

TERMS—Three dollars and fifty cents in advance.

Advertisements of a square and over inserted three times at ten cents per line; less than a square, \$1.50 for three insertions.

The Agents of the American, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Michigan Anti-Slavery Societies are authorized to receive subscriptions for THE LIBERATOR.

The following gentlemen constitute the Financial Committee, but are not responsible for any debts of the paper, viz:—WENDELL PHILLIPS, EDWARD QUINCY, EDWARD JACKSON, and WILLIAM L. GARRISON, JR.

WM LLOYD GARRISON, Editor.



THE LIBERATOR

VOL. XXXV. NO. 3. BOSTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1865. WHOLE NO. 1772

Selections.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF HON. J. M. ASHLEY, In the U. S. House of Representatives, Jan. 6, 1865.

Mr. ASHLEY. I desire to call up this morning, pursuant to notice previously given, the motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution in reference to slavery was rejected.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does the gentleman call it up for action to-day?

Mr. ASHLEY. No, sir; but for discussion, intending to allow to discussion to run on until the House sees fit to order the main question to be put.

Mr. SPEAKER. This being private bill day, it requires a majority vote to set aside the consideration of private bills.

The consideration of private bills was set aside by a majority vote, and the motion to reconsider was taken up.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, "If slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong." Thus simply and truthfully, he has spoken our worthy Chief Magistrate.

The proposition before us is whether this universally acknowledged truth shall be confirmed or abolished. Shall we receive the sanction of the American Congress by the rejection of this proposition, or shall it be condemned as an intolerable wrong by its adoption?

Slavery had never been known in the United States, and the proposition should be made in Congress to-day, to authorize the people of the several States to enslave any portion of our own people or the people of any other country, it would be universally pronounced as an infamous and criminal proposition, and its author would be execrated, and justly, by all right-thinking men, and held to be an enemy of the human race.

I do not believe such a proposition could secure a single vote in this House; and yet we all know that a number of gentlemen, who could not be induced to enslave a single free man, will nevertheless vote to keep millions of men in slavery, who are by nature and the laws of God as much entitled to their freedom as we are. I will not attempt to explain this strange inconsistency, or make an argument to show its fallacy. I content myself with simply stating the fact.

It would seem as if no man favorable to peace, order, and a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

All who understand anything of our troubles, and who have a restored Union could hesitate for a moment as to how he should vote on this proposition. Commonly, however, of strife, sectional bitterness, and personal animosity these Halls have witnessed no appearance in Congress, or, indeed, I may say, since the organization of parties in 1836, slavery has usually been the sole cause. No observer of our history, or of the political parties which have been organized and disbanded, now hesitates to declare that slavery is the cause of this terrible civil war.

It is enough for me to know that slavery has forced this terrible civil war upon us; a war which we could not have avoided, if we would, without an unconditional surrender to its degrading demands. It has thus attempted to strike a death-blow at the national life. It has shrouded the land in mourning and filled it with widows and orphans. It has publicly proclaimed itself the enemy of the Union and our unity as a free people. Its barbarities have no parallel in the world's history. The enormities committed by it upon our Union prisoners of war were never equalled in atrocity since the creation of man.

For more than thirty years past there is no crime known among men which it has not committed under the sanction of law. It has bound men and women in chains, and even the children of the slave-master, and sold them in the public shambles like beasts. Under the plea of Christianizing them, it has enslaved, beaten, maimed, and robbed millions of men for whose salvation the Man of sorrows died. It so constituted its courts that the complaints and appeals of these people could not be heard by reason of the decision "that black men had no rights which white men were bound to respect." It has for many years defied the Government and trampled upon the national Constitution, by kidnapping, imprisoning, mobbing, and murdering white citizens of the United States, guilty of no offence, except protesting against its terrible crimes. It has silenced every free pulp within its control, and debauched thousands which ought to have been independent. It has denied the masses of poor white children within its power the privilege of free schools, and made free speech and a free press impossible within its domain; while ignorance, poverty, and vice are almost universal wherever it dominates. Such is slavery, one of the most odious and cruel of all the crimes of man. No nation could adopt a code of law which would sanction such enormities, and live. No man deserves the name of statesman who would consent that such a monster should live in the Republic for a single hour.

Mr. Speaker, if slavery is wrong and criminal, as the great body of enlightened and Christian men admit, it is certainly our duty to abolish it, if we have the power. Have we the power? The fifth article of the Constitution of the United States reads as follows:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the States, two-thirds of the whole number, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as one of the modes of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The question which first presents itself in examining this provision of the Constitution is, what constitutes two-thirds of both Houses, or what, in the eyes of the Constitution, is two-thirds of the House of Representatives? Is it two-thirds of the entire number of members to which all the States, including the States in rebellion, would be entitled, if they were all now represented, or is it two-thirds of the members who have been elected and qualified?

This question would have entered largely into the discussion of the subject now under consideration, had not your predecessor, Mr. Speaker, decided, and this House sustained him in declaring, that a majority of the members elected and recognized by the House made a constitutional quorum.

It has, so far as the action of this body can dispose of the question, been authoritatively settled, and settled as I think it should have been, by declaring that a majority of the members elected and qualified constitutes a quorum, and that two-thirds of a quorum can constitutionally pass this amendment. The question having been thus disposed of, I do not care to make an argument in support of a proposition thus authoritatively settled.

My colleague from the first district, [Mr. Pendleton,] in a speech which he made at the last session against the passage of this amendment, raised the question as to the constitutional power of Congress to propose, and ratify, an amendment to the Constitution to adapt an amendment of the character of the one now under consideration. He claimed that, though Congress passed the proposed amendment by the requisite two-thirds, and three-fourths of the Legislatures of the several States adopted it, or, indeed, all the States save one, it would not legally become a part of the national Constitution. These are his words:

"But neither three-fourths of the States, nor all the States save one, can abolish slavery in that dissenting State, because it lies within the domain reserved entirely to each State for itself, and upon it the other States cannot enter."

Is this position defensible? If I read the Constitution aright and understand the force of language, the section which I have just quoted is to-day free from all limitations and conditions save two, one of which provides that the suffrage of the several States in the Senate shall be equal, and that no State shall have less than one vote; and the other, that the Constitution without its consent, shall be no part of the national Constitution. These are the only conditions and limitations.

In my judgment, Congress may propose, and three-fourths of the States may adopt, any amendment, republican in its character and consistent with the continued existence of the nation, save in the two particulars just named.

If they cannot, then is the clause of the Constitution just quoted a dead letter; the States sovereign, the Government a confederation, and the United States not a nation.

The extent to which this question of State rights and State sovereignty has added this terrible rebellion, and manacled and weakened the arm of the national Government, can hardly be estimated. Certainly doctrines so at war with the fundamental principles of the Constitution could not be accepted and acted upon by any considerable number of our citizens, without eventually culminating in rebellion and civil war.

This fatal heresy doubtless carried many men of character and culture into the rebellion, who were sincerely attached to the Union. If we may credit the recently published private letters of General Lee, written in the spring of 1861, to his sister and friends, and never intended for publication, he was induced to unite his fortunes with the insurgents by the so-called secession of Virginia, under the belief that his first and highest allegiance was due to his State. Sir, I know how hard it is for loyal men to credit this. To thinking men, nothing seems more absurd than the political heresy called States rights, in the sense which makes each State sovereign, and the national Government the mere agent and creature of the States. Why, sir, the unity of the people of the United States antedates the Revolution.

The original thirteen colonies were never in fact dissolved. The man who had the right of citizenship in Virginia had the same right in New York. As one people they declared their independence, and as one people, after a seven years' war, conquered it. But the unity and citizenship of the people existed before the Revolution, and before the national Constitution. In fact, this unity gave birth to the Constitution. Without this unity and preëxisting nationality—if I may so express myself—the Confederation would never have been formed. The men who carried us through the revolutionary struggle never intended, when establishing this Government, to destroy that unity or lose their national citizenship. Least of all did they intend that we should become aliens to each other, and citizens of petty, independent, sovereign States. In order to make fruitful the blessings which they had promised themselves from independence, and to secure the unity and national citizenship for which they perilled life, fortune, and honor, they made the national Constitution. They had tried a confederation. It did not secure them such a Union as they had fought for, and they determined to "form a more perfect Union, more united, more compact."

For this purpose they met in national convention, and formed a national Constitution. They then submitted it to the electors of the States for their adoption or rejection. They did not submit it to the States as States, nor to the governments of the several States, but to the citizens of the United States residing in all the States. This was the only way in which they could have submitted it and been consistent with the declaration made in the preamble, which says that "we, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, &c., do ordain and establish this Constitution."

The whole people were represented in this convention. Through their representatives, they pledged each other that whenever the people of nine States should ratify and approve the Constitution submitted to them, it should be the Constitution of the nation.

In the light of these facts, to claim that our Government is a confederation and the States sovereign seems an absurdity too transparent for serious argument. Not only is the letter of the Constitution against such a doctrine, but history also. Since the adoption of the national Constitution, twenty-two States have been admitted into the Union and clothe it with part of the national sovereignty. The territory out of which twenty of these States were formed was the common territory of the nation. It had been acquired by cession, conquest, or purchase. The sovereignty of the national Government over it was undisputed. The people who settled upon it were citizens of the United States. These twenty-one States were organized by the concurrent action of the citizens of the United States and the national Government. Without the consent of Congress, they would have remained Territories. What an absurdity, to claim that the citizens of the New England States, or of the States, or of any section of the United States, are not citizens of the United States, form State governments, with barely inhabitants enough to secure one Representative in this House under the apportionment, secure admission as a State, and then assume to be sovereign and master of the national Government, with power to secede and unite with another and hostile Government at pleasure, and to treat all citizens of the United States as alien enemies who do not think it their duty to unite with them. This is the doctrine which deluded many men into this rebellion, and which seems to delude some men here with the idea that the national Constitution cannot be amended so as to abolish slavery, even if all the States in the Union demanded it save Delaware. Under this theory of State sovereignty, States like Florida and Arkansas, erected on the national domain, may, as soon as they secure admission into the Union, secede and embezzle all the property of the nation, including the public lands and forts and arsenals, declare all citizens of the United States who do not unite with them alien enemies, confiscate their property, rob them of their liberty, by impressing them into their army to fight against their own country and Government, and, if they refuse, to punish them by imprisonment and death. After doing this, if the authority to commit such wholesale robbery, impressments and murders is denied them by the national Government, they set up the claim that they are sovereign and independent, and are only defending their homes, their firesides and household gods, and we have men all over the North, who to-day defend this monstrous assumption and villainy.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a single section or clause in the national Constitution which clothes the political organizations which we call States with any of the attributes of a sovereign power, but on the other hand, prohibits in positive and unmistakable language any State from doing any act which a sovereign might do, without the consent of Congress. The supreme power of the national Government is rigorously maintained throughout the Constitution, and it is most emphatically ordained in article six, clause two, of the Constitution, as follows:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Section eighth, article one, enumerates seventeen distinct sovereign powers of a national character conferred on Congress by the Constitution, and, as if to leave no doubt on the minds of any, this extraordinary enumeration of powers is followed by this sweeping and significant provision:

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

If I understand this provision correctly, it means that the framers of the Constitution intended that the national Government should be intrusted with the interpretation of the Constitution, not only as to the construction of the powers delegated by it to Congress, but to all departments of the national Government. They never intended that any State, or any number of States, nor the officials of State governments, should be competent in any capacity to judge of the infractions of the national Constitution by any department of the national Government, nor of the propriety of any law passed by Congress. Any citizen has the undoubted right to express his opinions, and criticize the action of the General Government or of any department thereof; but neither is a State, nor are the officials of a State, clothed with any authority to decide as to the constitutionality of any law passed by Congress, nor as to the propriety of any act done by any department of the national Government.

It is past comprehension how any man with the Constitution before him, and the history of the convention which formed that Constitution within his reach, together with the repeated decisions of the Supreme Court against the assumption of the States rights pretensions, can be found at this late day defending the State sovereignty dogma, and claiming that the national constitution cannot be so amended as to prohibit slavery, even though all the States of the Union save one gave it their approval.

That provision of the national Constitution which imposes upon Congress the duty of guaranteeing to the several States of the Union a republican form of government is one which impresses me as forcibly as any other with the idea of the utter indefensibility of the State sovereignty dogma, and of the supreme power intended by the framers of the Constitution to be lodged in the national Government.

In this connection we ought not to overlook that provision of the Constitution which secures nationality of citizenship. The Constitution guarantees that the citizens of each State shall enjoy all the rights and privileges of citizens of the several States. It is a universal franchise, which cannot be confined to States, but belongs to the citizens of the Republic. We are fighting to maintain this national franchise and prevent its passing under the control of a foreign power, where this great privilege would be denied us or so changed as to destroy its value. The nationality of our citizenship makes our Army a unit, although from distant States, and makes them also invincible. It is objected that if we pass this proposition, the requisite number of States cannot now be secured for its adoption. In answer to this objection, I have to say that Congress has never before, in exercising its general powers, limited the time in which the State shall adopt or ratify. In no case has Congress attempted authoritatively to declare that it will require the ratification of twenty-seven States to adopt this amendment.

I hold that whenever three-fourths of the States now represented in Congress give their consent to this proposition, it will legally become a part of the national Constitution, unless other States, now without civil governments known to the Constitution, establish governments such as Congress shall recognize, and such States, together with any new States which may be admitted, shall be represented in Congress by three-fourths of the States now represented in Congress, and the ratification of three-fourths of the States thus recognized or admitted must be added to the number of States now represented in Congress, and the ratification of three-fourths of the States thus recognized, and none other, is all that will be required to adopt this amendment.

I lay it down as a proposition which I do not believe can be successfully controverted, that neither the Constitution of the United States nor the constituted authorities under it can know of the existence of a State in this Union unless it has a civil government organized in subordination to and working in harmony with the national Constitution. This principle has been fully recognized by all the executive branches of the Government since the outbreak of the rebellion. In this House we have authoritatively declared that a majority of the members elected and qualified are a quorum competent to transact business. The Senate at this session have adopted this rule also. Two-thirds of this quorum, then, if this decision be correct, as I believe it is, may constitutionally pass the proposition before us. If we may constitutionally pass this amendment by a vote of two-thirds of a quorum of this House and Senate as now constituted, three-fourths of the States now represented in Congress may constitutionally adopt it, provided that no new States are admitted, or before a rebel State government is organized and recognized by the joint action of Congress and the Executive. I believe this is the true theory of the Constitution. Certainly it is the only theory consistent with national existence. If we adopt the theory that a State once a State is always a State, we have no safety from factions and revolutions. Suppose that within the territorial jurisdiction known on the map of the United States as South Carolina, there should be no civil government organized in the next fifty years such as Congress will recognize, do you think you claim that at the expiration of that time, the old State organization would still be in existence, and that in order to secure the adoption of a constitutional amendment, such a State ought to be included in the number from which the constitutional three-fourths of the States must be secured for the ratification of an amendment? If not, then with what propriety can it be claimed as necessary to-day? The constitutional State government of South Carolina is as completely destroyed at this moment as though its Representatives had not been in these Halls, or their local government recognized by Congress for the past fifty years. Certainly no thoughtful man who has carefully examined this subject will defend the absurdity of the constitutional existence of political communities which we call States after their constitutional State governments have been destroyed by the action of their own citizens.

Speeches were made at the last session, and indeed at every session of Congress since the rebellion, to prove that the several acts of secession of the rebel States being illegal, were therefore void, and that the State constitutions in those States not only remained, but that the government of such States could at any time be put in motion without the consent of Congress, whenever ten or more loyal men could be found to assume the Governmentship and a few of the subordinate offices therein. Loyal citizens of the rebel States are fast being cured of this fallacy. They have learned by experience that the Government of the United States is supreme, and that local governments in rebel States cannot be put in motion without the consent of Congress. The mass of men did not at first seem to recognize the fact, that while acts of secession were illegal and void, its jurisdiction and sovereignty, nevertheless, it was such a crime that those committing it forfeited all rights guaranteed them by the national Constitution under their State organization.

Mr. Speaker, can there be such a thing known to our national Constitution as a State without a constitutional government? In my opinion, sir, a State government, to be constitutional, must be organized and act in subordination to the national Constitution, and in obedience to the laws of Congress. The national Constitution requires the officers in each State to swear to support it while they discharge the duties of any State office to which they have been elected or appointed. If a State does not act in subordination to the national Constitution, and its officers do not take an oath to support it, and they send no Senators or Representatives to Congress, there can be no constitutional State government in such State. Add to this the crime of secession, rebellion, and levying war, and the taking of an oath by the officers of such State to support another and a hostile government, and I claim it terminates, of necessity, and of right ought to terminate, the existence of a constitutional government in every such State. In a constitutional point of view, if there is no loyal State government, such as I have described, but in its stead a government under the Constitution established by the action of its citizens, then, in fact, there is no constitutional State government, and, of course, no State known to the Constitution. The States then in rebellion have no constitutional governments. They have civil organizations, however, hostile to the United States; organizations which are recognized as de facto rebel governments. When the rebellion is suppressed, there will be no constitutional State governments, in fact, in one of the rebel States, and certainly the rebel de facto government cannot remain or be recognized by us after the rebellion is put down. The people residing within the limits of these so-called States will be under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, because in point of fact they cannot be subject to the laws of a State which has no State government known to the national Constitution.

I may be answered that it is the duty of Congress to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, and that this provision of the Constitution implies the continued existence of the State, although its government may have been overthrown by violence or by the deliberate acts of a majority of its citizens. Grant it for the sake of the argument, but what will be the legal condition of such States if the minority do not call upon Congress to secure them a republican government? What will be its condition if Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional power, attempts to secure such State a republican government and loyal citizens cannot be found in sufficient numbers to maintain a State government? Is not the condition of such State for the time being that of a quasi Territory? Certainly, during the time it remains in rebellion and is unable to maintain a State government, it is not a State. If so, then, for practical purposes, whether of national administration or for the adoption of this amendment, States in rebellion and without civil governments which Congress can recognize, are not States within the meaning of the Constitution, and cannot act upon this amendment to the Constitution, or do any other act which a loyal State of the Union may lawfully do.

In pursuing this argument, we must keep steadily in view the fact that the United States are not a confederation, but a nation; that the national Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and that the Government organized under it is clothed with the sovereignty of the whole people. The first and highest allegiance is due from the citizen to the national Government; he is also subject to the laws constitutionally enacted by his own local State Government, the citizen is legally subject only to the laws of Congress. In the absence of a constitutional State government in any portion of the territory of the United States, where a State government formerly existed, Congress has all the authority of a State government within such territory. If, then, in the rebellious States there is no constitutional civil government, are they States within the contemplation of the Constitution? I again ask the question, can there be such a thing known to our national Constitution as a State without a constitutional government? If not, then the rebel States, having no constitutionally organized civil governments, are not States within the meaning of the Constitution, and the citizens residing therein, and subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, the same as citizens in any Territory of the United States.

If the contrary theory is true, that a State once a State is always a State, nothing can be clearer to my mind than that the Constitution ought to be so amended as to make it impossible for a minority of the States to destroy the Government, as they might do every four years, if the Electoral College failed to elect a President and Vice President of the United States.

In the event of the Electoral College failing to elect, the duty devolves on the House of Representatives; each State having one vote. Two-thirds of all the States must be present, and a majority of all the States is required to elect a President. The same rule applies when a Vice President is to be elected by the Senate. These are the words of the Constitution:

"But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States."

Now, suppose that from any cause two of the States represented here were not represented, and there were but twenty-three States represented in this House, and there had been no election in 1864 of a President by the Electoral College. The election for President in that event would have devolved on this House.

Would you, Mr. Speaker, have decided, when the question was raised, as it would have been, "Is there a constitutional quorum present?" that it required the presence of members in this House from two-thirds of the States, including the eleven rebel States; or in other words, that twenty-four States must be represented here, and that if you require a majority of thirty-six States, or nineteen votes to elect the President? If you would have so decided, and this House should have sustained that decision, and if but twenty-three States were present, then would have been an end of the Government. If we could not proceed to elect a President with the

consent of Congress, whenever ten or more loyal men could be found to assume the Governmentship and a few of the subordinate offices therein. Loyal citizens of the rebel States are fast being cured of this fallacy. They have learned by experience that the Government of the United States is supreme, and that local governments in rebel States cannot be put in motion without the consent of Congress. The mass of men did not at first seem to recognize the fact, that while acts of secession were illegal and void, its jurisdiction and sovereignty, nevertheless, it was such a crime that those committing it forfeited all rights guaranteed them by the national Constitution under their State organization.

Mr. Speaker, can there be such a thing known to our national Constitution as a State without a constitutional government? In my opinion, sir, a State government, to be constitutional, must be organized and act in subordination to the national Constitution, and in obedience to the laws of Congress. The national Constitution requires the officers in each State to swear to support it while they discharge the duties of any State office to which they have been elected or appointed. If a State does not act in subordination to the national Constitution, and its officers do not take an oath to support it, and they send no Senators or Representatives to Congress, there can be no constitutional State government in such State. Add to this the crime of secession, rebellion, and levying war, and the taking of an oath by the officers of such State to support another and a hostile government, and I claim it terminates, of necessity, and of right ought to terminate, the existence of a constitutional government in every such State. In a constitutional point of view, if there is no loyal State government, such as I have described, but in its stead a government under the Constitution established by the action of its citizens, then, in fact, there is no constitutional State government, and, of course, no State known to the Constitution. The States then in rebellion have no constitutional governments. They have civil organizations, however, hostile to the United States; organizations which are recognized as de facto rebel governments. When the rebellion is suppressed, there will be no constitutional State governments, in fact, in one of the rebel States, and certainly the rebel de facto government cannot remain or be recognized by us after the rebellion is put down. The people residing within the limits of these so-called States will be under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, because in point of fact they cannot be subject to the laws of a State which has no State government known to the national Constitution.

I may be answered that it is the duty of Congress to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, and that this provision of the Constitution implies the continued existence of the State, although its government may have been overthrown by violence or by the deliberate acts of a majority of its citizens. Grant it for the sake of the argument, but what will be the legal condition of such States if the minority do not call upon Congress to secure them a republican government? What will be its condition if Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional power, attempts to secure such State a republican government and loyal citizens cannot be found in sufficient numbers to maintain a State government? Is not the condition of such State for the time being that of a quasi Territory? Certainly, during the time it remains in rebellion and is unable to maintain a State government, it is not a State. If so, then, for practical purposes, whether of national administration or for the adoption of this amendment, States in rebellion and without civil governments which Congress can recognize, are not States within the meaning of the Constitution, and cannot act upon this amendment to the Constitution, or do any other act which a loyal State of the Union may lawfully do.

In pursuing this argument, we must keep steadily in view the fact that the United States are not a confederation, but a nation; that the national Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and that the Government organized under it is clothed with the sovereignty of the whole people. The first and highest allegiance is due from the citizen to the national Government; he is also subject to the laws constitutionally enacted by his own local State Government, the citizen is legally subject only to the laws of Congress. In the absence of a constitutional State government in any portion of the territory of the United States, where a State government formerly existed, Congress has all the authority of a State government within such territory. If, then, in the rebellious States there is no constitutional civil government, are they States within the contemplation of the Constitution? I again ask the question, can there be such a thing known to our national Constitution as a State without a constitutional government? If not, then the rebel States, having no constitutionally organized civil governments, are not States within the meaning of the Constitution, and the citizens residing therein, and subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, the same as citizens in any Territory of the United States.

If the contrary theory is true, that a State once a State is always a State, nothing can be clearer to my mind than that the Constitution ought to be so amended as to make it impossible for a minority of the States to destroy the Government, as they might do every four years, if the Electoral College failed to elect a President and Vice President of the United States.

In the event of the Electoral College failing to elect, the duty devolves on the House of Representatives; each State having one vote. Two-thirds of all the States must be present, and a majority of all the States is required to elect a President. The same rule applies when a Vice President is to be elected by the Senate. These are the words of the Constitution:

"But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States."

Now, suppose that from any cause two of the States represented here were not represented, and there were but twenty-three States represented in this House, and there had been no election in 1864 of a President by the Electoral College. The election for President in that event would have devolved on this House.

Would you, Mr. Speaker, have decided, when the question was raised, as it would have been, "Is there a constitutional quorum present?" that it required the presence of members in this House from two-thirds of the States, including the eleven rebel States; or in other words, that twenty-four States must be represented here, and that if you require a majority of thirty-six States, or nineteen votes to elect the President? If you would have so decided, and this House should have sustained that decision, and if but twenty-three States were present, then would have been an end of the Government. If we could not proceed to elect a President with the

consent of Congress, whenever ten or more loyal men could be found to assume the Governmentship and a few of the subordinate offices therein. Loyal citizens of the rebel States are fast being cured of this fallacy. They have learned by experience that the Government of the United States is supreme, and that local governments in rebel States cannot be put in motion without the consent of Congress. The mass of men did not at first seem to recognize the fact, that while acts of secession were illegal and void, its jurisdiction and sovereignty, nevertheless, it was such a crime that those committing it forfeited all rights guaranteed them by the national Constitution under their State organization.

Mr. Speaker, can there be such a thing known to our national Constitution as a State without a constitutional government? In my opinion, sir, a State government, to be constitutional, must be organized and act in subordination to the national Constitution, and in obedience to the laws of Congress. The national Constitution requires the officers in each State to swear to support it while they discharge the duties of any State office to which they have been elected or appointed. If a State does not act in subordination to the national Constitution, and its officers do not take an oath to support it, and they send no Senators or Representatives to Congress, there can be no constitutional State government in such State. Add to this the crime of secession, rebellion, and levying war, and the taking of an oath by the officers of such State to support another and a hostile government, and I claim it terminates, of necessity, and of right ought to terminate, the existence of a constitutional government in every such State. In a constitutional point of view, if there is no loyal State government, such as I have described, but in its stead a government under the Constitution established by the action of its citizens, then, in fact, there is no constitutional

PRESIDENT LINCOLN AND GEORGE GILL

FILLAN.

The President's Message, waited for with mingled anxiety and curiosity, was brought to England by the Asia on Monday morning. Summaries of the Message were immediately telegraphed to the "exchanges" and to the press of the empire. In the present death of those topics, the important document has naturally received quite its due share of attention. We heard some time ago, that Mr. Lincoln was at work on this Message so closely, that he had excluded himself almost entirely from general society. What was thus slowly elaborated has been very quickly criticised. Traversing a wide field, and reviewing alike the political, the financial, and the military situations, deliberation was needed to its adequate comprehension. But, unfortunately, the newspaper editor has little time to deliberate; while he is thinking, time is passing, and printers are inexorable. As might have been anticipated, the Message has given rise to a vast amount of contradictory criticism. To some journalists it seems a noble, to others a contemptible document. In our estimate of its merits, we are not disposed to indulge in either extreme. Nothing that we remember Mr. Lincoln has uttered deserves to be called contemptible, and though scarcely anything rises into the noble. He is the genius of common sense, there is no idealism in the genius of common sense, stating them boldly, about him. He is not an idealist, there is about him, whether asserting or advising. There is about him, the "magic grandeur" of the incarnation of the Confederacy. But if the citizen is not so commanding a figure in history as the soldier President, Lincoln has at least never been betrayed into the intemperance and exaggeration of Davis. "What speech of the 'rail-splitter' can match the 'impudent' of the Macon manifesto of the 'republican'?"

It says something for the sagacity and temper of the Federal Government, that, despite the many sources of misunderstanding inevitable during a state of war, it has managed to keep on terms of amity with all foreign powers. Questions have, indeed, arisen between our own government and the government of the United States; but we have the authority of Earl Russell for asserting that in every instance British representations and British claims have been met in a spirit of justice. Those who imagined General Butler's New York speech foretold the policy of the President, have been disappointed. The ostentatious display of his olive branch anticipated has not come from the grim field of carnage. The war will cease with submission, but not till then; though there will be no vengeance, there must be obedience. The leader of the revolt is the only man who fights with a halter round his neck, and the emphasis with which Davis has put the issue—subjugation or independence—leaves Lincoln no alternative but to fight out the quarrel to its bitter end. While deploring the continuation of this struggle, we must not overlook the fact that it is not Lincoln's creation, but the legitimate offspring of the policy of the South. The spirit of compromise which so long animated the spirit of compromise in the North felt it was not to give up every atom of manhood, a stand against the aggressive spirit of the slaveocracy was inevitable. President Lincoln was nothing except as the representative of that resolution. Personally he was as little objectionable as possible for a political antagonist. A free soiler from conviction, he had yet never exasperated "the chivalry" by any intemperate denunciation of their "peculiar institution." In point of fact, while repudiating the idea of extending the very, his repudiation was couched in terms of the utmost consideration for the slaveholder. Whoever looks with candor into his earlier utterances on this subject must confess they are attempted rather with the spirit of the philosopher than the partizan. The logic of events has lifted him to a higher platform than he occupied on the morrow of that election which proved the signal for revolt. He would, however, have been singularly unteachable, had he stood to-day precisely where he stood in 1860. Happily the advance has been all in the right direction. Let who may quarrel with Lincoln for the difference between his present and past opinions, assuredly it is most unseemly in the advocate of emancipation to chide him. Those who enquire in any particular name as to the great principles involved in this war, have but a poor conception of the magnitude of the issue. Had there been a better representative of an emancipation policy than President Lincoln, we should have deplored his non-acceptance, but inasmuch as his antagonist was the creature of the pro-slavery peace party, we rejoice in Lincoln's triumph. That triumph was the death-knell of a knot of as ignominious politicians as ever cursed a nation. The tools of the South, their craven-heartedness was yet the executioner of the chivalry. Had this party been victorious in the election of 1860, the friends of freedom must have bid farewell to hope.

Beyond all question, the real interest of America lay in the undelayed adoption of an emancipation policy. Emancipation in immediate prospect, and not merely glimmering through the mist of years, is indispensable to the weal of America. The interests of the white, no less than the black race, are bound up with the settlement of this great question in favor of freedom. The Message which Lincoln has just sent to Congress, no doubt that he, at least, is prepared to settle it. How Mr. George Gillilan can stand in the election of such a man as a heavy blow and great encouragement to the real interests of America, is beyond our comprehension. It is easy to hurl invectives at the North, easy to accuse it of inordinate ambition and insatiate thirst for supremacy, and quite as easy "to cumber the multitude of Southern sin" by the one virtue the South has displayed. But we had expected an abolitionist to have left that dirty work to other pens. Mr. Gillilan was not the least conspicuous among the band who, in other days, had nothing to do but to say of the apostasy of the South, and no taunt to copy of the man-stealers. Surely, then, when the North had cut loose from its "covenant with death and agreement with hell," it merited something of eulogy rather than rebuke. Mr. Lincoln has thrown no "bloody gauntlet down on the floor of the West," but says alike to West and South, only abandon slavery, and every right you ere while enjoyed will be religiously respected. It is, therefore, simply a caricature of the President's policy which Gillilan's letter presents. The speech at which he stands against self-interest; like Prospero, he starts at his own wand. Has Mr. Gillilan forgotten that whatever may have been Mr. Lincoln's shortcomings, the leading abolitionists of America have given him their confidence? Surely William Lloyd Garrison may be trusted to test the sincerity of the President's convictions and policy! Let Mr. Gillilan inquire on what side that band is to-day, who, when the nation bowed itself before the slave power, Abdiel-like, stood unmoved, unshaken in devotion to the negro? With scarcely an exception, they exerted their every energy, to secure the reelection he deplores as a heavy blow and great discouragement to the real interests of America. "What would be thought of that total abstainer who kept perpetually abusing the inebriate for his dissipation, but who, the moment that inebriate began to eschew the bottle, suddenly turned round and lavished all his sympathy, yea, all his eulogy, upon the publican who had drugged him? Of inconsistency quite as gross is Mr. Gillilan guilty. Who told Mr. Gillilan it was by mercenary hands that the battles of the North were being fought? Does he not know there is scarcely a battle in England, and this war has not made a house of mourning? If he is steeped in this point, let him look up the day to the lists of killed and wounded which appear daily in the newspapers of the United States, and he will see those stricken in the strife bear mainly English, and Scottish names. In proportion as we hailed with pleasure the eloquent and vigorous denunciations of unfaithfulness to anti-slavery principles Mr. Gillilan was wont to indulge, we now mourn his defection from the good old cause. Self-love may, indeed, veil his practical apostasy. He may imagine himself as good an abolitionist as ever, but the fact that he has taken sides on this great question, and that he has taken sides on the South, and scorn of the North, betray him as completely as did Peter's speech in the judgment hall of Pilate. —Saturday (English) Press.

GEN. GRANT ON SHERMAN. In his letter to a committee of Ohioans relative to the testimony to Gen. Sherman, which he has headed with \$500, Gen. Grant says: "I cannot say a word too highly in praise of Gen. Sherman's services from the beginning of the rebellion to the present day, and will, therefore, abstain from flattery of him. Suffice it to say, the world's history gives no record of his superiors, and but few equals."

NEGRO SUFFRAGE

A LETTER FROM THEODORE TILTON.

CHICAGO, JANUARY 5.

Editors of the Missouri Democrat: Let me borrow a hand's breadth of your space, to say from a distance to your Constitutional Convention, what several gentlemen in St. Louis desired me to tarry and say by word of mouth. The convention has a novel prerogative—to make a new constitution, which, when made, is not to be submitted to the people, but to go immediately into effect, subject to no tribunal of revision or rejection. But the convention is not to be formed by the people. It is to be formed, first, to emancipate the slave; second, to disfranchise the rebels; third, to ordain what else the public good requires. As to emancipation and disfranchisement, only one sentiment (and that a right one) prevails. As to what else the public good requires, the gate stands wide open to suggestions, old or new. I venture one concerning suffrage—a subject you are now debating. Give the ballot to all who can read, and deny it to all who cannot. It is strange that this proposition—approved, as it is, by every wise man's private conviction—is so generally omitted from the public law. Democratic government is grounded on the intelligence of the people. Every voter is a legislator for every other. The theory, therefore, is, that the voter must cast an intelligent vote. But what shall be the entailing measure of intelligence? Let it be the lowest measure consistent with the public safety. What is the lowest measure? If a man who could not read was once counted fit for an English king, let a man who can read be counted fit for an American voter. This is the simplest, easiest, and best of all measures. What is its practical value to your Convention? It affords a beautiful, just and equitable disposition of your disputed point of negro suffrage. I asked the radicals in St. Louis, "Will you permit black men, who fight for the Union, to vote for the Union?" "No!" said they; "the blacks are too ignorant." "You are not opposed, then, to negro suffrage because the negro is black, but because he is ignorant." They answered, "When the negro knows how to vote, we will give him the ballot." Now, this is well. The negro should not vote till he knows how. So long as they can not read, give it to both as soon as they learn. Today, in Missouri, more whites than blacks are unable to read. To grant the ballot to these ignorant whites, and deny it to these ignorant blacks, is a mere caprice of prejudice. Grant it to neither till they can it by alphabet and spelling-book. On the other hand, to deny negro suffrage entirely—to say, for instance, to a black man who is intelligent and thrifty, "you may pay taxes on twenty thousand dollars' earnings, but you shall not have a vote"—this violates the divinely-ordained democracy of mankind, and is an affront to Him who is "no respecter of persons." Is negro suffrage an untried novelty, that it should be feared? Not at all. Many years ago, Maryland and North Carolina sent their free negroes to the polls. A few days ago, Gatz Brown told you truly that except for the negro vote in New York State, the calamity called Horatio Seymour would have been repeated at the last election. I believe with Frederick Douglass, that "if a negro knows as much when sober as an Irishman when drunk, he knows enough to vote." There is no reason why your State should not now receive the noblest of all political constitutions. Such a basis of suffrage would command the assent and admiration of the world. It would crown its makers with everlasting remembrance. Now is the golden hour for Missouri. Let not her convention tarnish their opportunity by any stain of injustice and inequality. Faithfully yours, THEODORE TILTON.

THE LIBERATOR

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!

BOSTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1865.

I REPEAT THE DECLARATION MADE A YEAR AGO, THAT I WILL NEVER IN MY POSITION, I SHALL NOT ATTEMPT TO SUPPORT BY WORDS THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION, NOR SHALL I RETURN TO SLAVERY ANY PERSON WHO IS FREE BY THE TERMS OF THAT PROCLAMATION, OR BY ANY OF THE ACTS OF CONGRESS. IF THE PEOPLE SHOULD, BY WHATEVER NAME OR NAME, MAKE IT AN EXECUTIVE DUTY TO ENFORCE THESE PERSONS, ANOTHER, AND NOT I, MUST BE THE INSTRUMENT TO PERFORM IT.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

THE THIRTY SECOND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will be held at the MELODEON, in Boston, on Thursday, January 20th, 1865, day and evening, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M. The members and friends of the Society, one and all, are requested to attend.

At the morning session, with the least possible delay of organization, addresses are expected from Hon. GEORGE THOMPSON, WENDELL PHILLIPS, Esq., and others.

As heretofore, the NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY SUBSCRIPTION FESTIVAL at the Music Hall, on the previous evening, (Jan. 25th,) will constitute an additional attraction to all friends of the Cause.

By order of the Board of Managers, EDMUND QUINCY, President. ROBERT F. WALLCUT, Sec'y.

MR. CONWAY ONCE MORE—AND FINALLY.

In the Commonwealth of the 14th inst. appears the following Card from M. D. Conway:—

28 NOTTING HILL SQUARE, LONDON W., December 17, 1864.

The greater portion of Mr. Garrison's comments upon me in the Liberator of Dec. 2, is irrelevant to the real point of my letter to the Standard. When, on July 4, 1863, at Framingham, Wendell Phillips, with which I had a personal acquaintance, was in correspondence with me, he expressed his approval of the abstract principle stated therein as to the motives of abolitionists in sustaining the war, he drew the line between what I am and what I am not disposed or able to defend in that matter. The error of judgment which led me to a general statement, which I had the right to make, into a form which gave it the character of a negotiation which I had no right to make, was one of which I became conscious before the correspondence terminated, and which I did my best to correct when Mason had published it. There is, therefore, no question on this point. Nor is there any on the principle involved; for I look in vain through resolutions passed by the abolitionists, or Mr. Garrison's article, for any declaration that they would support the war were slavery uninvolved. Hence the only point requiring my attention is that which relates to the circumstances under which I came to England.

It seems to me scarcely candid that Mr. Garrison should have inserted the insinuation of a "secret history" that I should wish to conceal in the matter, when, as (Mr. G.) was cognizant of all the facts,—that the State of Philadelphia was not likely to be known, and, in ignorance of which, had done me, unintentionally, I hope, an injustice. The project that some one of the abolitionists should go to England had been earnestly discussed during the winter. Mr. Phillips and Mr. Garrison were both urged to go, but declining to do so, the project was abandoned. Mr. Phillips and Mr. George L. Stearns warmly approved. Both of these gentlemen said they would give \$100 apiece to the object, and more if necessary. I had before been connected with these gentlemen in anti-slavery operations, e.g. I had addressed public meetings throughout the State of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society paying my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of Ohio, at their request, and had been paid by the Society for my travelling expenses, and, by a similar arrangement with the Emancipation League, of which Mr. Stearns was a prominent member, had given lectures throughout Massachusetts. I entered the cause of

LETTERS FROM NEW YORK. NO. XXV.

Slavery exists only nominally in Delaware; first, by reason of natural decay, and next, because the State is surrounded by free soil, without a fugitive slave law to help her in. All this Governor Cannon points out in his annual message, and urges emancipation as the only remedy.

DEATH OF HON. EDWARD EVERETT. Edward Everett died at his residence, 82 Summer street, between 4 and 5 o'clock on Sunday morning last. The fact became known at an early hour, and was rapidly and extensively circulated, spreading the whole city in profound grief.

FAREWELL ADDRESS OF GENERAL BUTLER. HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF VIRGINIA. To the Honorable the Senate of the State of Virginia, and the House of Delegates, assembled in General Assembly at the City of Richmond, January 8, 1865.

THE FREEDMEN OF GEORGIA. The subjoined appeal has come to the New England Freedmen's Aid Society, from Gen. Saxton and various Superintendents and Teachers of Freedmen in South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida.

THE NEW ENGLAND HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN is now permanently established at No. 14 Warren Street, Boston. Its object is to furnish to the women of New England and the ministrations of their own sex, and such isolation and peculiar care as, in many cases, essential to successful treatment.

THE PAINE BALL. The One Hundred and Twenty-Eighth Anniversary of the BIRTH-DAY OF THOMAS PAINE will be celebrated by a Grand Ball, at Minot Hall, 1131 Washington Street, (corner of Springfield Street, Boston,) on Monday Evening, Jan. 30, 1865.

Various small notices and advertisements at the bottom of the page, including 'WANTED', '55th MARCH', and 'MR. GARRISON'S PORTRAIT'.

Poetry.

For the Liberator. SPIRIT OF FREEDOM. BY D. M. H. Spirit of Freedom! gladly we confess The power thou hast to elevate and bless...

TO JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER, ON THE DEATH OF HIS SISTER.

O, far away, who thousand hearts Most tenderly remember, Who read thy sweet words by their hearths...

SONG FOR THE NEW YEAR.

Old Time has turned another page Of eternity and truth; He reads with a warning voice to age...

IN FERO CONSENSU.

The day is past: Ere, like a weary child, Rests on the bosom of her mother, Night I hear the sound of laughter, sweet and wild...

The Liberator.

COLORPHOBIA IN WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, (D. C.) Jan. 6, 1865. W. L. GARRISON, Esq.: DEAR SIR—In the morning's issue of Mr. Forney's Chronicle...

A CHAT WITH THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD.

I have just been reading, in your paper of the 24th ult., an admirable sonnet to Edmonia Lewis, which I presume is written by Mrs. Waterston...

BLINDNESS OF EMANCIPATION.

We have seen eminent philanthropists, whose names are found in almost every benevolent institution or movement instituted for the improvement or welfare of mankind...

TEMPERANCE TRACTS.

MR. EDITOR—Let us leave nothing undone to stem the tide of Intemperance, which now threatens us. Temperance Societies, however useful, are insufficient for the exigency...

THE LOUISIANA ELECTION.

Maj.-Gen. Banks has submitted to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary some suggestions relative to the recent elections in Louisiana. He says he did not commend to his people the election of 1864...

THE RECORD OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Up to December 22, 1864, the whole number of colored troops which have been credited to Massachusetts, during the war, was 10,750...

ABOUT THE FREEDMEN.

In our efforts for the freedmen, there is one aspect of the subject which should be constantly kept in mind, and that is, that our time for helping them is short...

THE BALL MOVING.

It will be remembered by our readers, that a year ago an effort was made to elect Mr. Grimes, chaplain of the Massachusetts Senate. He is called and considered a colored man...

LUCIFER MATCHES.

THE philanthropic sighs over the fearful list of names who have been caused by inhaling the fumes of phosphorus matches. The most ghastly of these diseases is cancer...

HUMANITY DROPS A TEAR.

OF sorrow over the numerous cases of accidental deaths caused by the use of these easily ignited, inflammable agents. A truthful inscription upon many a little tombstone would be—

SCANDINAVIAN CHEMIST.

who has produced, to his credit, the long-looked-for alchemy; and it is true that he who makes two blades of grass where but one grew before is a public benefactor...

PEOPLE OF AMERICA.

may share with those of Europe the blessings of this invention, arrangements have been made for the working of the patent here, and an association formed under the name of

THE UNIVERSAL SAFETY MATCH CO.

who now offer to the citizens of the United States A DOMESTIC MATCH, INODOUROUS AND SAFE, and for out-door use

A FARM OF 1500 ACRES FOR SALE.

THE St. Mary's Lake Farm, 3 1/2 miles North from the city of Battle Creek, Calhoun county, Michigan, is offered for sale. The proprietor wishing to retire, offers this farm for sale on reasonable terms...

CARPENTER'S Great National Picture.

THE Emancipation Proclamation BEFORE THE CABINET. PAINTED ON CANVAS, measuring 14 1/2 by 9 feet, and containing full-length life-size Portraits of President Lincoln, Secretaries Seward, Chase, and Attorney-General Smith...

THE LIBERATOR.

us to exert them to put forth their best efforts for the oppressed blacks in the slave States now, while there is opportunity? If Butler and Porter succeed in their very perilous enterprise, the rebellion will be shut in from the outside world, and then, like the scorpion when surrounded with fire, it will commit self-destruction.

THE RECORD OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Up to December 22, 1864, the whole number of colored troops which have been credited to Massachusetts, during the war, was 10,750...

ABOUT THE FREEDMEN.

In our efforts for the freedmen, there is one aspect of the subject which should be constantly kept in mind, and that is, that our time for helping them is short...

THE BALL MOVING.

It will be remembered by our readers, that a year ago an effort was made to elect Mr. Grimes, chaplain of the Massachusetts Senate. He is called and considered a colored man...

LUCIFER MATCHES.

THE philanthropic sighs over the fearful list of names who have been caused by inhaling the fumes of phosphorus matches. The most ghastly of these diseases is cancer...

HUMANITY DROPS A TEAR.

OF sorrow over the numerous cases of accidental deaths caused by the use of these easily ignited, inflammable agents. A truthful inscription upon many a little tombstone would be—

SCANDINAVIAN CHEMIST.

who has produced, to his credit, the long-looked-for alchemy; and it is true that he who makes two blades of grass where but one grew before is a public benefactor...

PEOPLE OF AMERICA.

may share with those of Europe the blessings of this invention, arrangements have been made for the working of the patent here, and an association formed under the name of

THE UNIVERSAL SAFETY MATCH CO.

who now offer to the citizens of the United States A DOMESTIC MATCH, INODOUROUS AND SAFE, and for out-door use

A FARM OF 1500 ACRES FOR SALE.

THE St. Mary's Lake Farm, 3 1/2 miles North from the city of Battle Creek, Calhoun county, Michigan, is offered for sale. The proprietor wishing to retire, offers this farm for sale on reasonable terms...

CARPENTER'S Great National Picture.

THE Emancipation Proclamation BEFORE THE CABINET. PAINTED ON CANVAS, measuring 14 1/2 by 9 feet, and containing full-length life-size Portraits of President Lincoln, Secretaries Seward, Chase, and Attorney-General Smith...