





He thought the people might, if they would, abolish slavery through the Constitution. They had the power, and it was their duty. And he desired to ask Garrison if it would not be easier to bring the people to exercise this power under the Constitution...

Mr. GARRISON thanked Mr. May for his good Republican arguments. He (Mr. May's) position was similar to that of many intelligent persons in the country. He thought injury rather than good would result from sending out the resolution in favor of dissolution.

Mr. MAY desired to say, that if any thing would hasten him to the conclusion that the Union ought to be dissolved, it was the Republican leaders. He was shocked at what Senator Wilson and Speaker Banks had said. (Cheers.) He voted the Republican ticket, but was glad now that party did not succeed, for they were not in a condition to assume the government.

Mr. GARRISON said he agreed with Wendell Phillips, that God did not send him into the world to abolish slavery, but to do his duty. Consequences were to be left with God. He denied that the question of dissolution was one of expediency. The people were absolute worshippers of the Union. It was their God!

Mr. GARRISON said he did not get her! Mr. BLOSS—But he did not get her! Mr. GARRISON—No, because of the breeze it created.

It is notorious of Jefferson, said Mr. Powell, that he was not only a slaveholder, but that his own children have been exposed for sale in the slave market.

Mr. GARRISON knew of no delay in morals. He knew of no such thing as waiting till a bad thing was made good, meantime pledging alliance to the evil.

Mr. W. J. WATKINS then took the stand, and declared himself to be an unadulterated, uncompromising Abolitionist. But there is, said he, a difference of opinion among the friends of emancipation as to the means to be made use of to accomplish abolition.

Mr. GARRISON did not doubt the existence of such a feeling, but he knew of no considerable prevalence at the South of a sentiment regarding slavery as a sin.

Mr. W. J. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

North anti-slavery. So long as the North is pro-slavery, the Northern Church pro-slavery, there will be no dissolution. But we are laboring for and expecting a change. The oath to support the Constitution covers an immorality. Hence a man cannot do right, and take that oath.

Mr. POWELL was disposed to look with less favor upon the Republican party than his friend, Mr. May. He would recognize fully the merits of the issue presented by that party, the non-extension of slavery. But his standpoint of observation was from the position of the slave, and, as one with those in bonds, he felt himself outraged and wronged by the present attitude of the party.

Mr. GARRISON said he agreed with Wendell Phillips, that God did not send him into the world to abolish slavery, but to do his duty. Consequences were to be left with God. He denied that the question of dissolution was one of expediency. The people were absolute worshippers of the Union. It was their God!

Mr. GARRISON said he did not get her! Mr. BLOSS—But he did not get her! Mr. GARRISON—No, because of the breeze it created.

It is notorious of Jefferson, said Mr. Powell, that he was not only a slaveholder, but that his own children have been exposed for sale in the slave market.

Mr. GARRISON knew of no delay in morals. He knew of no such thing as waiting till a bad thing was made good, meantime pledging alliance to the evil.

Mr. W. J. WATKINS then took the stand, and declared himself to be an unadulterated, uncompromising Abolitionist. But there is, said he, a difference of opinion among the friends of emancipation as to the means to be made use of to accomplish abolition.

Mr. GARRISON did not doubt the existence of such a feeling, but he knew of no considerable prevalence at the South of a sentiment regarding slavery as a sin.

Mr. W. J. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

Mr. WATKINS thought not. If the tyrant omitted any clause necessary to secure his part of the compact, we are at liberty to take advantage of it. He held that it was an insult to the colored population to hold that they were not included in the 'we' of the Constitution.

Mr. GARRISON—Does our friend mean to say that the intent and meaning of a compact are not to be considered? Should not the construction of the framers be adhered to?

the victims of American slavery. But Methodists are no more guilty than are Presbyterians and Baptists and Episcopalians. Through the Government, other denominations, such as Free-Will Baptists, Quakers, &c., whose members own no slaves, become responsible as holders of slaves. They recognize Border Ruffians, Democrats and slave-holding Republicans as Christians, and throw the weight of their religious influence on the side of oppression.

I have been thinking, since I read yesterday the notice of your Convention, what a rare combination of qualities it needs for an Abolitionist to be a wisely successful teacher and advocate of this Gospel of Humanity. What manly and womanly courage, what reverence for man, what slight regard for institutions of Church and State, except as they help to higher freedom and truer life,—what boldness of speech,—what faithfulness of criticism,—and, at the same time, what sweetly noble serenity, what kindness of spirit, what charity and patience toward the sins and follies of the weak, the proud, and the wicked, what invincible perseverance and cheerful faith in truth and freedom,—in God's good angels, waiting long, watching ever, but saving at last.

But I must close, with best wishes. Yours, truly, G. B. STEBBINS.

NOTES BY THE WAY.—NO. II. NASHUA, (N. H.) Jan. 28, 1857.

DEAR FRIEND MAY: From Lowell I came to this place, arriving here on Saturday the 24th inst. The friends here were anticipating my coming, and were making arrangements for a meeting on the Sabbath.

The chairman of the committee met the proposition with apparent favor, saying he had no objection to our having the house—he would consult the other members of the committee. It was subsequently reported that the committee had decided that the house could be used only for meetings of their own Society! This is a denunciation that makes loud boasts of its liberality! 'No sectarianism here! But then, if a man won't grind on our organ, why let him presume to seek our fellowship. True, we profess to believe in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man; but these naughty abolitionists preach the equal rights of the colored race, and they would as soon expose the short-comings of our sect as any other.

Now, for myself, I can very easily conceive how a man, who believes that ninety-nine hundredths of the whole human race were created for endless misery, and are doomed to certain and inevitable destruction, can consistently do all in his power, by keeping an entire race in ignorance and degradation, to help on the work of the Lord? In this preparing man for his final doom! But how a sect, whose cardinal doctrine is 'God's impartial and unbounded love,' can refuse to fellowship those who are striving to make that idea practical, is past my comprehension, save on the ground that they are really more interested in the upbuilding of a sect than the spread of justice, truth and righteousness upon earth.

Rev. S. J. MAY said that he, as the only minister on the stand, and probably in the Convention, ought to repel the grave charge made by the first speaker (Mr. Powell) against the Church. He must, however, acknowledge that he could not see the fallacy of the speaker. He believed the American Church to be the great bulwark of American Slavery. He then referred to the reception of Mr. Garrison by the ministers and churches of Boston, when he first began to speak for the slave. He was denied admission to all the churches, but he advertised that if no other place was found, he would speak at Boston Common. That spirit of determination to be heard, drew his (Mr. May's) attention, and in the Infidel Hall which was thrown open for him, he heard Mr. Garrison for the first time.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

Mr. GARRISON expressed his gratification at the fair hearing which had been accorded the Convention in Rochester. Strikes, but hear! They had been heard; the blows, if any, were yet to be given. Mr. G. then briefly rehearsed the ground occupied by the Convention, and repelled the charge of 'infidelity,' so often raised against them. It was true, that in all ages, religion had been against reforms, but the Anti-Slavery Society was not an Anti-Bible or an Anti-Sabbath Society; it was Anti-Slavery, nothing more. For twenty-five years, it has defended the Bible as an Anti-Slavery book; but it has said that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, it was not of God,—and ALBERT BARNES now says the same thing.

New Year's leading article, that this struggle must be against slavery itself, is hailed as true as well as bold. The many letters of Wade and Giddings to the Worcester Disunion Convention call forth earnest answers from many hearts, while multitudes feel ashamed of the apologetic weakness of Wilson and Banks.

I have been thinking, since I read yesterday the notice of your Convention, what a rare combination of qualities it needs for an Abolitionist to be a wisely successful teacher and advocate of this Gospel of Humanity. What manly and womanly courage, what reverence for man, what slight regard for institutions of Church and State, except as they help to higher freedom and truer life,—what boldness of speech,—what faithfulness of criticism,—and, at the same time, what sweetly noble serenity, what kindness of spirit, what charity and patience toward the sins and follies of the weak, the proud, and the wicked, what invincible perseverance and cheerful faith in truth and freedom,—in God's good angels, waiting long, watching ever, but saving at last.

But I must close, with best wishes. Yours, truly, G. B. STEBBINS.

NOTES BY THE WAY.—NO. II. NASHUA, (N. H.) Jan. 28, 1857.

DEAR FRIEND MAY: From Lowell I came to this place, arriving here on Saturday the 24th inst. The friends here were anticipating my coming, and were making arrangements for a meeting on the Sabbath.

The chairman of the committee met the proposition with apparent favor, saying he had no objection to our having the house—he would consult the other members of the committee. It was subsequently reported that the committee had decided that the house could be used only for meetings of their own Society! This is a denunciation that makes loud boasts of its liberality! 'No sectarianism here! But then, if a man won't grind on our organ, why let him presume to seek our fellowship. True, we profess to believe in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man; but these naughty abolitionists preach the equal rights of the colored race, and they would as soon expose the short-comings of our sect as any other.

Now, for myself, I can very easily conceive how a man, who believes that ninety-nine hundredths of the whole human race were created for endless misery, and are doomed to certain and inevitable destruction, can consistently do all in his power, by keeping an entire race in ignorance and degradation, to help on the work of the Lord? In this preparing man for his final doom! But how a sect, whose cardinal doctrine is 'God's impartial and unbounded love,' can refuse to fellowship those who are striving to make that idea practical, is past my comprehension, save on the ground that they are really more interested in the upbuilding of a sect than the spread of justice, truth and righteousness upon earth.

Rev. S. J. MAY said that he, as the only minister on the stand, and probably in the Convention, ought to repel the grave charge made by the first speaker (Mr. Powell) against the Church. He must, however, acknowledge that he could not see the fallacy of the speaker. He believed the American Church to be the great bulwark of American Slavery. He then referred to the reception of Mr. Garrison by the ministers and churches of Boston, when he first began to speak for the slave. He was denied admission to all the churches, but he advertised that if no other place was found, he would speak at Boston Common. That spirit of determination to be heard, drew his (Mr. May's) attention, and in the Infidel Hall which was thrown open for him, he heard Mr. Garrison for the first time.

POETRY.

DR. KANE IN CURA.

A noble life is in thy care,
A sacred trust to thee is given;
Bright land! let thy healing air
Be to him as the breath of Heaven.

SONG OF THE EMIGRANT.

To the West! to the West! to the land of the free!
Where mighty Missouri rolls down to the sea;
Where a man's a man, if he's willing to toil,
And the humblest may gather the fruits of the soil.

REFLECTIONS.

The Mirror Face of Nature is a new patent toilet-
glass, lately invented in Paris, which reflects a per-
son's back, enabling a lady to arrange her hair back
and apparel with the greatest ease and precision.

MINNIE'S ANSWER.

There's a certain girlish grace
Hovers round thy form—
Sit upon thy beaming face,
Sweetly blended with a trace
Of a ripper charm.

ROSES AND GRASS.

I saw some handfuls of the rose in bloom,
With bands of grass suspended from a dome.
I said, 'What means this worthless grass, that I
Should in the rose's fairy circle sit?

The Liberator.

The Present Aspect of American Slavery.

SPEECH OF REV. THEODORE PARKER, At the Anti-Slavery Convention, Jan. 30, 1857.

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I have but a few minutes to speak in, for steam and railroad cars wait for no man. I shall not detain you long, but will call your attention to a few THOUGHTS ON THE PRESENT ASPECT OF AMERICAN SLAVERY.

There is obviously one great obstacle to our national Welfare at present and Progress for the future. That is the institution of Slavery, which now directly hinders the welfare of the white and the black, and threatens to ruin our Democratic Institutions at no distant day.

1. Yet Slavery is opposed to our National Idea, as once set forth in the Programme of Political Principles which the American People laid before the nations of the world: All men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain natural and unalienable Rights, among them, with the right to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.

2. It is also opposed to the Ethical Instinct of the whole Teutonic family, and specially of the Anglo-Saxon tribe. With little niceness, and no sentimentalism of morality, the Saxon has an intense love of personal liberty; and though he has been a tyrant like other men, he yet instinctively gravitates towards such political institutions as secure National Unity of Action and Personal Freedom at the same time.

3. Slavery is equally alien to the present Spirit of all Christendom. The nations of Europe long since weeded bondage from their nicely-cultured field.

4. Slavery is not less opposed by the general Progress of Mankind. For as the baby is detached from his mother at birth, and gradually outgrows the necessity of being fed from her bosom and borne in her arms, and at length becomes his own master, so the individual man gradually integrates himself from that excessive subordination to the Community—mother of all civilization—develops his free personality into all the forms which the variant genius of individualism requires.

5. Now, as American Slavery is hostile to all these forces of the Nation, the Tribe, of Christendom, of Mankind, it is certain that Slavery is to disappear and perish. Nay, as it is the chief obstacle to our present Welfare and future Progress, it is clear that the great Duty of America is to get rid of this hindrance as soon as possible, peacefully if we can, forcibly if we must.

6. All the great offices of the American Democracy have long been in the gift of the slaveholder. He is the Federal Government—a power behind the throne of the People, and hitherto greater than the People.

7. While Slavery has four such powerful foes, it would seem easy to end this mischief; but, on the other hand, it has two allies, which are both powerful and close at hand, viz., (1) Ambition for Political Power; (2) Covetousness for Commercial Wealth.

8. The Party of Slavery has hitherto had the control of the government, and is now to hold it till 1861. The single head of this creature is in the South; its double tail in the North;—for, though single-headed, it is double-tailed,—monocephalous and duo-setal. It had a Democratic tail and a Whig tail, the latter once a little longer, and so always behind the other. Freedom trod on the little end of Slavery, the Whig tail, and killed it; yet it did not exactly die; 'it kind of gin out.' There is still a little life in 'about the stump; 'it won't die till sundown,' as the boys say of other snakes. It is unconscious; 'it is a Know-Nothing stump of the once long and glittering Whig tail. The Democratic tail still lives. It is coiled up in all the custom-houses, and post-offices, and courts of the whole North,—a huge tail and a

famous, with a sting at its tip, and a deal of poison under it; and just as the Southern head wills, so the Northern tail straightens out, or curls up, lies low in the dust, or erects itself to strike Mr. Seward, Chase, Sumner, Mr. Beecher, or more especially the objects of its special hate, Mr. Garrison and Mr. Phillips.

9. The Party of Freedom. This is not yet very well organized, nor well compacted. It has no unity of action, no conscious unity of purpose, only unity of sentiment, perhaps only a unity of tendency, against slavery.

10. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

11. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

12. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

13. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

14. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

15. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

16. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

17. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

18. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

19. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

20. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

21. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

22. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

23. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

24. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

25. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

26. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

27. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

28. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

29. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

30. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

31. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

32. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

33. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

34. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

35. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

36. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

37. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

38. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

39. The Party of Slavery has a new lease of Federal Power—till 1861. The National Legislative, Judiciary and Executive are all in the hands of the slaveholder.

my peace of mind to say it, here and now. If the parties concerned do not like it, let them shut their ears.

One is Mr. GARRISON. I think no man now living has done America so great service. He has called the attention of the People to the great Crime of the American State, the great Sin of the American Church; he has foretold the national ruin which it is sure to cause, and has also pointed out the only mode of escape—the Abolition of Slavery, unconditional, total, immediate.

Two more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Three more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Four more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Five more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Six more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Seven more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Eight more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Nine more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Ten more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Eleven more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Twelve more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Thirteen more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Fourteen more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Fifteen more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Sixteen more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Seventeen more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Eighteen more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Nineteen more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Twenty more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Twenty-one more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Twenty-two more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Twenty-three more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Twenty-four more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Twenty-five more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Twenty-six more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Twenty-seven more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Twenty-eight more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Twenty-nine more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Thirty more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

Thirty-one more I wish to name is Mrs. ABY KELLEY FOSTER. Of a living woman, I must speak with more delicacy and reserve, and in nicer words, than of a living man; I would not overstep the modesty of nature.

the very earth, which teems with profusion under the cultivating hand of the free-born laborer, shrinks into barrenness from the contaminating sweat of a slave.

While his throne stands, agitation will go on until the foot of a slave shall not press the soil of the eastern or western continent.

It is not to be suffered to exist. We believe, with Henry Clay, that 'Slavery is a curse—a curse to the master—a wrong, a grievous wrong to the slave; that it is all wrong, and no possible contingency can make it right.'

We believe in the sublime doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal, and have an inalienable right to liberty.

We believe that doctrine to be embodied in the Constitution, that without due process of law, no person can be deprived of liberty. We do not believe, with Mr. Calhoun, the Declaration of Independence to be a 'rhetorical flourish.'

We do not believe it to be what Mr. Pettit pronounced it, 'a self-evident lie.' We do not believe it to be 'an eloquent and passionate manifesto of a revolutionary war'—'mere glittering and sounding generalities of natural right.'

We believe it to be a living truth, from the pages of the New Testament, expressed in the Declaration of Independence, and embodied in the Constitution of the United States.

He bestows these rather moderate commendations on the anti-slavery men of a different stamp:—

'I will do them the justice to say here, that they have for years devoted their lives and their property, and endured contumely and reproaches, for the bondmen of America; and here or elsewhere, while I exist, I will not let disagreement with them, or any other thing, prevent me from honoring them as men of great ability, who have studied the Slavery question in all its aspects, collected volumes of statistics bearing upon it in all its relations—men at whose feet the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Bigler) and other Senators who so gloriously pronounce them fanatics, might sit and learn something of Slavery in America.'

He goes on and declares what he considers the design of the Republican party:—

'Since I took my seat in the Senate, early in February, 1855, I have travelled more than thirty thousand miles in fourteen of the free States; I have seen hundreds of thousands of American citizens in counsel; I have listened to many of the ablest men in the country; I have conversed with them; and I never, nor proposing to usurp power in Congress, to abolish Slavery in the slaveholding States.

The venerable Senator from Michigan (Mr. Cass) mistakes in the idea that many persons voted under the conviction that they were voting for the abolition of servitude in the States.

So, then, if the Republican party had come into power, it would only restrict slavery in the territories. I think him a little mistaken in his opinion. I certainly have heard Republicans, and quite prominent Republicans, too, claim the Congressional right to abolish slavery in the slave States.

But Mr. Wilson not only declares that the Republican party does not now intend to abolish slavery in the slave States, but he says—

'When the Constitution was framed, the men who framed it did not intend to give Congress the power to abolish Slavery in the slaveholding States. Opening the Constitution of our country, we find no power specifically granted to Congress to abolish Slavery in these States.'

Yet he says elsewhere—

'When the Constitution was framed, there was not a man in America who believed that the idea of property in man, to use the words of Mr. Madison, was embodied in that Constitution.'

But Mr. Wilson goes much further. He defends the Union as an End which is to be secured at all hazards, not simply as a Means for the attainment of nobler ends. Thus he says—

'When the Republican party was organized, the avowed was made that the Union must be maintained. The declaration of Mr. Webster, "Liberty and Union, now and for ever, one and inseparable;" the declaration of Andrew Jackson, "The Union must be preserved," were borne throughout the canvass on all our banners.'

Here the Union is the Purpose, not the Instrument, for the security of Liberty, but at least as important as Liberty itself. Now, I venture to state a political secret, that some leading Republicans did not value the Union much for itself; nay, some thought it was a hindrance to both the immediate Welfare and the future Progress of the People, and did not much care how soon it should end; but they knew it was a popular cry, and intended to outdo the Democrats themselves in shouting that watchword!

The Democrats wanted Union for the support of Slavery. The Republicans shouted the old cry, 'Union! Union!' But the old faith in Union, for its own sake, is gone by; at least, it seems so to me.

He goes further yet—

'In the public press, and before the people every where, the doctrine was maintained that we were for the Union; and if any men, North or South, laid their hands upon it, they should die, if we had the power, traitor deaths, and leave traitor names in the history of the Republic.'

This passage, it seems to me, has been condemned more harshly than is necessary. He would hang men as traitors who should lay hands on the Union to destroy it! Exactly so; but the Constitution declares what treason is—levying war. Of course, it is to be supposed he would say this. Looked at carefully, it means only the same as his oath to support the Constitution and the laws. But I confess I see no reason for the words.

Here is another passage:—

'We vindicate the rights of the States—the right of the Southern States, if they choose, to hold men in Slavery, and the right of Massachusetts, Vermont, Michigan and Wisconsin, to protect, by their own legislation, the liberty of every man who treads their soil, until his liberty has been forfeited by due process of law.'

I think this the worst sentence Mr. Wilson ever uttered. No word spoken in this Congress has given me such pain. He pledges the Republican Party to vindicate the right of the Southern States to hold men in slavery! Mr. Webster, Mr. Douglas, has said few things worse than that. I reprobate the doctrine. The Republican Party will not vindicate the right of the Southern States to hold men in slavery. If it does, then the People of the North will tread the Republican Party in the dust, where the Know Nothings and the Whigs are already gone.

The Republican Convention declared that the rights of the States must be preserved. Did it admit that any State had a right to do wrong, and that right must be preserved? Has any State a constitutional privilege to prevent the attainment of the Purpose of the Constitution, to annul the unalienable right to Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness? Whence does such a State derive the privilege? From the Constitution? Does the Constitution, in its provision of means, confer the right to defeat its ends? From the moral nature of man? Does that moral nature authorize slavery, which is 'an atrocious debasement of human nature'? Shame on the base, unworthy thought! A shoemaker of Massachusetts vindicate the right of South Carolina to hold men in slavery! Has Massachusetts come to this?

We talk a great deal about the compromises of the Constitution; we forget its GUARANTEES. Look at this, from the Constitution itself (art. 4, sec. 4), 'The United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a Republican form of government.' The Nation has not fulfilled that guaranty to the bondmen. I think the Supreme Court has not determined what a Republican form of Government is. But there is a Supreme Court of Posterity, which will one day rule that to answer that question, an American is not to go

to the historic past of Greece, Rome, Venice, Holland, but to the American Programme of Political Principles in the Declaration of Independence; to our Programme of Political Purposes in the Preamble to the Constitution.—We, the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America;—aye, to the Ideal Justice which is dear to the human race, and gets established in the Golden Rule of Jesus and gets established of noble men. I say, Shame on the Senator who vindicates the right of the Southern States to hold men in slavery! All the more shame that he was a shoemaker before he was a Senator, for his continual contact with the daily life of common man should have kept his moral instincts fresh and pure. If shoemakers forget the instinct of humanity, what will ordinary Senators do?

But I do not give up a man for one ill thing, say, though so ill as this. Henry Wilson has done many noble things; I trust he will do many more. I have always held him to be a brave, an upright, a just, and an honorable man. He has endured temptation before now. In 1848, when the Whigs nominated Gen. Taylor, Mr. Wilson refused to sustain him. He was poor; not very thriving or thrifty, with a family dependent upon him. He was ambitious of the respect of worthy and respected men. Some Whigs told him they would make him agent in their factory, with a salary of \$2500 or \$3000 to begin with, and more in prospect, if he would not oppose Gen. Taylor. 'We don't ask you,' said they, 'to say a word, only to hold your tongue, and let your victuals stop your mouth.' Henry Wilson would not hold his tongue; he spoke manfully against the continuous encroachments of the Slave Power, against the corruption of the Whig party.

Last spring, you know what honorable service he performed after his generous colleague had been so foully assailed. His own life was in peril—should not here dare tell you how imminent his bodily peril was, nor how he was defended, nor do I care to remember what other Northern men trembled and turned pale. Remember this—he cannot now go to his place in the Senate without a revolver in his pocket. Let us be just to his error, also generous to the man; for I trust that, as in times past, he will yet do long and faithful service to the great cause of Humanity.

I saw it stated in the newspapers, some time since, that during a debate in the Senate, a Southern Senator charged Mr. Wilson with saying 'that the slaves had a right to rise in insurrection and cut their masters' throats,' and Mr. Wilson replied that he had never said so. I do not know his position on that matter, and seldom evert a position other than my own; but I should not have been sorry to be a Senator from Massachusetts when such a question was asked. I would have called the attention of the Senate of the South, and the world, to my words, and then rejoiced that I not only think, but am sure, that the American slaves have the natural, moral right to rise in insurrection and cut their masters' throats for the sake of freedom, and the time may come when it will be their natural, moral duty to do so; and if I were held in bondage as they are, in the centre of the continent, and a file of men two thousand miles long stood between me and my natural liberty, I would split that thread of life from end to end, and secure my natural right to liberty, even if I bled down a man at every step, and walked blood red from Texas to Canada. It is high time that this was said at Washington and at Boston! Why, what mass that pile of stones at Bunker Hill—the celebration of the great days of the Revolution, and the memory of its men!

Well, the Idea of Freedom is destined to prevail to prevail in America and become a fact. May will falter and turn off, but others will come forward and take their places. There may be unity of spirit and diversity of manifestation. It will be one function of this Convention, of these men and women, to quicken the sentiment of Freedom and Philanthropy, and to furnish thereby the appropriate Idea—while the Political Abolitionists organize it into the Fact of institutions. So a part of our work must be to criticize the action of others. We have never been charged with excess of leniency to foe or friend. Are we not just enough to be also generous? In the Anti-Slavery Household there must be Fathers and Mothers, yes, Grand-parents also; but likewise babes and sucklings of Liberty. Let us be a little indulgent to the boys and girls; they will be growing while we are working. The Anti-Slavery ladder, like the visionary one of Jacob in the Old Testament myth, has one end in the calm silence of the upper heavens, but the other must rest next on the poor humble ground. There will be men on all the rounds, and the lower will not always comprehend the higher. But let no man who has climbed as far as Mr. Foster and Mr. Garrison be over-averse to such as stand lower down; but with faces turned toward heaven. Rather let the lofty cheer and encourage the inexperienced, like a wise trumpet talking with them and saying, 'Come up hither!' In the Commonwealth of Liberty, as in the Kingdom of Heaven, there are shallow brooks which lambs may wade, and rivers also where elephants can swim; but elephant and lamb belong to the same land, and brook and river seek the same ocean.

DISOLUTION OF PARTNERSHIP. REUBEN H. OBER retires from our firm this day, by mutual consent.

The business of the firm will be settled by either of the late partners. Those indebted will please call and adjust the same as soon as possible.

REUBEN H. OBER, DAVID B. MOREY, THOMAS SMITH.

Boston, Jan. 1, 1857.

The business hereafter will be carried on under the style of MOREY & SMITH, who will continue to manufacture Block Tin and Britannia Ware; will also keep on hand a general assortment of Glass and Japanned Ware, at Nos. 5 and 7 Haverhill street, and would solicit a continuance of the patronage which has been so liberally bestowed on the late firm.

DAVID B. MOREY, THOMAS SMITH.

Boston, January 1, 1857.

THE United States Constitution, AND ITS PRO-SLAVERY COMPROMISES.

The Constitution a Pro-Slavery Compact, or, Extracts from the Madison Papers, etc. Selected by WENDELL PHILLIPS. Third Edition, Enlarged. 12 Mo. 208 pages. Just published by the American Anti-Slavery Society, and for sale at 21 Cornhill, Boston. Philadelphia. Price, in cloth, 50 cts.; in thick paper covers, 37 1/2.

Copies of this work will be sent by mail on the receipt of its price and the amount of its postage, viz., forty-four cents for those in paper covers, sixty cents for those in cloth. Address the Anti-Slavery Office, 21 Cornhill, Boston, or 138 Nassau street, N. Y.

Boston, Feb. 1, 1857.

Amusement and Instruction. PARLOR DRAMAS:—OR—DRAMATIC SCENES FOR HOME AMUSEMENT, SOIREES, ETC. BY THE AUTHOR OF THE 'HUNDRED DIALOGUES.'

All new and original, of a high moral tone. Just published. Price 1 00. Sent safely by mail, postage paid, on receipt of price.

Sold by Booksellers generally. MORRIS COTTON, PUBLISHER, BOSTON.