Thousand of this most charming book is ready this morning. JOHN P. JEWETT & COMPANY, Publishers. IOWA AND MINNESOTA. PARKER'S Handbooks of these States, With new MAPS. Each volume complete in itself. Price, 75 cents each. Every traveller to the West should purchase these admirable Handbooks. JOHN P. JEWETT & Co., Publishers, Boston. HOPEDALE HOME SCHOOL, For Children & Youth of both Sexes. THIS School is located in the pleasant and quiet village of Hopedale, Milford, Mass., within two hours' ride from Boston, Worcester and Providence, a place admirably fitted for an Educational Institution which is designed to combine with intellectual training proper attention to the physical health and comfort, and a watchful regard to the moral and social culture of those who may share its privileges and opportunities. Its success, since it has been under the superintendence of its present Principals, together with their former experience, and general qualification for the position they occupy, increases the hope and the belief that they may prove themselves worthy of the confidence and patronage, not only of their friends, but of the friends of a true and comprehensive education, and of the public at large. The design of this School is to educate in the highest and best sense of the term; to exalt substance above appearance, being above accomplishment, merit above pretence, and to make neither of these, nor of the formation of a symmetrical, harmonious, substantial character; to fit its pupils for any truly honorable calling, and for useful usefulness in life. Hence, the superlatives, mockeries, and shams, that so often characterize popular and fashionable boarding schools, will be studiously avoided, and thoroughness rather than extent—quality rather than quantity—will be carefully regarded. Parents and Guardians desirous of finding a pleasant and comfortable HOME for their children or wards well cared for, and kindly treated—where they will be removed from the temptations of common society, and from the corrupting power and support of wickedness—where they will be nurtured in the truest and purest religion, will find here an unusually favorable opportunity of realizing their wishes. As this Institution is thoroughly reformatory and progressive in its purpose, and spirit, it must necessarily rely to a very great extent upon the friends of Reform and Progress for its prosperity and support. To all such, its claims and merits are respectfully and confidently submitted. To those desiring it, the names of persons who have had children or wards at the School, and of others competent to judge in the matter, will be given, on application, for purposes of reference and particular information. The next—Summer Term,—of this Institution will commence on Wednesday, April 15, 1857, and continue twelve and a half weeks. For further information and particulars, see large Circular—to be obtained by addressing either of the Principals, Hopedale, Milford, Mass. WILLIAM S. HAYWOOD, } Principals. ABIE HAYWOOD, } March 15. DR. ALCOOT'S NEW BOOK The Laws of Health, Sequel to 'The House I Live In.' THIS is unquestionably one of the most complete and valuable Physiological works ever written. It is designed by the venerable author not only as a book for the family, but for the school-room, and is a well worn ten times its cost, to any family in the land. The Author and publisher are daily receiving the strongest testimonials in favor of this excellent work. President Hopkins, of Williams College, writes thus to the author: WILLIAMS COLLEGE, Dec. 22, 1856. DR. ALCOOT—DEAR SIR.—You have been a public benefactor, a pioneer in a great work, and I have no doubt have prevented untold suffering. A wide circulation of the 'Laws of Health' cannot fail of being greatly useful. Sincerely yours, MARK HOPKINS. John D. Philbrick, Esq., Superintendent of the Public Schools, Boston, speaks as follows: DR. ALCOOT—MY DEAR SIR.—I have read your 'Laws of Health' with great satisfaction, and I say to my friends, 'Go and do likewise.' I have just put a copy in the hands of a college student, and with a copy of it might be put into the hands of every student in every college, seminary and school in the land. Most respectfully yours, JOHN D. PHILBRICK. The work is comprised in one handsome 12mo volume. Price \$1. JOHN P. JEWETT & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS, 117 Washington Street, Boston. DENTIST. DR. MANN, M. D., Surgeon Dentist, formerly of 13 Avery Street, and attends to those who wish for his services. For the convenience of invalids and others, who may not conveniently visit a Dentist's Office, Dr. Mann will attend at the residence of those who desire it. J. B. YERRINGTON & SON, PRINTERS, 21 Cornhill, Boston.

