





the traffic in slaves between Africa and Brazil, and the same time voted a large sum of money for the purpose of establishing a suppression squadron on the coast of the empire.

It is, however, further apparent that the executive government of Brazil seems to have honestly, zealously, and to the best of its ability, carried out the intentions of the legislature in these enactments, by prosecuting the most notorious among the slave-traders, and by taking measures for the seizure of slaves, by releasing slaves when they were found on board of ships on the coast, and by the encouragement of free emigration from the country.

The second resolution had reference to British India, and was included in the report. Mr. Poretti, a colored gentleman, formerly resident in New York, in seconding the resolutions, described the horrors of slavery and the slave trade in Brazil, as witnessed by himself in that country.

Mr. Pillsbury called the attention of the meeting to the aggressive designs of the Slave Power of the American States upon the territory on the banks of the Amazon river, and their intrigues to prevent the abolition of slavery in Brazil.

Mr. Thompson moved a vote of thanks to the President and Vice President, and said: "As Mr. Steinhilber has given a very decided opinion, and one or two other gentlemen have been given by gentlemen upon this subject, I have never shown any very remarkable deficiency of moral courage, (loud cries of 'Hear, hear,') and I should not have been wanting in the assertion of the right of Mr. Barker to speak in this meeting, if I had seen that that right had been really assailed; but as I calmly looked upon the proceedings of the meeting at the time, and guided by the knowledge I have of the forms of public meetings generally, and of this country in particular, I cannot say, as an attentive observer of the proceedings of this day, that Mr. Barker was denied a hearing; and I should be very sorry indeed that such an opinion should go forth, unaccompanied by any evidence that Mr. Barker was denied a hearing. I was permitted to say, however, that I had no sympathy with the peculiar view in which Mr. Barker was presented from being heard; but was deeply pained by a manifestation of feeling which I could not ascribe altogether to the mere circumstance of his having risen out of order, but which I was compelled to ascribe—I hope erroneously—to a prejudice against him in consequence of opinions on other matters, and given in other places. I therefore ventured to say, that I thought an error had been committed on both sides; on the side of Mr. Barker, in pertinaciously asserting his right to be heard at a particular moment, in contravention of the rules of public meetings; and an error on the part of the audience in not giving way to him, and going to the extreme of liberality, even at the cost of Mr. Ward's time, to allow him to occupy the five minutes asked for; and, however, say that he was denied a hearing, had I been in his place, I should have treated the matter in a very different way. I should have deferred to the dictum of the Chair, and should have been satisfied with the statement that another gentleman was appointed to speak at that particular time—indeed, I know that he was, before any one of us recommenced the proceedings of the day; but I should have stood by and asserted my right at a future stage of the proceedings, and put it out of the power of a public meeting or a Chairman or officers to deny my right on any ground arising out of order or decorum, or any thing else. I say, however, that if there was a feeling of prejudice against Mr. Barker, (cries of 'No, no,') or if there be now, that such persons will, before they think themselves good abolitionists, worthy to undertake this sacred cause and carry it on, seriously examine whether such feeling is in accordance with the great object at which we aim, and is in accordance with that very spirit of liberty which we propose to establish in the earth; and whether they can be the fittest instruments for availing the sceptre from tyrants who are disposed, in consequence of any variance of opinion, to deny a fellow-man an undoubted right in a public meeting. With these observations, which I hope will be taken in good part, I shall leave the matter, sorry that anything should have occurred to mar the harmony of the meeting, or bring about any discussion.

The Conference broke up at half past six, only half an hour before the great public meeting to be held in the evening, having been in session seven hours, exclusive of the hour for adjournment.

**GREAT PUBLIC MEETING AT THE TOWN HALL.** Before the hour appointed for the commencement of the proceedings, every seat in the spacious Town Hall was filled, and shortly after the proceedings commenced, the room was crowded in every part.

By the same mail which brings this letter, you will receive the *Manchester Examiner* and *Times* of this day's date, giving a report of the evening meeting. It does not, however, convey to you any thing like the spirit of the meeting. Mr. Pillsbury had a most enthusiastic reception in the evening. The great feature of the meeting, however, was the resolution of the Rev. Dr. Board, respecting the Kossuth and Mazzini controversy. Here the great Hungarian will come out in this meeting, and preserve his character for veracity, it is difficult to see. An impeachment of his anti-slavery character and veracity, in a town where he has been so long and so prominently known, and by a gentleman who was foremost in doing him honor, must tend to lower him in public estimation, unless he can perform the miracle of exonerating himself before the world, in the face of such apparently irrefragable proofs. William Wells Brown made what, in all probability, will be his final speech in this country.

The public meeting having unanimously confirmed the resolutions of the morning's Conference, it is to be noted that the North of England Anti-Slavery and Anti- Reform League is now fairly launched upon a career which will terminate in the abolition of personal slavery as triumphantly as the Anti-Corn-Law League prevailed in the emancipation of the industry of the British people from oligarchical domination.

On Thursday last, Mr. Pillsbury and Mr. Powell addressed a large audience in an Evangelical Independent Church in Manchester. One of the immediate practical results from their preaching was, an intimation given to Mr. Pillsbury by a lady, that so powerfully had she been impressed with the recent anti-slavery proceedings in Manchester, that they had come to a determination to send a large box of articles, which had been destined for another direction, to the next Boston Bazaar. Mr. Pillsbury has received an invitation to preach to-morrow (Sunday) in the pulpit of the Rev. F. Howarth, of the anti-slavery meetings during the ensuing week. His zeal is warm, and eager for the fray. This was surely but indicative of an improved state of physical health.

On Monday next, one of the Honorary Secretaries of the Conference, the Rev. W. Parkes, has been appointed to present a subject for discussion at the next meeting of the Congregational (Evangelical) ministers of

Manchester and vicinity. Mr. Parkes, I believe, will choose an anti-slavery topic. I shall endeavor to learn the particulars of this discussion amongst a large number of ministers of the most important religious bodies in this part of the kingdom.

I have much interesting matter to communicate, but my time has been so fully occupied in preparing a corrected and extended report for publication in a pamphlet, that I am unable to complete it before post time for the American mail.

I am, dear sir,  
Yours, most truly,  
W. FARMER.  
W. L. GARRISON.

**JOSEPH BARKER AND THE MANCHESTER A. S. CONFERENCE.**

Not having room for it, in our last number, we were obliged to postpone the following portion of Mr. FARMER'S account of the proceedings of the Anti-Slavery Conference at Manchester, in reference to Mr. BARKER—

Mr. BARKER suddenly ascending the platform, said—"I have only five minutes to remain in this meeting before my train starts; and I wish to speak before I go." (Cries of "no, no," "Ward, Ward.")

The CHAIRMAN—The Rev. S. R. Ward is appointed to address the meeting next. ("Hear, hear.")

Rev. S. R. WARD—Let the sense of this meeting—a British meeting—determine what is the next order of the day. To that decision, I am quite willing to bow.

Rev. W. PARKES—As one of the Secretaries, I beg to say, that I engaged Mr. Ward to address the Conference next.

Mr. BARKER—I have only five minutes left, and I wish to make one statement. (Cries of "no, no.") I have made the offer; that is sufficient. I do not wish to press the matter.

Mr. POWELL—I believe this meeting represents all classes of abolitionists. I hope you will not make an invidious distinction upon your platform. I know that my friend Ward, if a consistent anti-slavery man and a consistent colored man, will waive his right, (I say it with all due respect to the regulations which have been made for the speakers,) and allow my friend Barker to speak. It does not matter what he may be in his religious opinions, if he says anything in behalf of the slave. I know that Mr. Ward will, if a consistent advocate of the emancipation of the slave, waive his right. Let each one judge upon matters of religion for himself.

Mr. BARKER—If the meeting will allow me to speak two minutes, I shall be satisfied. (Cries of "Hear, hear," with most general cries of "No, no.")

Rev. S. A. STEINHILBER—Let Mr. Barker speak, by all means; he has a right to do so. (Cries of "No, no.")

Rev. Dr. McKEEROW—Sir, rise to order. (The noise and confusion were so great at this moment, that the Reverend gentleman could not be heard.)

Mr. POWELL—This is an open platform. We ought to permit every one to be heard; if he agrees in our fundamental principles.

The CHAIRMAN—I must differ from that view of the case. I think the officers of this meeting have the order and arrangement of the public speakers. For my own part, if I were in the place of the individual now attempting to speak, I should think it unbecoming of me, as a gentleman and a Christian, to interrupt the meeting in this manner.

Mr. BARKER (having descended from the platform, and ascended a seat in the body of the room)—No officer has a right to stop a speaker, unless he is excluded from speaking. On the ground of the first resolution passed in this meeting, I claim a right to speak one minute, which is now about the only time I have left. (Cries of "Chair, chair," "Order, order," and great confusion.)

Rev. Dr. McKEEROW—You can express your sentiments at the proper time.

Mr. BARKER—As long as I have been in the habit of attending public meetings—(The remainder of the sentence was drowned in cries of "Chair, chair," and in the general confusion.)

The CHAIRMAN—Mr. Ward will address the meeting. Mr. BARKER, still standing upon the seat with Mr. Steinhilber by his side, again essayed to speak, but in vain.

Dr. McKEEROW—I rise to a point of order. I have no desire to express my sentiments as to who is to speak, whether Mr. Ward or Mr. Barker; but this I say, that it is the custom in Manchester to make previous arrangement for the order of the meeting. If any individual, after the proceedings have been brought to a close, obtains the permission of the meeting to address the audience, then it is all right; but no one has a right to stand up, and interfere with the order of the proceedings, as previously settled.

Mr. BARKER—The first resolution states, that all persons who believe slaveholding to be a sin, and immediate emancipation to be the right of the slave and the duty of the master, shall be eligible to be a member of this conference, and take part in its deliberations. This resolution passed unanimously. I asked only five minutes to speak to this resolution. I shall speak to this meeting to the extent to which my voice will reach them. (Mr. Barker then attempted to make himself heard, but the noise from the stamping of feet, knocking of sticks and umbrellas, and cries of "Chair," completely drowned his voice.)

Mr. POWELL—rise to a point of order. This is a most extraordinary course of proceeding.

Mr. BARKER—I am unwilling to allow the subject of this resolution to pass, without endeavoring to give utterance to my feelings against slavery, and in favor of abolitionism. (Cries of "Chair, chair!" "Order, order!" "Ward, Ward!") My children will read the report of this meeting. (Cries of "Chair," and hisses.) The American abolitionists will read the report of this meeting, and will see that I have not been heard.

Mr. OLDHAM—Mr. Barker has a right to be heard. He comes within the first resolution.

Mr. BARKER—My children will read the report of this meeting. (Hisses, noise, and great confusion, during which Mr. Steinhilber endeavored to speak, but could not gain a hearing.)

Mr. BARKER—This conduct is most infamous. I am sorry that it should take place among abolitionists.—(Cries of "Chair, chair," and hisses.)

Mr. OLDHAM—This conduct is disgraceful to the Conference. The Chairman ought to have allowed him to speak.

Mr. BARKER again attempted to address the meeting, but except to those who were close to him, the attempt was dumb show. (Cries of "Chair, chair," "Put him out.") Mr. Barker then left the meeting. After silence had been restored.

Mr. THOMPSON rose and said—I think we have all of us committed some little error in this matter. It was an error upon the part of Mr. Barker to insist upon taking precedence of Mr. Ward, simply in consequence of the resolution that we passed this morning, because while that resolution recognizes distinctly the right of every person to speak in this meeting, so long as he speaks to the question and to the objects of the meeting,—that is, every person who should subscribe to the fundamental principle of the sinfulness of slavery, and the duty of immediate emancipation,—yet I do not think that more subscription to that preliminary resolution necessarily gave him the right to set aside the arrangements of the officers of the meeting, and to put himself between Mr. Ward and this audience. (Hear, hear.) At the same time, I think there has been some error committed, if the opposition to Mr. Barker has arisen out of any dislike to the peculiar opinions known to be entertained by that gentleman. We ought to be consistent with the great principles which we laid down as our rule of association, when we came into this meeting. We should not have allowed any differences of opinion with Mr. Barker on any question to have prevented our hearing him. (Cries of "No, no!" "We deny it!")

Rev. Mr. ROBERTS—I deny that there has, Mr. Thompson. You are not fairly representing us.

Mr. THOMPSON—I am only uttering the expression of my views. I hope we shall bear in mind, that we leave the infinitely diversified opinions of men out of doors, and bring into this meeting, and into any other anti-slavery meeting we may attend, only a simple single-minded desire to serve the cause of the slave. (Cheers.) As it is, the question is broad as humanity itself, and the duty of every man, whatever his opinions may be upon minor points, to help this cause. We should allow any man, who has sympathy with those in bonds as bound with them, to express his opinion amongst us. I think it due to myself to say this, because, after twenty five years of public life spent in public meetings, I can say with confidence that I have asserted the right of every human being, who ever attended any meeting of my own, to express an opinion, while he expressed it in relation to the subject under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN—I beg leave to say, in vindication of myself and the course I have taken as chairman, that our friend Ward had to leave, for the purpose of attending another meeting at Leeds this evening. There was very little time for him to deliver his speech before the train went. I am as liberal as Mr. Thompson, with regard to matters of opinion. I maintain that Mr. Barker had no right to come upon this platform, and interrupt the order of the meeting. (Hear, hear.) If he had waited his time, we should all have heard him speak without interruption.

Mr. OLDHAM—He only asked for five minutes, and he was not allowed to have that. The noise which was made to drown his voice was disgraceful.

Mr. STEINHILBER—Hear, hear. (Cries of "no, no.")

Rev. Mr. ROBERTS—I deny that any one opposed Mr. Barker out of any consideration for his peculiar religious opinions. If he had chosen to speak in order, with proper deference to the chair, I am one who would have supported his being heard. The resolutions were moved, but they should have been seconded. After that, it would have been perfectly competent to any one to have risen, but, until then, there was a clear violation of the order of the meeting.

The Rev. Dr. BEARD—As one of the managers of the meeting, I feel myself bound to make a remark. Mr. Barker's presence was noticed at an early period of the meeting. (Hear, hear.) It was thought he might wish to speak, and two or three of the managers of the meeting talked the matter over one with another; and it was resolved that if he wished to speak, he should speak. (Hear.) I beg that I may have the attention of the Conference to this statement. There was no intention whatever to exclude Mr. Barker, and the only requirement or modification in his case was, that should he enter into matters alien to the business of the Conference, he should be called to order. Now, had Mr. Barker not interfered between Mr. Ward, who was compelled to retire, and who had been asked to speak, I would have been the first to stand up and claim for him five minutes, or a quarter of an hour. If he had intimated that he was desirous of speaking, some arrangement would have been made that he was not allowed to speak.

Dr. BEARD—Allow me, sir, I am in possession of the chair. An arrangement was made that he should be allowed to speak, as long as he confined himself to the object the meeting had in view in coming together. My friend Mr. Thompson makes a mistake, if he in any way intimated that there was the slightest possible compromise of the breadth of our platform. I will discuss it altogether when it is not a free platform. As far as I did anything, I used my influence to keep it free; but, at the same time, I am not a friend of disorder.

Dr. McKEEROW—I am an advocate, to the fullest extent, for civil and religious freedom, whatever diversity of sentiment may exist amongst us here, with regard to religious matters. I do not think we have to do here with discussions about creeds. This is a great question of human right, and human suffering, and human liberties, and the platform is broad enough for us all to stand upon. I would not have objected to Mr. Barker addressing this meeting; but I have had some little intercourse with Manchester people, and know something of the arrangements of Manchester meetings, and I say that it is understood perfectly among us, that when arrangements are made, no one has a right to interfere with them; but that, at the conclusion of the meeting, if any one desires to speak, or an amendment is proposed to the resolution, an opportunity may be afforded. I recollect well when we had a large meeting in the exchange upon the education question, that Mr. Holyoake rose up, and asked permission to speak. As Secretary of the meeting, I refused to hear him, simply on the ground that arrangements were made for speakers, but I intimated that, at the close of the meeting, he might speak. Mr. Holyoake, whatever his sentiments may have been, acted with the courtesy of a gentleman upon the occasion. (Cheers and partial hisses.)

Thus ended this unpleasant episode in the proceedings of this Conference. I never wrote anything in connection with the anti-slavery movement with so little relief; but as it may be contended by the friends of Mr. Barker, that the right of free speech was assailed upon the occasion, I have given you such a detailed account as I am able, of a discussion in which half-a-dozen were sometimes speaking at one time, in order that you may judge for yourself as to which of the parties was to blame, and who was responsible for the waste of such valuable time, and the interruption of the otherwise perfect harmony of so important an Anti-Slavery Conference. W. F.

**LETTER FROM SAMUEL JOHNSON.**

SALEM, August 24, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR: A word as to your comment on my letter to the Abolition meeting, the report of whose proceedings I have just read. I regret that any slight ambiguity in my language should have made possible such a construction as you put upon it: and had I been aware of the proposed meeting at Manchester, should have been more on my guard against misconceptions. But could you seriously suppose me capable either of believing that the British government desire to hallow the anniversary of West India emancipation, or of calling George Thompson and his friends, supporters of oppression in any shape!

Your statement that only the radical lovers of freedom really rejoice in this glorious anniversary is, of course, perfectly true. But there are, unquestionably, a great many people in England who are inconsistent enough to sanction and sustain the government in many of its oppressive features and measures, while they profess, and in some cases perhaps feel, in a measure, a wholesome indignation against slavery, an institution the safely got rid of and quite unpopular in that country. And it is not too much to assume, that very many such persons would attend a celebration of the 1st of August, and profess sympathy therewith. These are the "supporters of the government," of whom I spoke as celebrating the day in vain. I cannot think you believe inconsistencies of this class to be confined to our side of the ocean.

With sincere regards,  
Very truly yours,  
SAMUEL JOHNSON.

Wm. L. Garrison.

The slight criticism I made upon a passage in the letter of our respected friend, has drawn from him just such an explanation as we deemed to be necessary, on his part, to prevent his language being perversely applied by those who hate England for her many faithful anti-slavery testimonies. On hearing his letter read, the qualifying words "supporters of the English government" escaped our attention; but, even with this qualification, the case stands as we stated it—for, aside from a few active abolitionists and reformers in England, there are none who observe the anniversary of West India emancipation, either in a pharisaical or any other spirit. "The supporters of the government," who are content with its unjust administration, take no interest in the most honorable achievement in English history.—Ed. Lib.

**LETTER FROM H. C. WRIGHT.**

SALEM, Ohio, Aug. 19, 1854.

I AM far from you and the band of true and faithful that surround you. But I am not here alone; for a band of men and women more truly devoted to the abolition of slavery, and to the triumph of freedom, cannot be found, than exists here in Ohio. The friends here are hopeful. Well they may be, for a power is approaching, which will sweep slavery away from the earth; but which must also, in all probability, in order to that end, sweep away with the beam of destruction this blood-cemented confederacy, and the graceless, inhuman religion that sustains it in all its cruelties. There is a shaking of the old political and religious heaven and earth in Ohio, such as this State never knew before. The old political and religious sun, moon and stars, are being cast down, and new planets are rising.

But it was said that our noble Giddings,—for noble he is, and no man in the political world has earned a name on that arena of strife, of compromise, and of tears and blood, so truly deserving a world's gratitude, as J. R. Giddings,—should have so far yielded to the demands of Whiggery as to offer to withdraw his name from the contest, if it should be necessary to conciliate the Whigs, and induce them to unite on a candidate with the Free Soilers. The Whig who cannot vote for J. R. Giddings is not worth having. He would only curse any anti-slavery movement. To sacrifice Giddings for the Whigs in the nation would be a poor exchange. He has done, for fourteen years, all that any man can do for liberty, while acting as an ally of slaveholders, and bound by his official oath never to defend the fugitive slave against kidnappers.

Much have I heard, since I left you on Monday last, about getting Ohio and other States to pass a law granting to fugitive slaves a right of trial by jury. Trial by jury, indeed! A professedly civilized and Christian people passing a law to give to a man a jury trial on the issue—*Is he a man, or a brute?* No man who respects the nature he hears ever discuss the question of a jury trial on such an issue. Better strike deep at once into the very heart, the vitals, of the monster, Slavery, and pass a law that no man shall ever be put on trial, on such an issue, before any State or national tribunal. I wonder a man can, for an instant, consent to discuss the question—*Is a man a man, or a beast—a chattel? I will not.* There is no crime that a man would perpetrate, should a fitting occasion offer, who would consent to act as a jurymen or a judge, in a trial on such an issue. I ask, would you consent to yield the point, that a man is a chattel, should a jury so decide? "No," then, answers the Free Soiler and the Abolitionist. Why, answers the Free Soiler and the Abolitionist, who decisions you have previously determined to disregard, if they are against you? Have we not settled it—have not Nature and Nature's God settled it—that no decision of any tribunal, in heaven or earth, is to be respected, which decides that a man is a brute—an article of merchandise? My soul spurns all such decisions, be they from whence they may. I despise the authority and defy the power of any being or set of beings in the universe, that can arrest, try, condemn or acquit a man on such an issue. A man is not a man because declared so by a human tribunal; nor is any tribunal, divine or human, competent to declare a man to be a chattel. Away, then, with all juries, judges, commissioners, to try such an issue, and away with all Presidents, Governors, marshals and constables, who are appointed to execute a decision so blasphemous and atrocious! Let every free State legislature be called upon to pass a law forbidding a man to be arrested or tried on such an issue. Let them also be called on to pass a law outlawing any man who shall take any part in the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law.

These questions are all to come before the Western A. S. Society, at their anniversary meeting in this town, on the 26th, one week from to-day. The friends here are expecting Quincy, Remond and Barleigh; and they intend to make it a true inquiring meeting. It is hoped that many will be brought upon the anti-slavery mourning seat, to inquire—*What shall Ohio do to be saved?* There are many anxious inquirers, not only in Ohio, but in Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, and even in Illinois—the land accused by an Arnold. Should not an inquiring meeting be held for Massachusetts in Faneuil Hall? Now is the time—the Lord God of the oppressed is come down to plead the cause of the poor, the despised and down-trodden. His word to the Northern States is, "Let my people go, that they may serve me, their God, and no more cover before slaveholders and slave-drivers. Break every yoke, and let my oppressed ones go free." How true it is, "There is no peace to the wicked!" Is it too late? Will this Republic receive a baptism in blood? And will the North combine with the South to shoot down the slave who shall unshrink the sabre of revolution? What will Sumner, Hale, Chase Giddings, Wade, Gillett, Smith, &c., do, when the slave, with torch and sword in hand, raises the cry, "Death to tyrants!" Will these men join the slave, struggling for liberty, for wife, child and home—for manhood; or will they join the tyrants, who fight for slavery, for justice, for pollution, for dehumanizing humanity?

Radical matters are to be agitated at the coming anniversary. Let those who come to it, come prepared to discuss and to hear discussed the rights, not of Church or State, not of creeds, countries, castes, or conditions, not of Bibles, Sabbaths, or institutions, or organizations, but of man—*simply man*—and nothing else. Is man a man, or a chattel? We will not discuss the question. It is an insult to God, and an outrage on man to discuss it. But we will inquire into our duties in regard to all governments and religion, to all creeds and sects, to all books and priesthoods, that tolerate such discussion, and plead that the decision of any tribunal is to be respected, that can assert and try a man on the issue—*Is he a man or a thing?* Would that two laws might be passed by Ohio or some other State—

1. That no man shall be arrested within its limits, or tried, on the issue—*Is he a man, or a chattel?*

2. That all who shall attempt to execute the Fugitive Slave Law shall be deemed as enemies to the human race, and declared outlaws as such.

Let every friend of God and man bend his efforts to elevate the public heart and conscience to this standard, and Boston will never again behold in her streets the conversion of a man into a beast—when he must grope his way into the future, feeling after God and immortality amid beasts and creeping things.

God bless all who, at this hour, stand erect before God and their own souls, on the slavery question—the question of the world, for the nineteenth century. In this matter, we cannot serve two masters. He who is for freedom cannot wear the livery of slavery; nor, even with the delusive hope of benefiting liberty thereby.

Yours,  
HENRY C. WRIGHT.

ANOTHER DASTARDLY OUTRAGE. Here is a fresh specimen of the justice which is meted out to Northern citizens in the slaveholding States. A man named Graham was suspected, in the interior of Kentucky, of causing a number of slaves to escape into Canada. He managed to escape; if caught, summary punishment would have followed, for the planters believed him to be guilty, and that was enough.

A few days ago, Graham, (another man,) of Preble county, Ohio, (the inventor of a new and valuable plow,) visited Cincinnati while the Court was in session, to sell it. Some sounder whispered that he was the "negro-seducer." This settled the case. Neither his explanations nor remonstrances were heard. Not even his demand for trial, nor to produce witnesses against him, or to let him produce witnesses for himself. He was seized by the mob, and more than a bushel of eggs thrown upon him. Nor was this all. The mob blacked his face with indelible ink, except a circle around his eyes, and then ordered him to leave the State as soon as possible. He arrived in Cincinnati in a most deplorable condition.

**NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY BAZAAR,**

TO BE HELD IN BOSTON, MASS., DURING THE CHRISTMAS WEEK OF 1854.

The Managers of the National Anti-Slavery Bazaar beg leave to present their appeal for aid and sympathy once again to every lover of Freedom, whose eye this paper shall reach. We do it in the spirit of that hope which is power, pleading our own most earnest exertions in the slave's behalf, and feeling that liberty to improve the same at the hands and hearts of others.

The present is no time for faithlessness, or delay, or inaction. Its throbbing events announce that the hour draws nigh which is to decide, in this nation, the great conflict of Freedom with Slavery. In such an hour shall men be wanting? Shall it find a people weak, timid, selfish, alive only to material success and enjoyment, or shall it be able to summon to its emergency the heroism, the self-sacrifice, the religious faith, that bring in their very nature the assurance of success?

The cruelty, the baseness, the danger of slavery is fast becoming apparent to the whole North. Her best lesson must be, that no human legislation can sanctify crime; that, if, indeed, slavery be a sin against God and an outrage on man, all laws for its support are part and parcel of the original atrocity, and are to be disowned at all hazards.

The most abominable crimes ever perpetrated against humanity have been committed in the name of and under the sanction of Law. The persecutions of the early Christians, the persecutions of all the sects from the dominant church in centuries gone by, the lquisition, Massacre of St. Bartholomew, the Witeherst Delusion of New England, the recent imprisonment of the Madia, are examples of the truth of what we say. The legal enactments of their day gave sanction to them all, even as to the Fugitive Slave Law now.

For the authors of these deeds, shall it be more tolerable in the day of judgment that they trampled under foot the commandments of God, *legality?* It is as individuals that people must learn their duty touching this matter. The impious and shallow folly which supposes that men as Commissioners, or Marshals, or Soldiers, or Attorneys, can aid in the execution of atrocious enactments, without the same amount of guilt before God and man as if it were not "iniquity framed by law," must be met and exposed. When men give account to God for deeds done in the body, this refuge of lies cannot stand. Let us sweep it away now, by such earnest promulgation of light and truth on the duty of individual responsibility, that no man shall say he sinned ignorantly.

The diffusion and support of those great principles of justice that underlie the universe is the work that now claims our labor. For our foundation principle, we assume the right of a man to himself as against the world, and we accept every consequence that legitimately flows from this doctrine.

It is in Boston, in the United States of America, in the nineteenth century, where the Declaration of Independence has been yearly read amid public solemnities and rejoicings for more than seventy years, that this language will be esteemed fanciful, perhaps treasonable. To stir to their inmost depths our own or other hearts, can we add a stronger motive than that presented by such a statement?

Hon. Charles Sumner, in a letter to a gentleman in New Bedford, defends the course of Mr. Eliot, representative from that district, in proposing a repeal of the fugitive slave law at the particular time he did. He maintains that the fugitive slave law, like a wolf or a venomous snake, is fair game whenever and wherever a blow may be aimed at it.

The Mayor and several other members of the Boston city government, who visited New Bedford last week, were pelted with cold victuals, by the colored waiters, at the hotel where they dined. A placard on which was written, "Anthony Burns carried back into slavery," explained the cause of the salutation.

For a fortnight past, we have been absent on a visit of recreation among our friends in Brooklyn, Ct. and have just returned to the city, greatly refreshed in spirit.

COLORADO EMIGRATION CONVENTION. This Convention closed its labors in Cleveland on the evening of the 24th ult., after a session of three days. About one hundred delegates from the States and Canada were present. The Rev. Wm. C. Munroe of Michigan, acted as President. The Convention adopted a platform favorable to the segregation of the colored race, to establish a Board of Commissioners, and reported a plan for issuing a quarterly periodical, to be called *The Colored American Quarterly*.

Tremendous Conflagration.—It is our painful duty to record the most disastrous conflagration that ever visited Milwaukee. About 12 o'clock to-day, a fire was discovered in the loft of Davis's Stables, in the rear of the United States Hotel. The wind was blowing fresh from the Southeast, and in a few moments the whole row of buildings from Davis's to the Tremont House was in flames. The wind then shifted to the East, and in an incredible space of time, the United States Hotel, and the whole block, extending from Huron to Michigan street, including the whole square bounded by Main, Huron, East Water and Michigan streets, was in flames.

The destruction of this valuable property was comparatively but the work of a moment. The flames then extended across East Water street, to the west side, destroying all the buildings from the corner of Huron street to Nazro's hardware store.

As far as we have been able to learn, the losses are estimated variously from a quarter of a million to a million of dollars.—*Milwaukee News*, 20th.

A most destructive fire broke out in Troy, N. Y., on Friday last, and spread with irresistible fury over a space equal to about eight blocks, consuming not less than two or three hundred buildings, and destroying property amounting to not less than one million of dollars. Owing to the dry state of everything, it was almost impossible to check the fury of the flames.

The burned district is bounded on the west by a river, on the east by the river to Division St. and from thence by an alley to the East, and in an incredible space of time, the United States Hotel, and the whole block, extending from Huron to Michigan street, including the whole square bounded by Main, Huron, East Water and Michigan streets, was in flames.

The destruction of this valuable property was comparatively but the work of a moment. The flames then extended across East Water street, to the west side, destroying all the buildings from the corner of Huron street to Nazro's hardware store.

As far as we have been able to learn, the losses are estimated variously from a quarter of a million to a million of dollars.—*Milwaukee News*, 20th.

A most destructive fire broke out in Troy, N. Y., on Friday last, and spread with irresistible fury over a space equal to about eight blocks, consuming not less than two or three hundred buildings, and destroying property amounting to not less than one million of dollars. Owing to the dry state of everything, it was almost impossible to check the fury of the flames.

The burned district is bounded on the west by a river, on the east by the river to Division St. and from thence by an alley to the East, and in an incredible space of time, the United States Hotel, and the whole block, extending from Huron to Michigan street, including the whole square bounded by Main, Huron, East Water and Michigan streets, was in flames.

The destruction of this valuable property was comparatively but the work of a moment. The flames then extended across East Water street, to the west side, destroying all the buildings from the corner of Huron street to Nazro's hardware store.

As far as we have been able to learn, the losses are estimated variously from a quarter of a million to a million of dollars.—*Milwaukee News*, 20th.

A most destructive fire broke out in Troy, N. Y., on Friday last, and spread with irresistible fury over a space equal to about eight blocks, consuming not less than two or three hundred buildings, and destroying property amounting to not less than one million of dollars. Owing to the dry state of everything, it was almost impossible to check the fury of the flames.

**Annals of Meetings, &c.**

**N. E. FEMALE MEDICAL COLLEGE.**—The Seventh Annual Term will commence Nov. 1, 1854, and continue four months. Professors—Wm. M. Cornell, M. D.; Enoch C. Boileau, M. D.; Stephen Tracy, M. D.; John K. Palmer, M. D.; Isaac M. Cobb, M. D.; Wm. S. Brown, Chemist. Fees—To each Professor, \$10; Practical Anatomy, \$5; Graduation Fee, \$20. The Massachusetts Legislature having appropriated funds to pay the tuition of forty pupils annually for five years, from the different counties of the State, according to the number of Senators, applications can be made, personally or by letter, and particulars be learned, at the College, 274 Washington street, Boston. SAMUEL

